

INDUSTRIAL ACTION FOR POLITICAL ENDS, LIKE— **TAKE OVER THE FACTORIES!**

ALL GOVERNMENTS are opposed to the use of 'Industrial means for political ends'. And no wonder, for governments are in control of political action, but industrial action calls up the strength of the people, and this every government fears.

To show how fair they are, however, governments never hesitate to use political means for industrial ends. In fact, the whole of the governmental gambit is organised to control society in the interests of our economic masters, who own or control the whole of industry either for their own private profit or for the power of the state.

The true power structure of our society exists quite independently of Parliament. The enormous financial power of the City of London and its equivalents abroad; the great industrial power of the Confederation of British Industries and all the bosses' associations linked with it; the real state power that lies in the professional Civil Service; the influence of the old school tie and the old boys' act and the solidarity of the aristocracy loyally supported by the middle classes, reaching down to the magistrate's bench and the school board of governors and the masonic lodge—this is the power of the establishment.

On top of this real power structure, Parliament sits like a Bird's Whipped Dropping, proclaiming the farce of democracy.

PICK YOUR MANDATE

The present Government declares piously that it 'has a mandate from

the electorate' to bring in the Industrial Relations Bill, because it was part of the programme on which it won the election. So was a promise to keep prices down—in fact this was the MAIN plank of Ted Heath's election campaign, and we all know what has happened to that mandate! And who gave them a mandate to increase unemployment?

Once in Government, the elected party can pick its mandate to suit itself and politically there's nothing you can do about it until the next election, when you can choose, if you will, another bunch of mandate-pickers, to keep you distracted while the real power boys get on with the real job of pocket-picking.

When you get down to brass tacks, what does a mandate mean? It means that the vote of a retired colonel in Gloucester carries as much weight as that of a Yorkshire miner in matters of life and death for the Yorkshire miner.

Democracy means one man one vote, one woman one vote. So the vote of a nurse in a hospital, or an upholstery seamstress at Fords, is cancelled out by the vote of a manicurist at the Ritz or the duchess whose hands she is tending. The vote of a power worker is cancelled out by that of his own vicar! Now this is OK if all we are voting about is the colour of lamp standards, but we are talking about living standards.

When the Government claims to have a mandate to bring in the Labour Relations Bill, all it is saying is that a lot of middle class people have voted for something

which is out to control a lot of working class people—at their place of work.

In other words, political action for industrial ends!

THE REAL DEMOCRACY

Now as anarchists we are not interested in political action or political ends. What we are interested in is an industrial end: workers' control of industry. This is the real democracy; this is what will make us free men and women, not this silly nonsense of 'one man one vote' when all you are voting for is some government!

What the politicians want is for you to think only in terms of political action—i.e. voting—to get anything done. They are terrified that you will start to think that real changes in society can be made by industrial action, for this is the one thing they fear.

This is why both the Labour Party and now the Conservatives are concerned to try to contain the power of the industrial workers by legislation. Labour, which gets its Party funds from the trade unions, had to back down in the face of TU opposition, but the Tories, who get their funds from the bosses, have to go forward to a confrontation.

But it is all quite irrelevant, for the real struggle is going to be fought out in industry anyway. There is no other battlefield, and there are no other revolutionary means but those of direct action, that can wrest control from the hands of bosses or bureaucrats.

It is because they know this, even

if the workers themselves do not realise it, that both boss and bureaucrat want to stem the tide of rank and file militancy. And it is the rank and file that they are concerned about. The Tories have tried to stress that their Labour Relations Bill does not interfere with the functions of the official trade union leadership—and well they might, for they are very happy with those functions, most important of which is the controlling of the workers.

But the rank and file movement, remaining at shop steward level, is a much more dangerous kettle of fish, for it is from here that the drive for workers' control is to come, is already making itself felt.

AGAINST THE RANK AND FILE

It is to control the unofficial, grass roots unionism of the rank and file or shop steward movement that the Bill has been introduced. This, indeed, was the purpose behind the Labour attempt to do the same thing—an attempt that was dropped only when the TUC promised to do the controlling more efficiently itself.

The hard fact is, however, that the rank and file movement cannot be controlled as easily as that. We will not go so far as to say that it cannot be controlled at all, since obviously the introduction of totali-

tarian methods and governmental terror can suppress the outward form of militancy, as we have seen in fascist and communist countries.

Can it happen here? That remains to be seen, but one thing is clear. If the attempts to bring that form of totalitarian slavery into British industry are to be fought back, then it will demand more than a few hundred or a few thousand militants. It will demand clarity of understanding of the issues and a determination to fight for their freedom on the part of the entire working class. Any attempt at victimisation must bring millions out!

In fact the answer is to go beyond the possibility of victimisation by removing from their privileged positions those who would practice it. In other words, the answer to the Tories' attempts to bring in dictatorship by their slimy democratic methods must be social revolution and the taking over of the means of life. Workers' control of the means of production and distribution!

Time is running out. It makes it all the more important for the Anarchists and Syndicalists to get going in the factories and on the streets to ensure that at least the workers are aware of what the score is—and what is in store for them if they ignore what we have to say.

JUSTIN.

POSTMEN'S KNOCK

IF YOU GET this copy of FREEDOM by post on time you will know the Post Office strike has been settled. Whether it has been a union victory or a defeat for the workers we cannot at the moment (February 22) say.

It seems probable that the Government picked on the Post Office dispute as a trial of strength. They had to dig their heels in somewhere and the public sector (at public inconvenience) is always preferable to a Government committed to private enterprise. In any case the postal side was loss-making and the telecommunications side was more or less solidly scab, thanks to the multi-union structure of the Post Office.

Up to the time of writing there has been very little drifting back to work. After five weeks without strike pay over 96% of the Union of Post Office Workers' membership (plus a number of non-union members) were still determined to defy the Post Office bureaucrats and the Government.

The fact that they were without strike pay and the voluntary paying out of pensions, etc., secured considerable public support in contrast to the power workers' work-to-rule. Unions in this country and abroad helped with strike funds.

During the course of the strike Mr. Tom Jackson, secretary of the UPW, said the strike was 'an explosion of layer upon layer of discontent piling up on the Post Office year after year. This dispute was not just a dispute about wages. This is about management and efficiency. The money should be there to pay you a decent wage.' He said that the Post Office was filling Mr. Chataway's head with untrue figures about the effects of the Union's claim on postal rates. Administrators and bureaucrats were 'proliferating like sex-mad rabbits'.

Indeed, claimed Mr. Jackson, 'There are 24% more administrators than there

were four years ago, and 15% more supervisors to watch over us. If we are not careful, every postman is going to have an administrator in his satchel when he goes out in the morning.'

Replying to a claim by Mr. Chataway (Minister of Posts and Telecommunications) that a 15% settlement could lead to fewer jobs, Mr. Jackson said that it was important that the Post Office should be less 'labour-intensive' and added: 'If our claim is conceded in full, there will be fewer postmen, but there is enough wastage every year to take care of that. The UPW was ready to accept that. I wouldn't mind if we had 50,000 fewer members if we had a decent wage and didn't have 200,000 wage slaves.'

For its part the Post Office, in the person of Mr. Ryan (standing in for the locked-out and redundant Lord Hall), has muttered about three-tier postal systems, circular delivery, no parcel traffic, and all-round reduction of deliveries. The only bright ray was that many of the private get-rich-quick postal deliveries couldn't make money either.

When will it be realized that the Post Office is a public service or even, considering the work done for the Government in delivering OHMS mail, paying pensions and family allowances, collecting unemployment and health insurance, issuing motor, dog, television and gun licences, a Government service?

It is true that the Post Office could be much more efficient and possibly that machines could cut down some of the donkey work. Whatever happened to the promised electronic sorting machines and the post-office preferred envelope? And do zip codes mean anything?

Whatever the outcome of the strike, postal workers will still remain wage slaves. The struggle against wage slavery in the Post Office as elsewhere is yet to come.

M.H.

TUC's Aldermaston

THE TUC'S PROTEST march against the Industrial Relations Bill turned out to be the biggest demonstration of trade unionists since the 1930s.

The massive response far exceeded the estimates. A figure of 140,000 has been estimated. The sheer size of the demonstration made it a very impressive and moving event. The numbers assembling in Hyde Park simply overwhelmed one. Each industry was allotted a number, behind which the unions organising in that industry lined up their members. Twenty-three brass bands, one for each section or industry, led these columns in a seven-mile-long march.

The march started at 1.30 p.m. led by the TUC and the National Union of Mineworkers marching 15 abreast across the road. Union followed union, from building to bakery workers, from weavers to actors, until the last column, made up of political parties and 'left wing' groups left the park at 4.15 p.m.

Long before this, when over half the columns were still waiting to start, it was announced that an overflow meeting would be held on the Victoria Embankment after the Trafalgar Square meeting.

Taking part, marching with one's fellow-trade-unionists on such a massive scale, was certainly an experience which will be remembered for a very long time.

Sheer numbers are impressive, but should not detract from the fact that this march was organised by the TUC. The TUC bureaucracy achieved a mas-

sive turn-out in support of their line of attacking the Bill. No doubt many of those who marched thought that the TUC were not going far enough and would welcome a general strike. One political group did display placards calling for such action and many marching gave indications of their agreement.

But the day was one of sheer size, of workers calmly and good-humouredly demonstrating their opposition to the Government's Bill.

The TUC's answer to the Industrial Relations Bill is a feeble one which has no hope of 'killing the Bill'. Meetings at the Albert Hall, advertisements in the papers, Sunday marches and national petitions are not going to be successful.

The members of the TUC are men of compromise. They are only too happy to run a voluntary wages policy which will keep earnings down, if the Tories drop the Bill. Already the TUC and the Labour Party have been working out plans for such a scheme. The Tory Party knows that the TUC will not mount militant action to defeat the Bill or make it unworkable when it becomes law. The whole history of the TUC demonstrates this and these august gentlemen are unlikely to change now.

In fact the Government and the TUC have a great deal in common. Both wish to curb the shop-floor militancy which plays such a big part in pushing up wage demands. The TUC in the past has willingly accepted wage freeze and squeeze, and is still open to com-

promise now.

Workers and their trade unions have been attacked for taking political action against the Bill. But the Bill itself is a political act along with the attacks on welfare services. The Government attacks the working class not just by legislation against strikes, but by increasing the price of school meals, abolishing school milk, increasing health charges, and even charging for museums.

The Government's policy of reducing wage increases and its present stand with the postmen are political acts.

The postmen's strike is also an example of how trade union leaders, when they do commit themselves to struggle, do it with one arm tied behind their backs. While postmen fight for survival, the Post Office engineers are scabbing, maintaining telephones and communications which would quickly fail if they gave their support.

The postmen's strike must not be lost as a victory for them is vital for all trade unionists.

However it seems certain that the Government will pass its Bill. It will be left to the rank and file to fight it in the best way it can. As in the past they will have to ignore and defy the law, either openly or by other tactics. Methods of struggle will be found to best suit the situation and combat the law. Trade unionists will soon discover that the law is an ass and that if enough defy it and act in solidarity with each other, the whole Bill will be unworkable and meaningless.

As anarchists we have the task of creating confidence, showing ordinary trade unionists that they do not need the leadership of the TUC, showing that their own organisations at work-places can be built up to defeat the plans of the Government.

P.T.

The Years of Boredom, or Colin Wilson, His Life and Times

THE AGE OF AFFLUENCE, 1951-1964, edited by Vernon Bogdanor and Robert Skidelsky. Papermac Books, 75p.

ment, as I remember it then, was so tiny that I knew, I think, every anarchist in Britain by sight, and I am not good at remembering faces.

Actually for those accustomed to the dole and the hardships of the 1920s and 1930s and before, it must have been a good period. It was only bad for dissident middle-class intellectuals. It was the age of affluence, for many a golden age. It was only depressing for those who wanted to see a fundamental change in human society, who were alarmed by Orwell's gloomy prophecies, who saw already the pollution of the environment, and found no one to listen to them.

Stock sayings of the day were: 'You can't stop progress', 'That's the way the cookie crumbles', 'Fuck you Jack, I'm all right', 'If you can't beat 'em join 'em'. All suggesting that basically, despite the

Cold War, myxomatosis, the extermination of a million Korean peasants, H-Bomb tests and Teddy Boy battles, all was for the best possible in the best possible of worlds, and anyone who objected was just a fool. It was the age of affluent apathy.

The different chapters of this book are written by different authors, and deal with politics mostly. Thus L. A. Siedentop writes about Mr. Macmillan's period of office, and describes it as a belated continuation of the famous pre-1914 'Edwardian summer'. Fair enough, I suppose, although not everyone who remembers that period describes it as all that idyllic. J. B. Priestley for example says somewhere that the spirit of the time was not so much traditionalist as a kind of Jack Londonish adventurism, but perhaps all generalisations are dangerous.

Certainly however the 1950s looked back to what it imagined the Edwardian age to have been like, this goes for its taste in Prime Ministers and its style of dress. I must say that I found the political chapters less interesting than the later ones in the book which deal with the literature and folk customs of the day. There is a chapter on 'Looking Back in Anger', another on 'The Teddy Boy', which incidentally tells the horrifying story of how the newspapers created the Teddy Boy gangster out of practically nothing, an example of Oscar Wilde's

dictum that life imitates art, and another called 'Fifties Children: Sixties People'.

The great thing about this age was that for the first time in history the teenager became a social force. In earlier times there had been an 'awkward age' between childhood and early man- and womanhood, but it was relatively short, and had no significance. However in the immediate post-war period the teenager appeared on the scene, to be cordially detested by all. The word 'youth' itself came to be nearly synonymous with 'thug'. The age of sexual maturation had been getting earlier and earlier since as far back as the 1850s, but after the Second World War this process accelerated, it is difficult to understand why, perhaps improved diet for much of the population had a lot to do with it. And the young, during the post-war boom, were for the first time being paid adequate wages when they began to work.

The political consequences of this are only now beginning to be felt. To begin with, as may be thought appropriate in an Age of Apathy, this revolt was a-political, or even, in the Notting Hill Race Riots, reactionary, and seems to have involved mainly the working-class youth. The middle class of the period were remarkably dreary. That dreadful sado-masochistic mishmash *Look Back in Anger* was taken seriously as a play, and looked upon as the manifesto of a generation. Colin Wilson's compilation of misquotations, *The Outsider*, was taken seriously too. It is difficult to understand why. I knew a number of people who thought of themselves as 'angry young men' or 'outsiders', but the whole thing was very superficial.

As far as I can make out from the chapter devoted to them, the thing they were mainly angry about was Women and her power and influence, and the general insincerity and phoniness that this power led to, which puts them in the same category as St Paul or John Knox. Raving about the 'monstrous regiment' (i.e. rule) of women has been a favourite occupation of males since time began, and was not so much Edwardian as practically prehistoric. The reality of course is that, though some women can exercise great power as individuals, women as a whole have little influence on social development. Society is run by men. Women see themselves as impractical and emotional because this is how men have told them they should be.

On the whole all one can say is that it was a weird age, but at least some of the population were for the first time relatively prosperous.

A.W.U.

Correction

OWING TO THE extreme haste in which I wrote previous report (January 30), there were a number of minor errors which I have now noticed. There may, of course, have been others as well!

The membership of the UPW is, in fact, about 205,000 and not 220,000 to 230,000 as reported. The potential membership, however, is about 230,000 if all the Telephonists and OTOs joined. Nevertheless, the Post Office admitted last week that 215,000 of its employees were on strike—that is, at least, 10,000 more than the UPW membership!

In 1964, the then Tory Government did not offer Postmen an increase of 4/- a week, but 4% (that is 11/- on the maximum); but in 1963, Postmen on the maximum did only receive an award of 4/6d. a week.

Tom Jackson was a member of the Labour League of Youth, and not the LP Young Socialists. They came later, by which time Mr. Jackson had 'progressed' to the Labour Party proper.

I have also been asked who the 'well-known sectarian Marxist group' was, whose members and supporters were prominent in the secessionist National Guild of Telephonists. It was the SPGB. The Communists, however, opposed the secessionists, and concentrated efforts on capturing key positions within the UPW. Furthermore, when the Post Office became a Corporation, the NGT was not recognised by the Corporation as a bona fide Trade Union. The UPW leadership often chided the NGT with this, as well as its non-recognition by the TUC.

RANK-AND-FILE TRADE UNIONIST.

NO POST— NO PRESS FUND

But we shall still get bills
EVENTUALLY so please let
us have your contribution after
the strike.

But don't blackleg!

F.R.

Politics of the SLL

Surely anyone knowing the internal pecking order of the SLL as you do, would realise that changes cannot be brought about by anyone except Gerry Healy. Any attempts to do so by the rank and file will only produce that demoralisation.

Comrade Whelan's book shows how the SLL policies happily reverse themselves from time to time, due to the inability of the leadership to understand economic and social situations.

Comrade Whelan's book shows how the SLL policies happily reverse themselves from time to time, due to the inability of the leadership to understand economic and social situations.

Their policies seem to deliberately destroy any trust in 'left' politics that the working class ever had. How can I respect a man who tells me, with full power of the League, that 'Capitalism will reach breaking point in September 1970 when we will lead the Revolution'. Perhaps I missed it? Their wild, unfulfilled promises repeated day after day destroy the political consciousness of the working class.

Their youth movement is ghastly—after 'conforming' (short hair, clean

shaven, etc.—Summer Camp 1968 resolutions) the working-class youth is taught to play football and table tennis and eventually plays in the YS branch team. When he falls exhausted between matches, a superannuated League official pours political sewage into his ears. If after several such courses, he does not respond favourably, e.g. donate 50p to SLL, agree to sell papers every night, come to the Annual Conference (£3.50)—he is dropped from the teams and is relegated to floor sweeper in the church hall. Eventually, by ridicule the League turn the branch against the lad, and expel him.

Is this how to raise the political consciousness of working-class youth? Surely this does irreparable damage? Comrade Whelan does not want the YS/SLL to become 'apolitical'. Surely, they are apolitical already—one night in Leicester I asked a skinhead where the nearest youth club was—he told me of a club in the church hall, run by a 'tall chap with glasses, probably the Vicar'. The 'Vicar' was John Edwards of the SLL National Committee! The church hall youth club was a YS/SLL branch! Leicester has five such 'youth clubs' each with a football team, ping-pong league, athletics section, swimming gala,

etc., etc. The SLL has no time for 'political' work (thank God) and spend all their time organising interminable competitions.

Comrade Whelan has written an excellent exposure of the SLL's policy acrobatics, why has he bugged it up with such sloppy sentimentality? He has admitted that they do more harm than good. He has admitted that they cannot be changed from within—isn't that why he resigned?

The IMG and the IS are too close to the SLL to be able to criticise properly.

The IS especially are moving closer to the SLL—one of their many splinter groups has recently been calling for SLL-type tightening up on members, sales, monthly branch reports on members, etc. Just look at the latest clutch of IS leaflets on the Industrial Relations Bill. They are unlike anything previous, but horribly similar to SLL literature of six months ago—broad generalisations, over-simplifications, broad expanses of minute type—to sum up—repulsive and completely useless at factory gates—guaranteed to produce least enthusiasm in the workers and greatest demoralisation in the distributors!

I congratulate Comrade Whelan on his excellent catalogue of SLL inconsistencies, and eagerly await further catalogues of IMG and IS inconsistencies!

BOOK REVIEW

itself dull, overlaps into more cheerful, or at any rate more active times, by several years. The period from about 1948 to Suez must have been one of the most depressingly conservative periods in modern history. The anarchist move-

THE CREDIBILITY GAP—The Politics of the SLL, by Tony Whelan (IMG).

A LITTLE RED MOLE appeared in my garden last week and presented me with a copy of *The Credibility Gap* by Tony Whelan... a study of the politics of the SLL.

As an expelled SLL member myself, I must admit I was rather disappointed.


As a literary work it is fair—rather like the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*—lots of useful facts, but all the wrong conclusions. I thoroughly recommend it for anyone contemplating totally annihilating their local SLL branch, but although that may be fun, some disturbing facts of IMG policy come to light and should also be considered:—

On pages 72 and 73, having previously torn the SLL to shreds on policies, strategy and organisation, Comrade Whelan exhorts SLL members to remain active 'even though their work would be "pointless, or even marginally damaging to the working class", so that they can attempt changes from within'.

BOOK REVIEW

Following that he says: 'It would be a tragedy and catastrophe for the working class internationally if this cadre were to become democratised and apolitical, if these resources were not to be used for the interests of the workers' movement.'

Comrade Whelan, you contradict yourself just as much as Gerry Healy!



ALL correspondence to
Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road,
Roston Park, Birmingham 16

ANARCHIST FEDERATION of BRITAIN

LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS. All correspondence to LFA, c/o Freedom Press, BLACK KNIGHT GROUP, 5 Nelson Road, N.E. Meeting Wednesdays.
LAVENDER HILL. Contact C. Broad, 116 Tynham Road, S.W.11 (228 4086).
NOTTING HILL. Sebastian Scraggs, 10 Bassett Road, W.10.
LIBERTARIAN TEACHERS ASSOCIATION. Peter Ford, 36 Devonshire Road, Mill Hill, N.W.7.
NEWHAM. Pat Keen, 26 Farringford Road, E.15.

REGULAR WEEKLY MEETINGS
Wednesday, 8 p.m., at Freedom Hall, 84B Whitechapel High Street, E.1 (Aldgate East Station).

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS

BIRMINGHAM ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary, Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road, Roston Park, Birmingham, 16. Meetings every Sunday, 8 p.m., in the smoke room of St. Martin's pub, corner of St. Martin's Lane and Jamaica Row.
BOURNEMOUTH AREA. Bob Fry, 30 Douglas Close, Upton, Poole, Dorset.
BRIGHTON & HOVE. Nick Heath, Flat 3, 26 Clifton Road, Brighton, Sussex.
UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX. Felicity Frank, Keynes Tower, University of Essex, Colchester, Essex.
BRISTOL. c/o Ian Stanley, Flat 1, 32 Station Road, Bristol.
CORNWALL ANARCHISTS. Brian & Hazel McGee, Hillcrest Farm, Hicks Mill, Boscawen, Truro, Cornwall. Visiting comrades welcome.
PLACE ACTION. Rory Weightman, P.C.T. Peace

Action Group, St. Pauls Road, Portsmouth, Hants.
CROYDON LIBERTARIANS. Laurence and Celia Outer, 35 Natal Road, Thornton Heath, CR4 8QH (653 7546) or contact Keith McCain, 1 Langwood Street, West Norwood, S.E.27. Phone 670 7297.
EDGWARE PEACE ACTION GROUP. Contact Melvyn Estrin, 84 Edgwarebury Lane, Edgware, Middx.
FARNBOROUGH. 81 Mytchett Road, Mytchett, Camberley, Surrey. Tel.: Farnborough 43811.
HERTS. Contact Val and John Pannell, 10 Fry Road, Chesham, Bucks.
LEICESTER. Black Flag Bookshop, 1 Wilne Street, Leicester. Tel.: 29912.
LOUGHBOROUGH. Peter Davies, 67 Griffin Close, Shephed, Loughborough, Leics., LE12 9QQ. Tel.: 2117.
MUTUAL AID GROUP. c/o Borrowdale, Carriage Drive, Frodsham, Cheshire.
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE. Terry Phillips, 70 Blenheim Walk, Corby, Northants.
NORTH EAST ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact M. Renick, 122 Mowbray Street, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne 6.
NORKE SOMERSET ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Roy Buxey, 3 Abbey Street, Bath, or Geoffrey Barfoot, 74 St. Thomas Street, Wells.
ORFINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Knockholt, Mr. Severnside, Kent. Every six weeks at Greenways, Knockholt. Phone: Knockholt 286. Brian and Maureen Richardson.
PORTSMOUTH. Ken Bowbrick, 26 Humberdon House, Landport, Portsmouth, Hants.
READING. 26 Bulmerside Road. Tel.: Reading 66645. Meetings every Thursday.
TAUNTON. c/o Dave Poulson, 473 Branley Road, Taunton, Somerset.
WEST HAM ANARCHISTS. Regular meetings and activities contact Mr. T. Plant, 10 Theobaldy

Road, East Ham, E.6. Tel.: 552 4162.
MERSEYSIDE. c/o John Cowan, 172a Lodge Road, Liverpool 8. Meetings first Sunday in each month, 8 p.m.

ESSEX & EAST HERTS FEDERATION

NORTH ESSEX. Write: Peter Newell, 'Angels', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester.
BASILDON & WICKFORD. Mick Powell, Glamis House, 24 Cameron Close, Brentwood, Essex.
ESSEX STORTFORD. Vic Mount, 'Eastview', Castle Street, Bishop's Stortford, Herts.
CHELMSFORD. Mrs. Eva Archer, Mill House, Purleigh, Chelmsford, Essex.
EPFING. John Barwick, 14 Centre Avenue, Epping, Essex.
HARLOW. Stephen Murrell, 34 Sharpcroft, Essex.
LOUGHTON. Group c/o Students' Union, Loughton College of Further Education, Borders Lane, Loughton, Essex.

NORTH-WEST FEDERATION

N.W. Federation Sec.: Les Smith, 47 Clarence Street, Primrose, Lancaster.
BLACKPOOL. Contact Christine and Graham, 2 Fenner Avenue, Southshore, Blackpool.
BOLTON. Contact John Hayes, 31 Rydal Road, Bolton.
CHORLEY. Contact Kevin Lynch, 6 Garfield Terrace, Chorley.
LANCASTER & MORECAMBE. Les Smith, 47 Clarence Street, Primrose, Lancaster.
MANCHESTER ANARCHISTS AND SYNDICALISTS. Jenny Honeyford, 33 Clyde Road, Didsbury, Manchester, 21.
FREESTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Rob Wilkinson, 73 Trafford Street, Freeston. Meetings: The Wellington Hotel, Glovers Court, Freeston. Wednesdays, 8 p.m.

SURREY FEDERATION

DORKING. Mungo Park, 16 Overdale Road, Dorking, Surrey.
EPSOM. G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom. Tel. Epsom 23806.
KINGSTON. Roger Willis, 69 Woodlands Avenue, New Malden, Surrey.
GUILDFORD. Contact Epsom Group.
MERTON. Elliot Burns, 13 Amity Grove, London, S.W.19. Tel. 01-946 1444.

YORKSHIRE FEDERATION

Secretary: Contact Leeds Group.
HULL. Jim Young, 3 Fredericks Crescent, Hawthorn Avenue, Hull.
KIRKBY. Steve Wood, 288 Cavendish Street,

Leeds. Martin Watkins, Flat D, 90 Clarewood Road, Leeds, LS2 9LB.
SHEDFIELD. Dave Jeffries, c/o Students Union, Western Bank, Sheffield, 10. L. C. Wood, 4 Havelock Square, Sheffield.
YORK. Keith Nathan, Vauxhall College, Kingston, York.

WELSH FEDERATION

ABERYSTWYTH ANARCHISTS. J. Smith, Nantocs Mans, Aberyystwyth, Ceredigion. Bobas Marland, c/o Students' Union, Laure Place, Aberyystwyth, Ceredigion.
CARDIFF ANARCHIST GROUP. AN correspondence to—Pete Raymond, 18 Marion Street, Splott, Cardiff.
SWANSEA ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Ian Bone, 18 Windsor Street, Uplands, Swansea. Meetings at the above address every Sunday at 7 p.m.

SCOTTISH FEDERATION

All correspondence to Temporary Secretary: Neil Munro, 203 Cornhill Drive, Aberdeen.
ABERDEEN & PETERHEAD ANARCHISTS. Contact both groups via Neil Munro, 203 Cornhill Drive, Aberdeen. For 'Freedom' Sales: Ian & Peggy Sutherland, 8 Eslonmont Avenue, Aberdeen. Also for contacts in Inverness.
EDINBURGH. Tony Hughes, Top Flat, 40 Angle Park Terrace, Edinburgh 11.
FIFE. Bob and Una Turnbull, Rath Home Farm, Rath Estate, Kirkcaldy.
GLASGOW. Moira Young, 91 Urquhart Drive, Glasgow, S.W.1.
ROSS-SHIRE. Contact David Rodgers, Broadfeld, Evanston, Ross-shire, Scotland.

NORTHERN IRELAND

BELFAST ANARCHIST GROUP. No address available. Letters c/o Freedom Press.

SOUTHERN IRELAND

20 College Lane, Dublin, 2.

STUDENT GROUPS

LOUGHTON. c/o Students Union, Loughton College of Further Education, Borders Lane, Loughton, Essex.
KEELE UNIVERSITY ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Pete Hannah, c/o Students Union, University of Keele, Staffs.
OXFORD ANARCHISTS. Contact John Nygals, New College, Oxford; Steve Watts, Trinity College, Oxford.

SWANSEA. Contact Ian Bone, 18 Windsor Street, Uplands, Swansea.
TAUNTON. Contact Dave Poulson, 473 Branley Road, Taunton, Somerset.
YORK. Contact R. Atkins, Vauxhall College, Kingston, York.
LSE. St. Clements Buildings, Houghton Street, W.C.2.
LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY GROUP. At the Anarchist Bookshop, Union Foyer, every Friday lunch time or write Anarchist Group, Student Union, Liverpool University.
SCHOOLS ANARCHIST GROUP. Kate & Jon, 31 Wilby Lane, Leonard Stanley, nr. Stonehouse, GLO 3NS, Gloucestershire.
SCHOOLS ANARCHIST GROUP—BELFAST AREA. Michael Scott, Longshot, Ballymaghlin, Lisburn.
UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX. Felicity Frank, Keynes Tower, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex.

ABROAD

AUSTRALIA. Federation of Australian Anarchists, P.O. Box A 389, Sydney South, NSW 2000.
BELGIUM. Groupe du Journal Le Libertaire, 28 rue Vivienne, Liège.
RADICAL LIBERTARIAN ALLIANCE. Box 2104, Grand Central Station, New York, N.Y. 10017.

PROPOSED GROUPS

BERMONDSEY. Roy Heath, 38 Thurston Square, S.E.1.
MONTREAL, QUEBEC. Anyone interested in forming a Montreal area Anarchist group please contact: Ron, c/o St. Lawrence, 449-6432.
EAST ANGLIAN LIBERTARIAN GROUP. John Sullivan, c/o Students Union, U.E.A., Wilberforce Road, Norwich, Norfolk.
NOTTINGHAM and area. Contact Jim Henson, 43 Henry Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham.
NOVA SCOTIA. P. Ridley, c/o Newport Post Office, Newport, Nova Scotia, Canada.
VANCOUVER I.W.W. and Libertarian group. Box 512, Postal St. 'A', Vancouver 1, B.C., Canada. Read 'The Rebel'—please send donation for postage.

Please notify us if entries in these columns need amending.

MOST COUNTRIES, both capitalist and communist, are facing problems in inflation and the governments and employers of these countries are each trying to tackle the problems in their own ways.

In Britain, the Tories with their abhorrence of a formal 'Prices and Incomes' Policy are nevertheless doing their utmost to bring down the level of wage increases. Soon after their election to power they made their intentions known by setting an example themselves in the public sector of the economy. First they had a showdown with the Council workers, with whom they were unsuccessful, and this was followed with the power workers. Their success just before Christmas in this case was due to the adverse public reactions to the power men's work-to-rule. The postmen's union has handled their present dispute more astutely although, as the writer on this strike in the last issue of FREEDOM pointed out, a better tactic would have been a work-to-rule.

The Chancellor, Mr. Anthony Barber, has claimed that the Government is slowly succeeding in its policy of 'progressive de-escalation' of the level of pay settlements against a background of firm control of demand. However a lot hinges on the Wilberforce Inquiry into the power men's work-to-rule. Although the report was expected to support the Government's contentions, delays in its publication and the latest news concerning it indicate that the 'national interest' might, after all, be served by giving the power men a 12-13% award. If this is the case, then there can be little justification for the Government to hold out against the postmen and certainly the Union of Postal Workers would

The 'National Interest' and 'Inflation'

settle for such a figure.

CHRYSLER'S UNIQUE POSITION

In the past few weeks the Government's attention has turned more to the private sector where a number of important pay claims have been settled or are to be negotiated. One such settlement at Chrysler, Linwood, far exceeded Government policy, but the award has been justified by the company who say they are in a unique position. Obviously no one company is in such a position that allows it exception, but Chrysler, by settling for an 18% increase, have done the Government no little harm and workers a great deal of good. By supposedly damaging the 'national interest' by this inflationary award, Chryslers have exploded a myth that far too many workers are only too ready to believe. It is the myth that is crammed down our throats every day of it being in the 'national interest' to keep wage claims to a minimum.

Chryslers have shown that the 'national interest' is not some collective whole of which we are all a part, but that it is of a particular class who run, own and control the production of this country. It

was in their interests to settle for 18% because a strike would have jeopardised their chances of breaking into the American market with a £20m. order for a version of the 'Avenger' model.

AN END TO PIECE-WORK

A similar settlement at Crawley by British Leyland management will now give some car workers the highest hourly rates in the industry of 21/-. However, once again it is in the interests of the company to give such an award because at long last they have broken the resistance to any change from the traditional piece-work system. The new hourly rate will avoid all the day-to-day negotiation over piece-work rates which give workers considerable workshop power. With a new car shortly coming into production, British Leyland see this new agreement as a safeguard against yet another round of negotiations on bonus rates and a possible turn away from their present ailing financial position. Manning and standard performances will still be subject to negotiation but it remains to be seen just how much job control has been lost for these new hourly rates.

STANDSTILL AT FORDS

Fords however already operate an hourly rate system, but their new pay offer was only £2 per week. When the workers heard this there was a spontaneous walk-out at some plants and Fords was soon brought virtually to a standstill. For the third year running the management has been in dispute with their workers rather than give in to demands. Both the Engineers' union and the Transport and General have given official recognition to the strike.

Mr. Ramsey, Ford's Labour Relations Director, had this to say about the unions' decision. 'We had a 12 months' agreement with them. On both sides we knew exactly what it meant when we signed it. Now Mr. Birch (union-side secretary) has just conveyed to me what appears to me a complete repudiation of that agreement between us when the contract still has three weeks to run. If this is so, I think it is an appalling situation.'

But what about men being thrown out of their jobs, as at Rolls Royce, Pilkingtons, British Steel, Vickers, Golden Wonder, and all the other companies who have been swelling the already high number of over 700,000 unemployed? This is an 'appalling situation' but no employer considers any agreement or contract when he finds he has too many employees.

Fords, together with the unions, were no doubt surprised at the speed and extent to which the strike spread in response to the management's offer. For their part, the former feel it is in their interests to stand up to these strikes. Their prices are competitive and their financial position is very healthy in comparison with other motor companies. They prefer to

face what they consider will only be a short-term problem now and try to keep their long-term competitiveness. In this case Fords are keeping to Government policy because it happens to suit their interests at present and their pay offer is a reflection of this. For any company to be successful it has to have secure profit margins. The attacks on wages are to ensure these profits and continued investment. Companies who pass on these wage costs run the risk of being uncompetitive, while if they cut back on profits to absorb these costs then future investment for expansion will be at risk and this in turn could lead to them becoming uncompetitive and even bankrupt.

LEGISLATION ASSISTANCE

This is already happening. Companies are going out of business or cutting back on production and because of this the pool of unemployed is rising. The capitalist profit-motivated system is once again trying to overcome the contradictions that are inherent within it. The Industrial Relations Bill is just another instrument to be administered by the State to assist this system to survive by protecting the 'national interest' of the employers.

Wage claims by workers are a desire to gain a just return for their labour, but the conflict that is now growing over these demands is exposing the contradictory interests of worker and management. To overcome this opposition an added dimension that looks beyond wage claims is needed. There can be no solution to the problems of capitalism and there is no answer for workers under a wage system, for the employers and the State are only interested in more production and more profit.

However, future conflicts could awaken a desire on the part of the workers for a change in the system under which they exist at present. They have the power to satisfy the material needs of the community and they will only be able to fulfil this function to its fullest capacity in a society without the State, Government and employers.

P.T.

Decimals and other Numbers

THE DECIMALISATION of our money is one of a number of moves by government, the significance of which might escape large groups of people for whom continual change has become the most pleasing aspect of life.

The counter-culture propagandists are few in number but they've created the seductive spectacle in which they can be seen riding the crest of the flux. Controlling the waves of fashion, if not their source, handstands can be performed for the watchers on dry land. Many of the educated middle class have become keen fans of this sport and joined the new refugees of the Eternal Present, the drifters in the global village, unable to see the economic undercurrents or read weather signs that might indicate a major political storm.

In this case though, even the business freaks of the capitalist right don't know what decimalisation is for. They know enough about international trade to realise that it has little to do with the ease or difficulty of converting one currency into another. There is the million pound or thousand pound contract which is obviously immune from troubles with an idiosyncratic currency. But the sale which involves ten pounds is subject to more important considerations than ease of conversion, as well.

In his determination to sell arms to South Africa, Heath will risk loss of real trade with other African states and the Commonwealth, which seems to carry less weight for him than the imaginary revenue of hypothetical capitalist allies who are being confused (as if that was possible!) by what is all the same stuff in the end. The arms sale could be called Conservative Party policy (which wouldn't be completely true, because it is state policy too). But decimalisation is a part of state policy and control in the abstract, without minor party differences coming into it.

Change is inevitable, there is a surplus of potential. If it isn't used up in expensive and useless modification that helps to streamline state organisation (with one eye on the computer), then it might have to be used more constructively, or build up into the explosion of possibility which everybody is expecting sooner or later.

Government will need to keep ruffling the surface of the social scene so that nobody gets a change to see into the depths—the economic and political ones, that is. Other surface creatures, who prefer more frothy tidal phenomena, will hardly notice that the lettering has disappeared from the dials of their telephones, while side by side (almost) with

this modification, is offered a range of unique colours with which the free individual is invited to determine the identity of his private telephone. One more of the landmarks of the memory is removed to be replaced by variety that appeals only to the eye.

The pigs of *Animal Farm* knew the importance of altering landmarks in tampering with memory. In our case it's much worse: History is being abolished not only by government, but by people who are the declared enemies of another set of 'pigs'. The objects of their enthusiasm in the Eternal Present aren't quite what government would have them be, which causes some misleading conflict. But the actual mode of consciousness that they are creating for themselves must suit government, or any potential manipulator, very well indeed. People with an obdurate memory create disconcerting eddies and swirls in the smooth tides of the global village.

Since I'm being chased halfway round the country by court orders, demanding what adds up to hundreds of pounds in rent in connection with more quickly departed dwelling places than I'd like to remember, I can't say that I care personally about minor manifestations of the encroaching flux. But I've renewed my belief in the importance of a few fixtures so that the chaos doesn't erupt too quickly, or at least not all over the place at one time. Similarly, people who expend a life's emotions on the familiar things around them, are undermined and weakened when these things are altered beyond recognition. Their memories, they might discover, are no longer good enough to remember a list of telephone numbers: and now the daily emissary of a year with a different government, when perhaps people learnt an unforgettable lesson, is going to be removed altogether. This isn't far-fetched, I think. Most people hang on to more tangible things than ideas.

An Arts-Lab performer already has a poem which mentions a fifty pence bit in all seriousness. It hasn't been 'released' yet because it's at least two weeks ahead of the mass-consciousness. But two classes of people, the workers and the Conservatives, who show no signs of a similar power of adjustment, are becoming noticeably grumpy about the exigencies of the greater social good. With their old mythologies about who they are and what's best for them, they are the tugs and dinosaurs of the global village.

A traditional anarchist sentiment: 'We'll fight the bastards on our doorsteps and in the fields and roads behind our houses', seems to have become the sole

property of the Conservatives in this country, and we will yet see a militant right wing. Not the middle classes of suburbia, but the monstrous English bourgeois who has recently discovered that the government isn't his government, as he thought. The damnable flux is swirling round the mock Tudor facade. He will have to be uprooted—in every sense in fact, because his huffing and puffing about proper behaviour is no longer needed to discipline the industrial army, or any other army, and his obtuse fixations are now obstacles to efficient government.

Another phrase which embodies a concept: 'muddling through'—with its connotation of mutual aid, improvisation and independence—was recently praised by the American, William Buckley, in support of his own political beliefs. This is disappointing, because it's a sentiment, together with the one that suggests that revolution begins at home, which has been lying around for long enough waiting for somebody to claim.

The anarchistic underground, and some others, have laid so much stress on the deviant and rootless aspects of freedom that the incipient anarchism which is part of the ecology of this country has been left to deteriorate. A member of the House of Lords has suggested that it is time we had a written constitution. It didn't raise a comment in the liberal press, and since one of the contents of such a document would be what sound like very fair rules governing police powers of search and arrest, they would probably welcome it.

One sleight of hand which is being worked with the old and the new, is being watched carefully. Two Northern trade unionists showed me lists which wholesalers will release to their shops to set the new prices. The most noticeable adjustment was probably three shillings on to an eight shilling jar of coffee, but mostly even the fastest movers have been content to manipulate package size. Even so, after February 15, the scramble could end in a fifteen per cent rise in the retail cost of living, and when union members find that every pay rise of the past year has been whipped clean away, listen for the uproar. Then wait for government's D-day, the general strike. A politician knows how to channel and direct most tidal phenomena; the barriers people present when they dig in their heels, grab something and hold onto it—even when it's only a case of remembering—are a different matter.

R. W. GRISWOLD.

EUNUCHS UNITE!

THE PUBLICATION of her book *The Female Eunuch* has won a measure of fame, or notoriety, for Germaine Greer. She has become a spokeswoman for the female sex. But she does not belong to any 'Women's Liberation' group because, she says, she doesn't want to preach to the converted.

On Tuesday, December 15, she carried her message to the unconverted masses of Radio 4 listeners, via the programme 'It's Your Line'. And they don't come much more unconverted than your average contributor of conformist reactionary clichés to P.M. Postbag and the like. In fact, on this occasion the BBC produced a more varied bunch of interrogators at the end of the hot line, and Germaine Greer was able to get across some patient explanation.

The programme was less exasperating than might have been feared, but also less satisfying from a liberatory viewpoint than, for example, the hard-line anti-marriage sentiments she expressed on another broadcast some time ago. In any case, her ideas deserve some discussion in revolutionary circles.

Germaine calls herself a feminist rather than an enthusiast for what is known (more contemptuously than affectionately, I suspect) as 'Women's Lib'. Reservations about the latter movement are understandable; it is not only on masculine sensibilities that aspects of it jar (the bizarre antics of transatlantic statue-erectors, the great anti-bra crusade...). The main points are too frequently submerged in a welter of trivialities. Germaine's approach is generally more balanced, theoretical and coherent.

One of her few lapses into trivialisation occurred when she prided herself audibly on never having signed her husband's surname. When one has compromised to the extent of getting married in the first place, such a delicate reservation can be only a small sop to the feminist conscience. Anyway, you can't win: it's either the name of

the man you chose, or (presumably) of a man your mother chose.

Let us emerge from these byways to consider whether the wider implications of Germaine's ideas are really subversive or anarchist. We can agree that the emancipation of women will not be achieved without drastic changes in society as a whole. The question is, which comes first? The feminist view seems to be that once women acquire a true consciousness of their position they will be able to band together to do great things, eliminating the virility hang-up with all its evil consequences and inaugurating an era of social justice and world peace.

Not that Germaine believes in a segregated exclusively female movement fighting it out with males (not 'Cunt Power' as advocated by some satirists). She pointed out that the opposite of patriarchy is not matriarchy, but fraternity; men and women together should evolve an alternative, better for everyone, to existing masculine-dominant patterns. Fair enough—some of my best friends are men, but I wouldn't like my daughter to marry one.

But if the women's movement as such is given too much priority by female revolutionaries, they run the risk of isolation, irrelevance, and complacency based on the illusion that women are basically nicer, as well as futile head-bashing against the brick wall of entrenched attitudes and customs. For most women, their personal struggle is hopelessly privatised, and will continue to be so until society itself is changed and the structure of family life effectively sabotaged.

By all means let us include analysis of the position of women in our critique of existing society. Let us carry on our individual struggles as best we can. But let us join with our comrades, male and female, in a general and total revolutionary movement.

LIZ W.

ONE EVENING each year one is the guest of the Royal Academy so as one willingly accepts the invitation one can only honour it by refraining from tossing the critical brickbats among the establishment. It is an evening and an event that I find extremely pleasant. The assembled guests come from every part of the country and each year one is impressed by the ancient charms, the studied ceremony and the slight shock of moving among a minority class of people who must surely be the unarmed rearguard of a quickly dying age. One stands at the side of the crowded marble stairs as these quiet people move up two by two and one by one to have their names announced by the liveried Burlington House servant. They nod their heads in greeting and wander into the enlarging throng, so very quiet, so very decaying middle class, so much an anachronism of evening-dressed fading gentility in this brute lower middle class world of Teddy-boy Heath.

These people can have little in common with the Royal Academy Winter Exhibition of the Vienna Secession: Art Nouveau to 1970 and one lounged in the cloak of shadows at the side of the marble stairs and watched with pity this moving living frieze of fading English gentility slowly drifting past the garish, vulgar and overworked canvases of the Vienna Secession. I have little sympathy with the work within this exhibition for I find that most of it is bad or banal and, like the worse Victorian painting and sculpture, it exists not by virtue of any inherent talent within itself, but by the sheer overloading of collected bad taste with a single frame. No space is sacred and like an overmeddled general or an overpainted whore one despises first the artifice and then the artist.

Only Egon Schiele has made any impact outside this exhibition and that by the raw strength of his draftsmanship. His leperous-looking nudes exist not as women, but as huge mounds of dead flesh sprawling on mountainous sheets. No one can pretend that it was a movement of minority revolt for if it had any struggle it was to stop every dauber trying

The Belted and the Gelled

ing to climb onto this brutish intellectual handwagon.

To judge the Vienna Secession one should place them alongside our own pre-Raphaelite brotherhood to realise that what they both had in common was an insensitive regard for their subject and their craft that justified their rejection within their own lifetime for, like all minor art forms, it tried to drag itself to glory as a parasitical form of life that by sheer irritation wins attention. One can always accept the honest vulgarities of the Belgian and Italian commercial artists for their cheerful indifference to aesthetic tastes but I find these Teutonic horrors on a par with the decorated beer mugs of the Austro-German middle class, the leather shorts, the feathered hunting hats, the official drinking songs and the unlovely vaguely functional hardware of the Bauhaus.

It is against this background that the guests of the Royal Academy move slowly like mourners mourning not only the death of the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy from whose mausoleum these painted flowers of decay bloomed from the foul meat of a decayed empire but their own sad misadventure into the dark of history, a gentle people serving no one. Intellectual masters of an empty mansion.

Yet within the same building was what was surely one of the most magnificent exhibitions that the Diploma Gallery have privileged us to view for a decade. It was an exhibition of the paintings of Giorgio Morandi and at the time of writing it is now being mounted in the Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris, and if our philistine government had any feeling for the arts they would have bought any or every one of Morandi's later paintings. There are those who talk of a painter's painter and, with the exception of our own Jack Smith, Morandi was singular and supreme. A

few jugs and bottles that he brings into existence with only a casual outline of background colour and he creates monumental shapes that Moore and Picasso achieve as master artists. Morandi's colours are but a few dull browns and his highlights are arbitrary but with his two-dimensional surface values he creates an infinite three-dimensional space that exist beyond the canvas and gives poetry to the mathematics of Newton. Morandi's dark dull shapes are solids floating in a space of his own creation and one turns time and time again to an individual canvas to understand his brush strokes for this is that most rare of paintings, visual intellectualism.

There was no queueing for this exhibition but Morandi is one of the few painters, nay the only painter, of our generation who has extended the visual area within the painted surface. The seventy-five years of Vienna Secession was hardly worth a visit while Morandi's modest exhibition was a major landmark for the artists who were fortunate enough to view it.

We are ill-served by the times, and the decision by our government of fools and philistines to close the museums and art galleries to the working class becomes more an act of petty revenge by men who act because they hate and hate because they are unable to act. No matter what charge is made as entrance to a museum or art gallery it will apply to all classes but the same claim can be made by the Hilton Hotels and only the gelled few seem to take advantage of it. As one circulates the petitions against admission charges and tries to play one's small part in this campaign it is with a feeling that one is fighting a noble, but hopeless battle. To go from gallery to gallery, bookshop to bookshop seems to be no more than contacting only the faithful and to spend an hour trudging

around the back lots of the British Museum trying to find the huge wall collage that protesters at the C G B Gallery in University College, Gordon Street, W.C.1, have mounted and to finally find it lost in the heart of this rambling building is to find the work of good-hearted people preaching to each other in their own isolation for one knows that this huge collage of collected works should be posted on some willing and donated public boarding. The tragedy of this Campaign Against Museum Charges is that it has failed to put across the central evil of this entrance tax. Tax it is, for not one halfpenny will go to the arts of this country and if I say it will debar the working class from using the galleries and museums I speak calmly and with measured words. Generations of London's children have used and been thrown out of the Science Museum, the V & A and the Natural History Museum as a cherished part of their London playground and they will now be denied entrance by virtue (sic) of an admission charge. For children of the working

class use these buildings as naturally as they use the public parks.

The Tate Gallery is the natural haunt of the working class who live in the blocks of mansions that surround the Tate and for them an admission charge to wander in and out of their own native culture closes the door on them while at the Whitechapel Gallery charge an entrance fee (tax) all those better boys, the factory girls, the shopping women and the old men who wander in to sit and rest among the gossiping women who daily use this fine gallery will no longer accept it as part of their working class way of life.

A small charge, my Lord Eccles. No more, my lord, than the tip that you toss to a waiter and you will deny to the working class of this country entrance to a vast field of intellectual life. Once in the age, my Lord Eccles, when soap-powder manufacturers boast that the plastic rose they give with the soap is 'free', and commercial radio and television that explores the morose depths of our intellectual life is 'free'. Are we, the working class, to have only the worst fed into us as your class's 'free' gift to us while the best shall be taxed away from us?

Arthur Moyne.

TREASON DOETH NEVER PROSPER

INTENDED TREASON, by Paul Durst. W. H. Allen, £3.50.

I REMEMBER as a child being terrified by a melodramatic novel about the Gunpowder Plot, written by a nineteenth century author, who spared one nothing in his creation of an atmosphere of 'Gothic' horror and doom. I think that he presented the Jacobean period in this way because it all seemed so remote and alien. (It certainly was a superstitious age.) The nineteenth century was, for the middle class at least, and those who read novels, a period of relative social stability. Fancy someone attempting to blow up Mr. Gladstone and Queen Victoria!

But in our age the plot associated with the name of Guy Fawkes no longer seems a curiosity from a barbaric past. It was, like ours, an age of ideology; religious ideologies perhaps, but in fact little more irrational. After all, are those who defend the 'free world', which includes a whole lot of highly authoritarian states, or those who pin their hopes on an Oriental despot (Mao Tse Tung), any more national than the Catholics and Protestants with their strange ceremonies and bizarre beliefs?

It was an age when power politics wore no liberal mask, a period of plots and conspiracies. Torture was accepted as natural, as it is coming to be again today.

Mr. Durst's book is clear, easy to follow although the story is a complicated one, and he seems to me to bring the whole thing vividly to life. There are no phantoms, no bells tolling doom.

It was a clash of rival totalitarianisms, a struggle for power.

Although one's sympathy is often with the Catholic minority, harassed and persecuted, the Church was (and is) a ruthless, authoritarian institution. Somewhere I've read a saying which goes something like this, 'The Catholic Church is a lamb in adversity, a fox in equality, a tiger in supremacy.'

This was a lamb period. The Church realised that a reconquest of England was not practical politics. Being an ancient institution, used to thinking in terms of centuries, the situation from the Church's point of view was regrettable, but all was not lost. Patience should be the watchword. Unfortunately individuals, with one brief life to live, cannot be patient, or not always.

Anarchists have a soft spot for Guy Fawkes. The thought of King and Parliament, most of the ruling class in fact, soaring skywards on top of a simply magnificent explosion, appeals to the rebel and to the small boy in all of us.

It comes as something of an anti-climax to discover that the whole scheme was known to the Government from quite early on. Gunpowder was at that time a Government monopoly, and it is fairly clear from the evidence Mr. Durst presents us with that it was made easy for the conspirators to obtain the powder. The records of the gunpowder stored in the Tower at this time are missing, though they are complete for the preceding and succeeding years.

The Catholic community harboured

Continued on page 9

The Liberators and the Free

THE ARGUMENT BETWEEN women and men anarchists and the Women's Liberationists current in FREEDOM is extremely healthy and begins to question a number of widely held beliefs about anarchism that have needed to be questioned for some time. How do we as anarchists look upon women? Not only how do we look upon women in general but how do we as male anarchists look upon women anarchists and upon 'our women' in particular; also how do women anarchists look upon men in general, anarchist men and 'their own men' in particular?

Perhaps I can digress here by saying I have noticed a very surprising number of anarchist couples, both legally married and not, with or without families, who have split up in the last two years. This process has been almost concurrent, though there is no evidence it is causally related to, the rise of the Women's Liberation Movement. Most of these dissolutions appear to be at the suggestion of only one party and in most cases it was the woman who left the man.

This, of course, brings into question some of the basic tenets of marriage bonds, acts of faith, and other paraphernalia of morality and legality that society lumps us with. But it also brings into question what anarchists mean, by what they say they mean, when they re-define the concepts of marriage and non-marital relationships, particularly where these are intended to relate to the having and the caring for, of children.

The anarchist view, as I see it, is that a bond is only valid if both parties continue to agree to it or derive benefit from it. It must, in point of fact be a true relationship or it should be brought towards a state of reality and honesty, in other words dissolved. Mind you, I am an individualist and no doubt other anarchists like syndicalists and communists and those people who call themselves 'straight' anarchists, might have a different view.

In terms of relationships what this means is that a marriage is only a marriage if both parties derive benefit from it, though an important point here is the fact that under anarchist tenets the views of the children, if any, are seldom taken into account. One can see that the difficulty of too straight an acceptance of this ethic is that it takes little account of differences in relationships due to time. I'll explain what I mean. If a man goes for a girl because she is attractive, be it sexual or companionable, he may expect this state to continue though life be rough and circumstances change. To

some men a pregnant woman, for example, is not so attractive. A woman harassed by kids has less time for the husband's whims and tires quickly and may not respond as a man wants, or to his claimed needs. Furthermore the mere fact that one's girl becomes pregnant may quickly daunt some spirit ever ready to 'die' or be arrested and imprisoned at the drop of a hat, but unready to accept the responsibility or give secure financial support to the girl comrade in time of need.

What I am suggesting is that the anarchist ethic of marriage and also responsibility seems to pre-suppose that either an anarchist society has arrived or that the present welfare economy is more efficient than it is—if you want a list of deserted girl friends I would be quite willing to run over it with the editor. The list of 'just-pregnant' girls by 'non-promised' comrades is rather longer.

Whilst marriage and pregnancy are not the only causes of Women's Liberation I feel it is an important area that anarchists gloss over too easily. Living one's anarchism is obviously the best way to cause the revolution but believing one's own propaganda to be a reality is highly dangerous.

There is, to my knowledge, no survey or other research work, to go on, which leaves one with any feeling of complacency. It is a man's world, even in the anarchist movement. We pretend it is not and feel it should not be, but usually we act as though it is. Even the women act as though it is, and here there is one thing which is very noticeable about the anarchist movement; there are precious few women.

Women in the anarchist movement can be usefully categorised in a number of distinct types. Firstly there are the independent single anarchist women who have been primarily drawn towards the movement by the relevance of anarchist ideas. I would say quite bluntly that I have not met any of these in the British movement, though I have met several continental comrades of this type.

Secondly one finds a few independent anarchist women who were drawn towards the anarchist movement by organisational association—I have met a few of these, mainly from the Peace Movement or latterly from the universities.

Thirdly there are anarchist women of independent thought, though usually non-intellectuals, married to non-anarchists who give them succour.

Fourthly we find girls who seem to use the anarchist movement in a most predatory manner rather like a bloodstock

pool of available males (and I would hasten to add here that there are an awful lot of males who do this themselves, both out of, and within, the anarchist movement, and with these girls when they get the chance). I would here point out that this latter group of girls seem to be passing through a stage of development or to be passing through a psychological state (man induced?) 'If I am an anarchist I must sleep with other anarchists, as a matter of principle.' The 'free-love' bug it could be called.

Fifthly we find anarchist couples—legally married or not (the legality of marriage seems to effect, almost inversely, the stability of the relationship).

Sixthly, girl friends of anarchists who may be very strong and active as anarchists but who frequently lose interest as soon as they break with their anarchist boyfriend. These are most noticeable in the universities. Perhaps the change in attitude towards anarchism is partly due to the fact that they may no longer wish to come into contact with their friend's friends or perhaps they feel there is no place for a woman in the anarchist movement.

Seventh and lastly we find young members of anarchist groups and these seem to either contract more permanent relationships with male anarchists or drop out. These categories are very loose and are not entirely inclusive. One can, of course, categorise men, though here I leave this to women, they seem to be so much better at it than men.

One might still say, but this writer has written only about marital relationships, what about jobs, what about rights, what about behaviour, etc.? Fair enough! I think however that the status of women in relation to men is primarily related to their sexual function and family life and whilst I see a growing demand for equal rights in the 'relationship' and for the recognition of the need for equality of rights in gaining entertainment satisfaction, I do not see any great movement in the basic institutional activity of society. There is the pretence of course, but that is all. I would suggest to women's liberationists that this is not all the man's fault.

A woman might claim anarchist sympathies and reject the authority and morals of the society in which she has been brought up whilst at the same time she conforms very actively to women's fashions, contemporary styles of taste and living, diet, holidays and aspirations for herself and the future. The average woman seems to want a man, either a husband or a steady boyfriend, with

economic prospects, marriage, a home, children (and an awful lot of children appear to be conceived prior to marriage in order to force the men into marriage). The life style of many anarchist women is distressingly conformist to this pattern. The individual freedom that many anarchist women talk about is a game they play with men to get more 'rights' in the relationship, but, distressingly, a myth in reality.

The trouble with most anarchists and certainly most anarchist women, in relation to Women's Liberation, is that as anarchists are usually highly intelligent, far more so than the average, they are far too intelligent to accept the monotony of the mundane existence, so naturally they change their partners or dissolve their relationships as fancy takes them. Anarchists are master escapees from situations where people try to battle them or force them into 'categories' of situational conformity. The difficulty is that women who have children are still economically dependent either upon men or other income sources to provide material benefits for their requirements.

The pace of social change is now moving so fast that yesterday's anarchist ideas are often irrelevant before they are ever really practised. Anarchist ideas sound all right in talk or on paper but it is not now merely a question of fitting one's life to the ideas but rather of trying to survive in a changing environment as well, and it is apparent that many comrades, particularly many women comrades, find it necessary very frequently

to accept the teachings given on their mother's knee, authoritarian though it may be, simply because this is the only system they know that works effectively for them as women, dislike it as they will.

I think the Women's Liberation Movement to be very healthy. Of course they haven't drawn the 'right' political lessons, they are not working for vertical change, they want horizontal change. They will not, I hope, get drawn off into the silly factionalism of the Left but concentrate on fulfilling their aims. In a sense, I would say, anarchist ideas of community, of association, of mutual aid, of solidarity, etc., are very important to them, but most important, they should (and I hope will) use them as they wish and re-define them as necessity arises. From the point of view of the male anarchist could I tactfully suggest that women anarchists should enter the Women's Liberation Movement to help out—men anarchists should encourage their girl friends and wives to participate even if it structurally changes their present relationships. I can see no change but good can come to the anarchist movement and a revolutionary process of social change if society is brought to a more realistic and humane view of reality. Perhaps the failure in achievement of an anarchist society, and to date it has been a failure, could be changed into success were it done jointly by men and women (or women and men) instead of, as at present, by the male monster alone.

PETER NEVILLE.

ROLLS ROYCE? —

It's only Money!

HOW MANY TIMES have anarchists said that, come the Revolution, all cars will be made like Rolls Royces? When motor cars and for that matter all other goods, are made for use and not for profit, then long life, reliability, perfection, will be regarded as the economic properties to aim at, not the built-in obsolescence that ensures the continuing sales of highly profitable rubbish which characterises today's productivity.

Not that Rolls Royce cars are not made for profit—indeed, the car manufacturing division is the most profitable side of this vast industrial complex. But the fact is that Rolls Royce cars are first made, and then priced, and such is the known elegance and perfection of these super status symbols that there is no shortage of oil sheikhs, pop stars, stockbrokers, royalty, politicians and racketeers in general who queue up to pay from £7,000 to £12,000 for them.

And they last. Twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years on, the old vintage cars still purr sweetly on, past the graveyards of thousands of lesser makes.

But it is not the making of motor cars that has brought the Rolls Royce Company to the dust. It is launching out into the uncharted wastes of the aero-space economics. It is being sucked into the insatiable maw of the military-industrial lunacy which has put competitive stresses upon research and production geared to money in a way that the old firm never envisaged.

Rolls Royce has gone bankrupt, not in any real, technical sense, but purely in the terms in which the financial jungle works. Ironically enough, it is precisely because of its technical excellence that the firm has got into its financial mess. Firstly, because such a firm builds up a work-force of technicians unequalled

in the world, and cannot possibly afford to lose them. Hence they must continually find orders to keep them in employment, and since Government orders for aircraft engines—RR's main contribution to the aero-space programme of the West—are notoriously subject to cancellation, variation or cutback, the tendency has been for the firms involved to keep their order-books over-full, if necessary by undercutting on price, in order to ensure full employment for their highly skilled workers and fantastically expensive capital machinery.

Further, a firm like Rolls Royce is entitled under present conditions, to think of itself (odd, how one imbuces a firm with human properties!) as of such national importance that it will always be supported by the nation. So much so, that we are now given to understand, RR took up this ill-fated contract with Lockheeds of America for the production of the RB 211 engines on a fixed-price basis, in a time of obvious inflation, because they had more or less been given assurances that the British Government would back them up.

Not for the first time, however, British Government assurances proved worthless. One of the destructive features of our democracy is that when there is a change of policy involving reversals which make long-term planning impossible, and Mr. Wilson's succession by Mr. Heath has led this whole thing into a cloud-cuckoo land which makes Alice's Wonderland look as logical as Plato's Republic.

Mr. Wilson's Labour Government encouraged the private capitalist firm of Rolls Royce to bid most competitively for the Lockheed contract, with the backing of public money if needed. While the work is going on and the research is run-

ning into difficulties and the costs are mounting, along comes Mr. Grocer Ted Heath with his 'stand on your own two feet' philosophy of free enterprise which forces the firm into bankruptcy—and then he proceeds to nationalise it! The Labour Government's line was to get a private British firm into the highly competitive, but highly attractive American market, not only on the excellence of its products, but on the keenness of its prices and reliability of delivery. That this was going to take a lot of the British taxpayers' money was beside the point! Presumably it was considered that it would pay off in the long run. Mr. Heath is interested in the short run, and since he is a Common Market man, perhaps he is prepared to forego a possible great future in the US market in favour of a great gesture to show the Europeans that he means business, and is prepared to look in their direction rather than America.

Although nationalisation is supposed to be anathema to the Tories, the importance to the national economy and defence system of Rolls Royce was such that the company must not be allowed to go out of business altogether, and what Mr. Heath has done here is to show the world that he is just as good a pragmatist as Mr. Wilson. If Wilson can play capitalism, Heath can play socialism, and British politics takes one more step—in the direction of consensus politics.

What the nationalisation of Rolls Royce demonstrates, however, more clearly than anything we could have

imagined, is precisely what the anarchists have always had to say about nationalisation: that it is a capitalist solution for capitalist ills, and nothing to do with socialism at all. Once the terrible shock to all preconceived notions has been absorbed, and once the great gusts of laughter have died down, we can see that Mr. Heath has been a clever little fellow. By taking over the ailing Rolls Royce, he has saved his face about subsidising lame ducks. Once the 'nation', i.e., the State, owns Rolls Royce, the 'nation', i.e., the taxpayer, can start to foot the bills, in the time-honoured way. No public money is going out to bolster up failing private enterprise; instead, yet another unprofitable public enterprise is going to demonstrate the costly nature of nationalisation! While the profitable side of Rolls Royce—the car-making factories—will be left in private hands to demonstrate the efficiency of private enterprise! Tories who were at first dumbfounded by the move may yet come to see what a brilliant stroke of realpolitik this has been.

Well then, what about the workers? As we said above, RR have not gone bankrupt in any real sense—it's only money. The absurdities of the money system could hardly be better demonstrated when one of the world's greatest capitalist companies is brought down by the very system it serves.

We are used to the money system not operating for the little man—if it doesn't operate for Rolls Royce, who the hell does it operate for? This is one more example of the way in which the money system has simply got completely out of control.

The workers of Rolls Royce have not lost their skills because the firm has gone bust. Their inventive capacity, their abilities to work and produce the very best products in their field; if you like that kind of thing, the sheer beauty of the things they produce, their efficiency and

perfection—these are not affected by financial shenanigans. This is real wealth we are talking about—not money. Unhappily these workers in Rolls Royce, the best in their field, sell themselves for money. Not only do they sell their labour by the hour or the day or the week or the month—they sell their responsibility too. For, let's face it, the beautiful products of Rolls Royce are made to power war planes, rockets and space projects for the State; the engines which end up in civil planes are researched for and got off the drawing board as offshoots of military programmes, and in any case move executives about the world the better to manipulate it for profit and exploitation. Even the beautiful motor cars (which may fall into the hands of the lower orders when they're over twenty years old!) are made for the very rich to show the world how very rich they are.

The skills of the Rolls Royce labour force are prostituted like any others. They are, perhaps, the elite of the engineering world, and as such, serve the elite of the political world even more closely. We are sorry if any of them are going to lose their livelihoods as a result of financial dealings over which they have no control—but then, over what do they have any control? And after all, do the Rolls Royce workers, when they send an engine off the line to power some warplane on its bombing, burning missions—do they ever stop to think what it's like to be at the receiving end of all that perfection and efficiency?

If the Rolls Royce workers would take over their factories and make machines for peaceful purposes only; if they put their skills and designing abilities at the disposal of society for social ends; then they would find even greater satisfaction to be won in working, more responsibility to bring more dignity, and, strangely enough, more security in freedom.

JUSTIN.

WILBERFORCE REPORT:

Those Sacked will not Benefit

THE REPORT by the Wilberforce Inquiry into wages in the electricity supply industry has been claimed as a victory by both the Government and the Electrical and Plumbing Trades Union. The estimates by outside parties of the wage increases that were expected to be recommended in the report varied from 10.9% by the Government to 16% by the union. Since there is no actual figure mentioned in the report, calculations are based on speculation as to the speed in which productivity deals will be extended in the industry.

However the report does not recommend any general increase on the £2 already offered by the Electricity Council and the difference of opinion centres around the substantial fringe benefits which the report emphasises are because the industry is a special case. Already, due to outstanding co-operation, substantial increases in productivity have been made and these new fringe benefits are to ensure further deals in an industry which Wilberforce and his colleagues consider to be overmanned.

The whole report is based on the premise that further productivity deals are vital and because of this the industry has to be taken on its own merits. The committee suggests a new system of 'lead-in payments' for about 80% of the workers in the industry who have accepted productivity deals but are unable to start for reasons outside their control. These payments which start in June at £1 will rise to £1.50 in October and £2 next January.

WIDENING OF DIFFERENTIALS

There will also be a widening of the

differential between craftsmen and labourers, giving the former, which amount to 43,000, an extra 67p a week, as well as increases for shift working. Three extra days' holiday per year, as claimed by the union, are also recommended. It has been estimated that these increases can give some workers as much as a 20% increase but the Government argues that they are 'self-financing' and therefore the overall increase is only a small advance on that offered by the Electricity Council.

It does seem that the Government is putting on a brave face. *The Economist* has said that Mr. Carr, Minister of Employment, should have rejected the report as 'anti-social and uneconomic rubbish'. However a lot hinges on the forthcoming productivity deals and just how much they are adhered to. In the longer term the victory at present being claimed by the union will turn sour on those who will be sacked as part of these deals.

The report says that 'overmanning should be got rid of as quickly as possible', but *The Economist*, in its usual hard business-like way wants to have its cake and eat it when it says: 'The court sees no clash between thus sensibly paying workers more money to get out of the industry, and foolishly paying them more money to stay on in.' The whole trouble in recent years has been that trade unions and workers have been willing to go along with this premise. Those remaining in employment have, in some cases, accepted high wage increases at the sacrifice of the jobs of their fellow workers who have only been compensated with a 'handshake' of varying size.

MORE WORK FOR LESS MEN

The Wilberforce report lays yet another foundation for such a deal. The recognised co-operativeness of the union in the past will certainly not change now or in the future. Electricity supply workers left in the industry will be expected to carry out the extra work previously performed by their former workmates and therefore the working day will become more intensive.

Once again nationalisation has meant rationalisation. The benefits of public investment are not helping the workers in the industry, neither has the new generating plant, which has faults, nor the planning of the Electricity Council brought the benefits that the public were led to expect. If the public had supported the electricity supply workers instead of falling for the malicious and vindictive nonsense put out by the Government and the newspapers, no report would have been needed and workers would have been better placed to fight further productivity schemes.

The Government's policy of holding down wages is for the purpose of ensuring higher profits for employers. Workers should not be impressed by their line that wage increases are causing the present inflationary situation. Industry has in fact been working at an under-capacity rate. Unemployment is increasing and prices are rising to compensate for the lack of demand. Increased taxes and cuts in social services have contributed to the inflation, while even decimalisation is being used to put up prices and therefore the profit margins of the employers.

The squeeze on wages is on. By Easter the Government intends to have its Industrial Relations Bill on the Statute Book and the means by which workers try to gain increases will then be unlawful. Although the one-day strike called by the Engineers' Union will not stop the Government, it is a step in the right direction. More propaganda and action against this Bill will bring home to millions of workers the importance of fighting it both now and when it becomes law.

P.T.

After Burgos

NOW THAT the trial of Burgos is over, the 16 must face the new situation, that of condemned men. Their new lodgings have already been prepared for them by the Directory of Prisons, which has this time acted in a somewhat different fashion from usual. Instead of the male prisoners being sent to Segovia, and the female to Alcala de Henares, the 16 prisoners have been scattered in various prisons around Spain. Here is the list:

Victor Arana Bilbao—Prision Central de Puerto de Santa Maria.
Jose Maria Dorronsoro—Prision Central de Puerto de Santa Maria.
Mario Onaindia—Prision Central de Caceres.
Jesus Abriskets—Prision Central de Caceres.
Gregorio Lopez Irasuegui—Prision Central de Cordoba.
Francisco Izco—Prision Central de Cordoba.
Yokin Gorostidi—Prision Central de Cartagena.
Eduardo Uriarte—Prision Central de Alicante.
Xabier Larena—Prision Central de Alicante.
Julen Kalzada—Prision Central de Zamora.
Jon Etxabe—Prision Central de Zamora.
Antonio Karrera—Prision Central de Burgos.
Enrique Guesalaga—Prision Central de Burgos.
Itziar Aizpurua—Prision de Mujeres de Madrid.

Jone Dorronsoro—Prision de Mujeres de Madrid.
Arantza Arruti—Prision de Mujeres de Madrid.

These prisons, not especially made for political prisoners, could paradoxically be better for these prisoners, if it were to be that they would be kept in them as ordinary prisoners. However, it seems much more likely that they will be kept in a prison within the prison, isolated from the rest of those incarcerated. The Directory of Prisons has followed here the traditional method of 'divide and conquer' to these Basques. In the courtroom they acted in concert, but now, spread around various jails, they are split, to be dealt with in greater ease. There are four special prisons for political prisoners, Segovia, Soria, Valencia, and Jaen, but these have not been used. Only the clerics have been sent to the special prison for them, at Zamora.

At Cordoba and Cartagena, as Puerto de Santa Maria, the prisons are especially repressive. Those who are there are the most dangerous to the State. In Caceres there are already some political prisoners, but none in Alicante nor Cordoba nor Cartagena.

The women's prison in Madrid has the many inconveniences of a remand prison, with much activity and informers to contend with. But this may be somewhat alleviated by its central position, which will at least make visits easier. Some consolation!

MIGUEL GARCIA.

Understanding the Opposition

PROBLEMS OF SOCIALISM TODAY, by Santiago Carrillo (Lawrence and Wishart, 75p).

MY FIRST reaction upon being handed this incredibly overpriced pamphlet of less than two hundred pages was to decide that it was not worth reviewing. Consisting of essays written by the General Secretary of the Spanish Communist Party in exile, a Party of whose errors and treacheries no reader of FREEDOM will need reminding, it is published by the official Party publishers and has moreover a most pretentious-sounding title. However after reading it, I feel that this is a book that should be read and discussed for it is the clearest exposition of the new thinking behind the Western (French, British, Italian and Spanish) Parties. Whether the realities of power would produce anything new is of course doubtful, but at least on the theoretical level, thinking has greatly changed. It is also easy to see the 'revisionism' that the Albanians and the Chinese complain of. Although only published in English in November 1970, these essays were written in Spanish in 1967 and 1968; i.e. before and after the last great crisis in the Communist world—the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The great imponderable throughout the book is to gauge the strength of the Party in Spain (as opposed to the great volume of anti-Franco feeling). However the most important point that both

the translator in her introduction and Carrillo make is to point out the often forgotten fact that the situation in Western Europe is so different both compared with Eastern Europe and with the 1930s that no comparison is possible and hence a totally different approach is needed.

The first section deals with the Party's relations with the Catholic Church. In 1940, Freedom Press published a pamphlet by F. A. Ridley entitled *The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age* in which the author predicted the current 'understanding' between the two great monoliths of Europe—Church and Party. Carrillo here tries to show that opposition to the Church is 'sectarian and stereotyped' and a product of 'infantile' 'ultra-leftism' and that the Church is a force for progress. Certainly it cannot be denied that today there are many priests who can in all honesty be considered progressive; that there were several priests executed by Franco in 1939 for 'liberalism', yet here Carrillo fails to distinguish between the individual priest, often in solitary revolt against his hierarchy, and the organisation which in Spain as elsewhere (including Poland) is firmly linked with the ruling group.

His next section is even more contentious though well argued and backed up with quotations from Lenin. It has the sub-heading 'What was universal and what was purely Russian in the Soviet Revolution?' It must never be forgotten that with the exception of Czechoslovakia (and here only for the inter-war period) there is no history of plurality of parties in Eastern Europe. Lenin said that bourgeois countries have a great variety of political forms and so too with Communist countries until the final 'withering away of the state'. Carrillo therefore sees the probability of there being separate parties to represent the bourgeoisie. These parties will by definition attract only a small percentage of the population and once the economic reasons for the existence of the bourgeoisie as a class disappear (and this should be a rapid process) then the need for separate parties disappears as well. In all this Carrillo admits several of the errors of the Stalinist epoch (and the greatest error of all was that 'Comrade Stalin could do no wrong'), for he realises that the biggest barrier against the Party in Europe is not so much the idea of Communism but the ghost of Stalinism (it is of course a matter of dispute as to whether this ghost has ever been laid). By this stage in the book, one is left to wonder two things—how far Carrillo is typical of the rank and file of the Western Parties and how he envisages making all this a reality in Spain.

He sees great hope in the revolt of youth (as does the *Morning Star* which now ritually links Students with Workers whenever possible—is the paper trying to increase circulation or is the British Party short of intellectuals? may I cynically add) and sees through the sham of the 'classless' society. Writing before the invasion of Czechoslovakia, he states that the USA will soon be defeated in Vietnam and will then be forced by its own internal contradictions to give up being the 'gendarme of world imperialism' just as the USSR is no longer the 'gendarme of world revolution'. Later events have shown that the USSR is still a 'gendarme' (though not of revolution) whenever circumstances permit. It is however correct to point out, as he does, the slightly more subtle interventions of the USA in European affairs. The last section of the book was written after the Invasion of August 1968 and here he admits error and although he acknowledges the supremacy of the Soviet Union in several respects, he makes a strong plea as before for the concept of national independence—again indispensable if you are trying to convince Western Europeans of the correctness of your case. This is

a similar line to the one used by the British Party over the recent shooting of workers in Poland.

From a strictly anarchist point of view (Anarchism and 'Ultra-Leftism' are rarely mentioned and then only in an appeal to their adherents to recognise their errors and enter the security of the all-embracing Party), each word can be attacked for each word of a politician has any sincerity at all (and it is about time that anarchists realised that the Communist and other Left-Wing Parties are made up to a large extent of sincere militants) then this book is indeed important. We may disagree with large parts of Communist Party thinking but unless we understand it in its modern form, then our opposition is not based upon actuality but upon some tribal memory of the Ukraine and the Spanish Civil War.

TONY LEVINE.

ANARCHIST TOPICS

Dear Editors,

Bill Dwyer gives a substantially correct report of what I recounted of my experiences as a member of a printing union 'chapel' (FREEDOM, 19.12.70). What he deduces from it, however, is wide of the mark.

Firstly, I do not maintain that 'the worker (whoever he is) is fitted only for obedience'. What I do maintain is that most workers (like most other people) have supported and defended authoritarianism and servility in the past, do so in the present and that, on the evidence of this, they will do so in the future. Every social upheaval so far has resulted in either the survival of the old authority or the creation of a new, and as far as I can see this is the inevitable outcome of all organized collectivities—no matter what names they are given. Bill Dwyer, like his utopian forebears, has confused 'the worker' as he is with 'the worker' as he would like him to be. He is, if you will pardon the philosophical pun, trying to deduce an 'is' from an 'ought'.

he believes that mankind can create the kind of world he would like to see by means of some unexplained (and, I suspect, unexplainable) process of concurrent and contagious spontaneity of the sort that will result in what Ellingham wants it to result in. Of course, any millenarian sect can claim the viability of their goal on this kind of 'evidence'. From Plymouth Brethren to Koreshanists—all can view the world as their oyster. More tough-minded folk, however, would demand better credentials than those so far offered.

Thirdly, I cannot see how I am being 'insulting' to point out what I think are the facts of the case. (F.E. is fond of derogatory labelling too. Because I have said most people appear to want a government of some kind or another he accuses me of saying they are 'stupid'. Not so. Some of the most ardent governmentals are very intelligent persons. Intelligence is no more a monopoly of anarchists than is stupidity of anarchists.) If I claimed that on the basis of what I knew about Bill Dwyer I thought it unlikely he could run a mile in three minutes would he regard that as being insulting? I should imagine not. My kind is simply begging the question.

Finally, I have never claimed that 'no change' is possible. The world I live in now is in many ways not the world I lived in twenty years ago, nor is it the kind of world I will live in twenty years from now. My point is that what changes will take place are, on the basis of what is and has been in the sphere of social constraint, unlikely to bring about anarchy as a universal condition. For this reason anarchist individualists, such as I claim to be, will shape their perspectives accordingly. Anarchism as an individualism can survive such a reshaping. I am quite prepared to admit that those who regard anarchism as a socialism will reject my view, since their ideas cannot.

Yours sincerely,
London, W.2 S.E. PARKER.

DOOMSDAY & AFTER

Dear Comrades,

The recent review in FREEDOM of Gordon Rattray Taylor's *Doomsday Book* is a very welcome expression of interest in the whole population/conservation problem on the part of libertarian revolutionaries.

Taylor is not of course an anarchist—he fails, in his book, to analyse the nature of the capitalist system (in its political, economic and social effects) in relation to the situation we find our planet in.

Britain was, under 19th century capitalism, the 'workshop of the world' and, with the rise of capitalism, her largely agricultural economic base was drastically altered. Peasant societies do appear to have forms of population 'restriction'—natural and man-made.

Some agricultural societies have used infanticide (often of female children) and, of course, because peasant societies lack technology (meaning a lack of medical science) are liable to drastic reduction of numbers due to pestilence and disease.

Capitalism is a society based upon technology and, thus, capable of combating illness and disease and, also, of increasing the live birth rate. In order to man the factories (the 'labour intensive' factories) of capitalism, population growth had to be allowed, nay encouraged, both by the removal of traditional human population restraints (i.e. the Victorian attitude towards infanticide among primitive peoples) and by improvements in general health—thus, the Public Health Acts of Victorian social 'reformers'. It is not suggested that these moves were planned or conscious moves by the ruling economic class, then or now. The need for an abundant, healthy labour force was implicit (and is implicit) in the capitalist system.

Capitalism, also, requires an expanding market. Furthermore, in order that profits be maximised, wages must be reduced, and the traditional capitalist device to do this has been the creation of unemployment—a phenomenon designed to undermine the economic effects of working-class organisation—i.e., socialist parties and trade unions. Perhaps the gallant working men of the 19th century Chartist Movement saw more clearly than we do today the effects of capitalist-inspired overpopulation, when they chanted, 'When bread is scarce, bread is dear / When men are scarce, men are dear'. I certainly find it significant that, among the Chartists, we may find the first working-class advocates of artificial contraception.

For today's revolutionaries, the question is a damn sight more than academic or historical. We fight on our crowded and varied platform; capitalism, we cry, cannot feed the people, it cannot clothe the people, it cannot house the people. Above all, we recognise the need of man to have shelter. But, will the

advent of socialism give us any more housing—with a population fast approaching 60 millions?

What house-building is going on at the moment, even under capitalist usury, is aimed at slum clearance and is scarcely denting that problem. There are no new houses for the children.

It is all a question of resources. For generations, the single woman has been regarded as something weird, the bachelor as eccentric, and the childless (by intention or otherwise) couple as 'selfish'. As a partner in a, so far, childless marriage (from choice), I have been accused of being 'selfish' and (believe it or not) 'evading responsibility'. Man, as I view it, has two responsibilities—one to himself (to secure the best life he can) and to his kind (to make and keep the world better to live in).

The entire ethos of 'trad' socialism—and of anarchism too—seems to me, basically, paternalistic. We must carry our brother, not only in adversity, but in relation to the results of his own conscious decisions. To talk of 'making contraception available' sounds like the bloody 1920s—it is available, from every GP in the country.

I object, strongly, to having a large section of my 'product', my contribution to society, forcibly removed from me by a paternalistic state to dispense to a fool with 10 kids. I do not, as a rational animal, intend to die like a rat in a trap as a result of senseless civil war brought on by overcrowding.

It is, indeed, amazing, the amount of 'consensus' that appears to exist among both the smug spokesmen of the system (middle class, the lot of them) and, even, revolutionaries. It is, it appears, OK to have two children per family. This rubbish is rationalised selfishness. If every family has three children, the population of this island is going to double; if two children, it will stabilise at the present level; if one only then it will begin to decline. There are anarchists (perhaps they should join the Powellites) who appear to believe in a form of 'laissez-faire', 'it will all even itself out in the end, if we all decide to do what suits us'.

This almost presupposes the existence of a divine being to see the humankind through. It sounds like a recipe for chaos.

Anarchists are, we fondly hope, men and women of strength and determination, able to resist the pressures of capitalist society. We feel no guilt in our political non-conformity. Let us feel no guilt about defying the lunacy of a population intent on self-destruction.

The reply, of course, will be that people are conditioned by the system. There is, in this, the fatalistic assumption that man has no free will. How come some of us can resist the pressure of the frustrated middle-aged who seek new release for their suppressed sexual desires by becoming grannies and

grandpas? The old Chartist who coined the scarcity quotation wasn't 'conditioned' by the system.

Unless the individual voluntarily ceases to overbreed, we have certain choices. Buy a gun, and turn your house into a fortress when civilization collapses—or, if you believe in the mechanistic

join the Socialist Party of Great Britain and wait for the end of capitalism, or join some of the other loonies on a mountain top waiting for the end of the world.

But the anarchists are based, surely, on the belief that men dominate events and things and make the world themselves.

Fraternally,
IAN S. SUTHERLAND.

Aberdeen

New Readers Begin Here

Dear Comrades,

Your editorial of January 9: 'We are not a mass-agitational paper. True, we agitate, and would like to appeal to the masses—but the world is not like that.' And a little later: 'Anarchism is dedicated to teaching people to live for themselves.'

But how is anybody taught if there is no vehicle to pass on the teaching? FREEDOM is defined as 'a paper at the service of the anarchist movement'. So it should be. But in as much as anarchism is dedicated to teaching people a new way of life, it must be the function of FREEDOM to express anarchist ideals in a manner appealing to the masses, and digestible by them. Preaching to the converted is a 'wank'.

Anarchism in this country is tangled with intellectualism, and while there is no flow between the masses and the voices of intellectual anarchism, alienation of anarchism from those for whom it should have most meaning is inevitable.

Sometimes in the pages of FREEDOM a certain snobbery appears (try 'the selfless sacrifice and dedication of the noble idiots', etc.). If FREEDOM were not so apparently aimed at a more or less intellectualist readership, if its content included some non-jargonistic, simple, but intelligent discussion of anarchist ideals for the 'masses', and if there were 'noble idiots' to sell FREEDOM on the streets and outside the factories, perhaps then the name 'anarchy' would mean more than merely the *Daily Express* synonym for 'chaos' or 'vandalism'.

However, it's easy to criticize. Please find enclosed a donation for the Press Fund.

London

T.H.

[Signature undecipherable.]

Letters

Because, however, this has been and is true of most workers, it by no means follows that all workers are incapable of transcending authoritarianism and becoming anarchists. A small minority in each generation do just this, as do a small minority of 'non-workers'. (Anarchism is an individual, not a class, phenomenon.) Secondly, what 'weakness' did Francis Ellingham show in my social pessimism? The only 'evidence' that he could offer to refute my view was that

MALTHUSIAN ANARCHISM

Dear Comrades,

J.W.'s article 'Will We Reach 2000?' introduced an air of Malthusian* pessimism as well as other weird ideas unconnected with anarchism into the columns of FREEDOM (5.12.70).

Surely a basic tenet of anarchism is the idea that we can feed, clothe and house the population of the world when we get the politicians and capitalists off our backs? When we remember that with every belly goes a pair of hands it doesn't seem wildly optimistic to believe that, when work is geared to real and urgent needs and not the profit of the few, we can perform what J.W. sees as an impossible task.

Now we come to the really weird part. J.W. says '... homosexuality needs to be seen as a useful means of limiting the population and prostitution seen as a means to release sexual frustration without contraception and without risk of birth.' I'm all for everybody doing their own thing—or anybody else's if they are willing—but is J.W. suggesting that the future of the human race depends on our ability to overcome our anti-social heterosexual desires? How does prostitution 'release sexual frustration without contraception and without risk of birth'? Perhaps J.W. means homosexual prostitution? Perhaps J.W.'s final solution is sterile, state-registered prostitutes?

Clearly J.W. is only concerned with male frustration. What about the frustrations of the unfortunate women who

are forced to submit to the whims of J.W.'s frustrated men? I say 'forced' because why the hell would they do it if not forced by physical, economic or psychological coercion?

J.W.'s Utopia and the road to it sound suspiciously like the existing hell!

Fraternally,
Corby, Northants. TERRY PHILLIPS.

*Malthus's 'Essay on the Principle of Population' argued that widespread poverty was inevitable because population grew faster than the means of satisfying needs. It was used by three consecutive generations of rulers as a spurious scientific argument against the ideas of equality.

4-page leaflet

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE—
THE POWER TO STRIKE

5/- per Hundred

Plus 1/- per hundred Postage
(4/6 on 500 and over)

50/- per thousand,
postage extra

from Freedom Bookshop

OUR OLD ENEMY

PUNISHMENT: The Supposed Justifications, by Ted Honderich (Hutchinson, £1.75).

ANARCHISTS HAVE always opposed the institution of punishment. It is one of our oldest enemies, and one which we are always meeting anew. Ted Honderich is not an anarchist. He is trying to find a justification for the institution. 'It has been my intention to consider all that I find intelligible and at all persuasive by way of defences of the practice of punishment . . . but he comes to the conclusion that the defences do not stand up to examination.

There are three main arguments for punishment:

1. Punishment is the retribution handed out to the wrongdoer, he gets 'his just deserts';
2. Punishment deters others;
3. Punishment reforms.

Practically all arguments are variants of these three, it seems to me. No. 1 is simply revenge. Yet it is amazing that philosophers like Kant and Hegel have embarked on the most elaborate verbal creations in order to justify it. There have not been lacking those who have gone so far as to say that a criminal has a 'right' to be punished. To which our author replies that 'a right that cannot be escaped is an odd right', and goes on to speculate that 'essays in the psychoanalysis of argument are not often profitable but it is hard to resist the feeling that the claiming of rights to punishment on behalf of offenders is most interesting as a projection of feelings of guilt or conscience'. One wonders, of what use

are people like Kant and Hegel? Word-spinners is all one can call them.

No. 2 has little to recommend it either. In earlier days punishments were in general much harsher than they are now, and crime was more prevalent. In the eighteenth century when a party went down from Hampstead to London, to the theatre, they went as if on safari in Central Africa. The ladies were in the centre and the men formed a screen around them, all the men of course being armed with swords and pistols. And yet people still talk about the 'shocking increase in crimes of violence'.

Mr. Honderich believes that this argument results in people being victimised. One must make an example. It is also possible to see how one can go on from this to saying that it may sometimes be necessary that an innocent person should suffer, rather than allowing the law to be seen to have made a mistake. Rudi Dutschke has recently been punished so that a Minister should not have to admit that he had made a mistake.

No. 3 is almost beneath contempt, but it is of course true that a person's spirit may be broken, and in that sense he is 'reformed', although he will probably be good for nothing after. Mr. Honderich however considers the question from the point of view of the hordes of psychiatrists who would be required, particularly if that American theory, that one can detect criminal tendencies in childhood, and forestall them, were to be introduced. 'One sometimes has the feeling that for reformists no expenditure could be too great if it secured an insignificant incidence of criminality. It is

as if there was no question but that an army of psychoanalysts would be best engaged in dealing with those who commit criminal offences, about half of which are motoring offences. Surely the claims of other sectors of institutions in society must be considered. Should we have so many psychoanalysts or practitioners of whatever kind? . . . One can certainly conceive of two societies such that one with a higher incidence of criminality would be far preferable.

Some forms of behaviourist therapy are unspeakable, they are really just another form of punishment. A man with a particular fetish can be treated so that what formerly filled him with excitement now fills him with disgust, a change from one horror to another.

The author comes to the conclusion that 'acceptable practices must prevent offences at the lowest possible cost of distress, and certainly not by causing more distress than would occur without them. Furthermore, they must not themselves give rise to excessive inequality, but rather secure that more equality or less inequality obtains than would obtain in their absence'. In present conditions the punishment of a criminal often is spread with a generous hand, so as to include his family also, for the law is never mean. So that there is more suffering all round when the crime is punished than was caused by the original offence, as when the breadwinner is jailed for some small theft.

This is a liberal and enlightened book, but I doubt whether many magistrates, and others in authority, will be much influenced by these kind of arguments.

A.W.U.

THE AMERICAN NEW LEFT

THE NEW LEFT: A Documentary History, Edited by Massimo Teodori (Cape, £3.75).

THE TITLE OF this volume, the editor admits, 'is perhaps too pretentious'. The book is in fact a 400-page anthology of about eighty passages from American New Left writings, preceded by a ninety-page historical introduction and followed by a twenty-page guide to the chronology, organisations, and press of the movement. It covers the decade up to 1968, and was published in the United States in 1969.

The scope of the extracts is very wide. Beginning with the civil rights, peace, community, and free speech campaigns, they move on to the emergence of a specifically 'New Left' (i.e. anti-traditional, non-sectarian, non-parliamentarian) consciousness, then to the radicalisation of the movement in the campaigns against war and the draft and for black and student power, and finally to the various 'problems and perspectives' that followed. Each section is supplemented by a list of sources for further reading.

The situation has of course changed since the book was prepared, especially in consequence of the events surrounding the Democratic Party Convention in Chicago in 1968, but the material Teodori has assembled remains very valuable. His introduction is useful, though rather lacking in analysis. His concluding guide is less useful because it is already out

of date and is inevitably incomplete. In general the book is not a documentary history so much as a collection of documents for a history, and as such it conveniently complements such histories of the American New Left as *The New Radicals* by Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau and *A Prophetic Minority* by Jack Newfield (both available in paperback).

It is interesting to see that, although a great many of the ideas contained in the book are much the same as those we have been putting forward for a hundred years or more, anarchism scarcely seems to figure at all in the American New Left. Even so, Teodori could have taken at least a few relevant extracts from anarchist publications. *Anarchos* is listed but not quoted, as are a few other papers vaguely described as 'libertarian' or 'anarchist', and Paul Goodman is given as one of the 'inspirers' of the movement, but that is about all—though the odd contributor (Marvin Garson, for example) seems to tremble on the verge of real anarchism.

In this connection it is perhaps worth noting that another recent anthology of American New Left writings—*The New Left*, edited by Priscilla Long (Porter Sargent, 1969)—does contain a passage chosen to represent the anarchist position: an extract from Rudolf Rocker's book *Anarchosyndicalism*, which was published back in 1938! Is that really the best we can do? N.W.

'Worker Traveller?'

THE END of the summer term at University brings the annual migration of students back to their home towns, armed with promises of summer jobs, Student Traveller booklets, and a dream of far-off lands in the sun. This dream meant for me this summer a five-week stint of bus-conducting, followed by a four-week tour of Italy, Greece and Yugoslavia. The job was a most enjoyable and rewarding break from an often monotonous college term, but sadly it appeared from conversations with workmates that students are considered as some kind of bourgeois 'jet-set', worlds apart from them. The fact that I was about to travel abroad heightened this impression. The more perceptive came out with 'Oh, it's all right for you students, they give you all this cheap travel'. However, the only 'they' involved are the students themselves.

The fact is that the NUS, rather than directing all its energies toward a frustrating battle with the wage-price spiral, has organised itself to provide cheap charter travel for its members. Workers with families are rightly anxious to wrest some sort of dignified living standard from their exploiters, but the aims of most trade unions seem sadly limited. Surely one of its functions should be like that of the NUS travel agency. After fifty weeks hard grind, a fortnight in Brighton (or Aberystwyth) is an insult. Students, being undoubtedly privileged have an added advantage . . . long summer holidays, which make possible the cheaper but slower methods of travel, i.e. long train journeys and hitch-hiking. With two weeks grudgingly awarded them, even the more affluent minority of the working class have time for, at best, two weeks in Spain, of merciless package tour and 'real English tea, no tea bags' exploitation.

Another aim then must be longer

holidays, and not an extra day a year as the TUC conference so militantly demands but a minimum four weeks in the summer. Again the student has a slight edge in possessing an International Student Identity Card, which can gain one useful concessions in many parts of Europe. Well, what about an International Young Worker Identity Card, available to all workers below a certain wage level, which would include students anyway, and as workers, not as classless freaks estranged from the workers.

Of course for families and older workers, cheap travel is much more difficult, but it is a tragic injustice that after five weeks in a particular job, I can afford a month abroad, whereas a workmate, of the same age and wage rate, and single like myself, gets, after fifty weeks, a fortnight of British rain and fish and chips.

Travel broadens the mind. An old but true cliché. I can think of no better way for a young worker to meet foreign comrades, and experience their way of life, their struggles for freedom, than a month 'roughing it' abroad in the summer. Why should the natural and man-made beauties of Europe be the monopoly of the middle class, students and unappreciative wealthy Americans?

Until capitalism is overthrown, the workers must chase price rises with wage claims in order to defend their standards of living. But how about some imaginative travel organisation, as well, from the unions, or better, from 'ad hoc' worker groups? The potential is vast. Exchange visit arrangements with other European workers and general working class co-operation in making travel easier and cheaper. Let's see a new phenomena on the continent in the summer . . . the worker traveller.

NEIL JONES.

Danish Revolutionaries

A DANISH anarcho-syndicalist writer Carl Heinrich Petersen* has now, after seven years of systematically collecting material, published his third book, *Danske revolutionære* (Danish revolutionaries) (1890-1940). Many young Danes of today have in their opposition to social-democrats and communists been inspired by foreign revolutionaries because the official histories of working class struggle have neglected those who were opposed not only to the bourgeoisie but also to the social-democrats and communists. C.H.P.'s book, which consists of portraits of 13 revolutionaries (most of whom C.H.P. has known personally) together with articles and pamphlets written by these people, is therefore welcome reading.

As the book is written in Danish I shall relate the parts which I consider of most interest to anarchists.

Anarchism is not firmly rooted in Danish history but small groups of anarchists have existed and with them a few anarchist papers, which however died out very quickly. Amongst the revolutionary Marxists and the syndicalists (who reached their height of strength 1918-1920) anarchist tendencies have come about especially when these people opposed party discipline in both the communist and social-democratic parties. An exception is the anarchist Jean Jacques Ipsen (1857-1936), who was greatly inspired by French anarchists and syndicalists during his 10 years' stay in Paris 1889-1899. Ipsen earned his living as a journalist but wrote many articles in the various Scandinavian socialist journals. In 1907 he was able to start his own newspaper together with the Norwegian anarchist Hans Jäger. *Korsaren* (The Corsaire) existed for only

five weeks and was followed later the same year by the weekly paper *Revolution*, which lasted two months. His last attempt in this field was made in 1923 with *Ny Produktion*, with the Swedish anarchist A. V. Lundström as co-editor. After two months they had to give up. Ipsen has left 13 small books and pamphlets of which C.H.P. has reprinted his pamphlet *Slip menneskene løs* (Let man loose). In this he analyses man's slavery and rejects the arguments against letting man loose. He has however had much help through knowledge of the anarchist classics.

While Ipsen was active as a writer and a speaker, an example of direct action comes from people who did not call themselves anarchists. Andreas Fritzner (1887-1969) has given the story of the Amalthea case in a tape-recording written down in C.H.P.'s book. In the summer of 1908 the dockworkers of Malmö were on strike. From England had arrived 70-80 blacklegs sent by the international blackleg-organisation in Hull. These blacklegs were lodging on the ship *Amalthea* in Malmö port and to get rid of them some Swedish young socialists decided to frighten them by a bomb explosion beside the ship. On Algot Rosberg's request A.F. bought the fuse in Copenhagen and back in Malmö A.R. made the bomb together with Anton Nilson and Alfred Stern. On Saturday night, July 12, 1908, the explosion woke up the whole of Malmö while unintentionally one blackleg got killed and several wounded. The bomb-makers were arrested and A.R. and A.N. (who placed the bomb) were sentenced to death while A.S. got life imprisonment. Fritzner who came to Malmö a few days after the explosion was

also arrested but acquitted after two months as he claimed he imagined the fuse was to be used for some fireworks. He was however deported from Sweden.

Andreas Fritzner was very active all through his life and still today holds the Danish record of imprisonment for political reasons (1 year and 9 months all added up). He was a pioneer for COs and because he kept this standpoint he was excluded from the CP in the thirties.

In 1918 after the outbreak of the German revolution A.F. and one of his comrades went to Germany to get help in spreading the revolution to Denmark. Once over the border they managed to get a travelling pass to Berlin from a barracks flying the red flag. Without much difficulty they reached Hamburg where all was confusion and no trains were running. Suddenly a sailor got up on a table announcing he had booked a train to Berlin for the red sailors of Kiel. With this train the Danes got to Berlin where they spoke to Karl Liebknecht, but from their conversation they soon realized that the Germans had their hands full and were the Danes to join the revolution they would have to take their own full initiative. They therefore returned and A.F. was arrested immediately for having propagated the release of political prisoners in Denmark.

Stockholm
A.P.
*C.H.P.: Born 1915, working class origin, cigarmaker, schoolteacher, now totally devoted to writing political history, one of the best writers in Denmark on workers' history and anarchism. Books: *Kommunismens kättere* (The heretics of communism), 1964; *Agitatorer og martyrer* (Agitators and martyrs), 1966.

Gay Liberation Front

A NEW ORGANISATION for homosexual men and women was formed last October to demand equal legal and social rights. It is already holding weekly meetings in London attended by well over 200 people.

The Front aims to end all discrimination by the law, by employers and by society at large. On November 27, 159 of its members demonstrated by torch-light at Highbury Fields in protest at the conviction by a ten-two majority verdict of Louis Eales, former Young Liberal Chairman, who denied police allegations of gross indecency. NOCL observers were present at the demon-

stration.

The case for a further substantial measure of sexual law reform was well made in an article in *The Times* on December 2, which referred to the setting up by the Sexual Law Reform Society of an expert working party which is to submit recommendations to the Law Commission.

The problems of homosexuals in Scotland are even worse. Under Scottish law, even the private homosexual behaviour of consenting adults remains illegal, though according to the Crown Agent, prosecutions are 'seldom, if ever' brought for this class of offence. In Edinburgh,

on December 4, the Scottish Minorities Group (affiliated to the Scottish Council for Civil Liberties) held its first AGM. Professor G. M. Cartairs, head of the Department of Psychiatry, Edinburgh University, spoke of the psychologically as well as the socially harmful effects on adults as well as on children of the deprivation of love, whether heterosexual or homosexual. He expressed the view that society evidenced a variety of sick attitudes towards homosexuals. The meeting called unanimously for early law reform in Scotland.

NOCL JANUARY BULLETIN

THE HYDE PARK SOCIALIST, Winter 1970/71. Price 2½p quarterly.

THE Hyde Park Socialist, produced by libertarian socialists who, it appears from the magazine, are regular soap-box orators in Hyde Park, is, again, well worth the modest sum of 2½p. Or 20p for an annual subscription.

The editorial supports the proliferation of revolutionary graffiti on hoardings, etc. Not a bad idea for a bit of cheap, quick propaganda. The capitalists provide the site, you provide the slogan!

The article on 'Law and Order' by Bill Hughes deserves reprinting in *FREEDOM*. It could well form the basis of an anarchist leaflet on the subject.

Particularly interesting is the account by the veteran ILP-er, F. A. Ridley, of his experiences as a Hyde Park orator between 1925-39. Hyde Park, claims Ridley, was a 'proletarian university'. As a more recent graduate of the soap-box myself, I can amply testify to the

efficacy of the spoken word in the revolutionary cause. And not just on street corners either, the factory gate's a good place, too.

The poetry could be better and, if one must complain, it might be best left out.

A useful review of other publications is included and it is interesting to note (in view of the ILP affiliations of the Hyde Park Socialists) that they recognise the decline into Labourite rubbish of the ILP's *Socialist Leader*.

I confess, as the 'editor' of a very small review, to a liking for the irrelevant, struggling little papers which constitute the 'undergrowth' of contemporary revolutionary publishing. They indicate the health of the movement at grass roots level—they are people doing their own thing—and that is what libertarian revolution is all about.

Hyde Park Socialist from J. Hughes, 48 Gilday Road, London, S.W.17.

IAN S. SUTHERLAND.

'WITHOUT THE CONSCIOUS will and conscious action of the majority of the proletariat there can be no socialism'—Rosa Luxemburg.

I get the above quotation from the Aberdeen Solidarity Pamphlet—*Spartakism to National Bolshevism*, the KPD 1918-24. An excellent Pamphlet marred at times by the usual Solidarity habit of inserting a few 'debating point' attacks against anarchism and omitting credit to anarchists in order to prove their Marxist orthodoxy.

This should not prevent any anarchist reading the Pamphlet, indeed it is a Pamphlet that ought to give rise to fruitful thought and debate within anarchist groups, as for all its omissions and pettiness with regard to anarchism, it makes an amazingly good analysis of how Leninism—during the lifetime of Lenin and the power of Trotsky—by imparting an elitist element to the German Communist movement, hampered the spread of revolution to the one country, where, by the Bolsheviks' own theories, revolution had to spread to complete the Russians' own revolution.

It shows that though in Germany workers' councils did exist; the reformists and even the bourgeoisie seeing the emergence of the council movement created their own so as to dilute the radicalism of the council movement; and so in such circumstances the task of revolutionaries was half done and yet all to do.

The councils existed, so it should have been easy to argue that the Parliamentary Assembly was an irrelevance, the councils were not exclusively revolutionary or even socialist and therefore the cry 'All Power to the Councils' had to mean real councils not the puppets that existed.

The Pamphlet shows examples of adventurism, it shows examples of *putschism*, it shows examples of turpitude, where leaders acted as a conservative force, or where they (leaders) spent so long debating what to do that the masses lost heart and had gone home by the

TWO PAMPHLETS REVIEWED

time they were called on to act; it shows that some of these faults were committed by men who called themselves anarchists, it shows that some were committed by Marxists. It shows that Rosa Luxemburg, magnificent socialist though she was, was sometimes over-cautious.

All of this any anarchist would expect to find—yes even that revered anarchists made mistakes too—and it is more than useful to have it documented in this way. (Occasionally one is surprised to find gaps, one such especially surprising in a Pamphlet published in Scotland, is that no use has been made of the material the late Guy Aldred published on the subject both at the time and subsequently.) So, despite what its author says, at times an anarchist can well hail this as an anarchist Pamphlet, essential reading, an essential contribution to anarchist arguments against Leninists.

But one would be losing part of our case to fail to answer occasional faults and this reduces one to quibbling a little. For if allegations are made against anarchism in an essentially anarchistic Pamphlet, and anarchists praise the Pamphlet without answering the allegations, then we might be thought to accept the allegations and criticisms. It is not just in criticism of us that the author appears at times to use debating points.

For instance Luxemburg said: 'The Spartakus League will never take power except in accordance with the clearly expressed will of the great majority of the proletarian masses.' In the circumstances of a party joining the Third International controlled by the Bolsheviks who had not similarly abstained, this was assuredly a fairly definite disclaimer, and to read into it, as the author does, the interpretation that she was leaving room

for a 'Spartakist government ruling along with the councils', would seem unfair—she may have been, certainly, she had always after all believed in a government whose power wrested on a mass extra-parliamentary workers' movement, but the charge is unproven and when one remembers that the masses are to intervene consciously the government wanted would obviously not be like any that we have ever known, and to argue that this means ambiguous attachment to the independent action, and ideological autonomy of the proletariat is to get bogged down in scholasticism, and linguistic philosophy.

Similarly in a footnote, after rightly attacking Landauer's and Muhsam's actions in forming a soviet divorced from the masses, and fairly poured scorn on Landauer's worrying semantically whether Landauer's cabinet was a government, rather than on the content of the soviet, it quite unfairly attacks anarchists for trying to posthumously co-opt non-anarchists to our banner.

Quoting *Workers' Councils in Germany*—Coptic Press (which may well elsewhere have committed the crime alleged) 'There is little difference . . . between the most advanced forms of council communism and anarchism'—it alleges retrospective identification. Anarchist-communism is by definition a form of communism that does not believe in forming a government and holds that to form one such betrays the communist aim. The term entered political debate not so much with Proudhon but in the arguments between Bakunin and Marx, and therefore stems from the discussions within the International as to whether the workers should capture the state.

If some other movement, which for

reasons of its own rejects the term anarchist, nevertheless advocates socialism and does not advocate capturing the state, then it can hardly be denied that in this it agrees with Bakunin and not Marx. The fact that the organization—on other matters—may condemn Bakunin is irrelevant, most anarchists would reject Bakunin's conspiratorial theories anyway.

It is equally irrelevant, that someone who calls himself an anarchist may have condemned an attempt to build socialism on an anti-governmental model, we have debates within the anarchist movement as does any other movement and would be in an advanced state of putrefaction if we did not. In terms of the meaning of words, many ideas, actions, and attempted actions of the council communists were non-governmental (an-

archical) socialism; and they would therefore have differed little from anarchism even if they had been opposed by all the German anarchists and all those who supported council communism had fervently believed that they were anti-anarchists. However this was not the case. The Pamphlet authoritatively quotes Pannecok but does not mention that Pannecok says he set out to build a synthesis of Marxism and anarchism. It favourably mentions the *cinquidern* but does not mention that this was in contact with Aldred and other anarchists outside Germany. It does not mention Karl Korsch though favourably mentioning the KAPD in which he was a significant theoretician—perhaps because Korsch later joined the Spanish CNT in order to carry on his fight for council communism.

L.O.

Correspondence Please

Dear Comrades,

Correspondence Please

Before seven months I wrote you a letter in which I pleased you to send me your weekly FREEDOM and your review *Anarchy* and some pamphlets. I wanted to see about what and how do you write. You were so kind and sent me that and now I must thank you for that. At same time I must excuse you because I didn't write before. I was ill five months and really I hadn't time to thank you. With a great interest I read over your weekly and your review. The article about Kropotkin (the title is 'Kropotkin and His Memoirs' by Nicolas Walter) I translated so that every member of our group knows something about his life.

In December, 1970, I found some friends and every week we discuss about problems in our society and about world problems. We try to establish a group which would be founded on anarchist ideas. We talk that we are anarchists but we don't know if we are really anarchists. Now, we have contacts with some students from Trieste (Italy). They think like me or my friends.

So we want to contact, correspond with some English groups. Perhaps we shall exchange our ideas, to inform about our work, etc. So I pleased you, to announce my address in your weekly. And please, excuse me for my bad English.

Fraternal greetings,

J.B.

Write c/o Freedom Press.

ZENGUNRO STRIKES

ON SEPTEMBER 10 and 11 the All Okinawa Military Workers Union (Zengunro) held its third strike against the lay-offs caused by the cuts in US military spending. The military plans to fire 10,000 of the 55,000 base workers; already speed-ups and other devices are used to cut costs, such as firing 500 PX workers and then advertising for 'part time' help, at a lower rate of pay, of course.

The first strike took place on January 8 and 9 of last year, with about 35,000 workers out (Zengunro has a membership of 20,000). The second ran from January 19-23, also with about 35,000 out, and ended with a few concessions from the military. During the second strike the military struck back by declaring 'Defense Condition Green', which meant that all bases were prepared for possible attack, but primarily that no 'unnecessary travel' was allowed, aimed at turning those Okinawans whose businesses (mostly bars) were patronized by soldiers against the strike; these people held a rally and then attacked the strikers, who then began to wear helmets and carry clubs, similar to student radicals.

The third strike, which took place while I was in Okinawa, was less successful than the previous ones, as only about 20,000 people participated. Although Condition Green was declared, the 'A sign' ('Approved for US Forces') bars simply closed down (many do not allow Okinawans to come in) without any retaliation. One difference from before was that leaflets and posters were written in English to explain the situation to the soldiers (see below for the military's version); one American girl was arrested for distributing leaflets but let go after several hours. After the strike ended the military offered to cut 100 names off the latest list of dismissals.

One interesting aspect of the strike was the reaction on the bases. While the military operations weren't affected, the people, especially wives, were in a state of panic, stockpiling water, candles, and food in case the Okinawans cut off the water and electricity or even laid siege to the bases. The reason is simple: the vast majority of Americans in Okinawa live on base in little American-style communities in which Okinawans are visible only as maids and clerks. Suddenly, they realize that there's a million people running around out there that they don't know anything about. This is helped by the military's claim that the strikers are all Communists and that the reason everybody has to stay on base is that the strikers will attack any American they catch alone—if these are the kind of people hired to work on US bases, what are the people who aren't

hired like? Zengunro may be the only union in the world whose long-range goals include the loss of every member's job, namely the abolition of the bases. I was not able to learn much about its internal structure, but it seems to have some kind of bureaucratic set-up. While claiming to be politically independent, the union as a whole is close to the Japan Socialist Party, which is rhetorically fairly radical, but in practice committed to parliamentary politics; some members follow the CP (pro-Russia, also committed to electoral revolution), and a growing number of young workers are sympathizers of various radical student groups.

Zengunro fights the abolition of jobs it thinks shouldn't exist for a basic economic reason: there aren't any other jobs. Over half of the farmland of Okinawa was taken over by the bases (they occupy 16% of the total area). 30% of the 'Gross National Product' comes from the bases; industry is virtually non-existent. The people are much poorer than in Japan. If Okinawa is to get rid of the bases it must first find some other base for its economy.

The Okinawan Government is headed by a US general who has absolute control; while there is an elected legislature and Chief Executive (who is a socialist), they are essentially in the same position as a student council.² The Japanese Government, which seems to think of Okinawa as a troublesome nuisance (before the war, Okinawa was treated like a colony), has suggested that the laid-off workers be retrained for other jobs or, better still, sent to Japan to work in its 'defence' industries. As a result of this attitude, many Okinawans, especially in Zengunro, are wondering if they'll be much better off as part of Japan.

The military's belief that the strikes must be some kind of political demonstrations is somewhat understandable when one considers the cultural differences between Japanese and American labour relations. In America the unions scoff at the idea of a class struggle, but a strike is pure economic war, often lasting until one side is driven to the brink of absolute ruin; a strike planned to last only two days would be meaningless. In Japan, especially in Sohyo, the largest group of unions and under SP control, the union spends several months beating the drums about its 'Fall Offensive' with much shouting about the evils of capitalism, only to settle after a token strike. A typical newspaper report reads 'Little progress has so far been made in negotiations between . . . management and workers to avert a 4-hour strike . . . scheduled to begin at 4 a.m. tomorrow'.

The five-day Zengunro strike is said to be virtually unprecedented in the history of the Japanese labour movement. The employers give in quickly for several reasons (the main one being to avoid threatening the paternalistic, big happy family relationship with the workers). The pre-strike rhetoric is just wishful thinking on the part of the union leadership.

A recent newspaper article said that Zengunro had decided to abandon its attempts to prevent the lay-offs by striking. Unfortunately the article was somewhat incoherent and only referred to 'various internal conditions' as the reason. Apparently the union will instead attempt to get the same benefits as in Japan for those losing their jobs and to change the employment system.

BORIS BADINOFF.

¹This number, which is equal to the number of soldiers in Okinawa, includes many maids and other private employees who were not involved in the strike.

²I am told that Americans actually have more rights in Okinawa than the Okinawans do.

ANARCHIST LIBRARY

Comrades,

We are attempting to form an Anarchist library for the purpose of facilitating research into both the past of the Anarchist movement and new ideas and activities. We are also interested in translating things into Japanese to make radicals here more familiar with modern libertarian thought abroad.

To do this we request that all groups send us any books, pamphlets and newspapers they feel might be of use to us (or lists of what they have available). As we are poor, we hope that groups can send us their own publications for free or at a discount. We will occasionally put out a kind of newsletter, not general news, but about specific things, and will send them in exchange.

We would appreciate publicizing of this request to reach groups we may not be in contact with.

Yours truly,

HIROSHI OZEKIS,
Secretary of
International Correspondent,
CIRA-NIPPON.

c/o Ryu, 251 Sugita,
Fujinomiya-shi,
Shizuoka-ken, Japan

St. Anns Community Craft Centre

THE CENTRE OPENED at the end of summer in a corner shop in St. Anns, a large redevelopment area to the east of Nottingham city centre. The Craft Centre provides facilities for people in St. Anns to develop talents they may have and to make some of their basic needs.

Each evening after school we have the use of a church hall nearby as a play centre where children of all ages can come and make soft toys, paint, draw, use hard materials, make simple clothes; some boys do woodwork, other children devise their own shows on the hall stage. Also when we have petrol in our van we take them out into the local countryside.

During the week the centre is open for mothers to use our sewing machines, weaving looms and other equipment. They can either bring their own material or use that which has been donated by local factories. We also run an old people's lunch club occasionally with free entertainment; all the food is obtained by gift, enabling us to provide the meals free, as all our other services are. We do painting and decorating work plus small repairs for people unable to pay to have jobs done professionally, and

act as an information and advice centre at times.

It is very important to stress that all the work we do is on a voluntary basis and we ourselves have no earned income. There are five of us who live and work at the centre, having decided to adopt practically the values we would like to see in a society based on love and co-operation with our neighbours. Our main commitment is to work according to need and not where one can gain the most profit. It seemed impossible to work within the present social and economic system whose very structure was responsible for most of the problems that surround us. So we offer our labour and most materials free of charge and ask shopkeepers and wholesalers if they in their turn will contribute to our needs by giving food and materials. The few items we cannot obtain by gift we buy with donations of money from sympathisers.

We hope our ideas of mutual aid and responsibility will spread amongst the people of St. Anns and as the new St. Anns emerges people will come together to control many aspects of their daily lives.

MIKE BAILLIE.

Okinawa US Base Attacked

ON DECEMBER 18 3,000 people rioted in Okinawa, attacking the largest US base. Four buildings and 73 cars with military licence plates were burned.

The riot was set off when US MPs, arriving at a traffic accident where an American soldier had run over an Okinawain, did nothing to help the injured Okinawain and didn't arrest the soldier. Okinawains have become increasingly angry about the numerous beatings of taxi drivers, attempted rapes, and other symptoms of the current trend of American society and are demanding that such cases be tried in Okinawain courts; just a week before the riot a soldier who killed an Okinawain woman

while driving drunk was acquitted by a military court.

The American 'High Commissioner' announced the next day that as a result of the riot it might be necessary to postpone the removal of poison gas and the return to Japanese rule. The Okinawains are particularly angry about the presence of poison gas and its removal has been delayed for some time because of the difficulty in finding a place in the US willing to take it, giving the feeling that the Americans are using Okinawa to store things that are too dangerous to be kept in their own country. The same day it was announced that 3,000 more base workers will be fired this spring.

BORIS BADINOFF.

The Rise of Mao

THE REVOLUTIONARY movement in China (as in England) received its early impetus from a vigorous sectarianism that broke up religious dogma, and the reform movement and the secret societies culminated in a revolutionary alliance which fought the decaying regime of the Empress Dowager.

Prof. Franke* gives an interesting account of how the schism developed between the Kuo Min Tang and the Chinese Communist Party, which both proceeded from the totalitarian nationalism of Sun Yat Sen. For Sun individual liberty meant becoming 'a sheet of loose sand'.

How shall we apply the term 'liberty'? If we apply it to a person, we shall become a sheet of loose sand; on no account must we give more liberty to the individual; let us secure liberty instead for the nation. The individual should not have too much liberty, but the nation should have complete liberty. . . . To make the nation free, we must each sacrifice his personal freedom.

'The nation' is the usual euphemism for the State, and from 'the State above all' both the KMT and the CP proceed. For Prof. Franke, 'anarchism fell on less fertile soil in China because of its complete denial of the state, whereas Marxist-Leninism with its strong emphasis on a state led by an élite . . . linked up with Confucian influences'. He passes lightly over the conflicts of Anarchism with both Marxist-Leninism and the Kuomintang (for which *The Origins of Anarchism in China*, now issued in an improved second edition, remains the guide).

The founder of Marxist-Leninism in China was the first of a series of Russian and cosmopolitan adventurers, part diplomat and part spy, Gregor Voitinsky, who (as Franke says) entered into 'sharp conflict' with the anarchists, and who began to build a 'working class movement' that would serve Russian secret diplomacy. His successor, Sneevliet, took the Communists into the Kuomintang, and Russian policy in China became involved in the conflict between Stalin and Trotsky. The issue was simply: should a nationalist China be built up, which would be an ally against Great Britain, or should the CP 'support' the revolution? One hardly knows which is worse, but the ultimate policy of

Borodin led to immense disaster for those who supported the 'Moscow line' and tens of thousands of others besides. Old soldiers like Mao have not forgotten nor forgiven this.

By 1928 the KMT had captured the government and Chiang Kai Shek entered Peking, a victorious general for the first

China well within the lifetime of those who remember Chamberlain or Baldwin as Prime Minister. Time and again there sprang up in the 1920s, in opposition to the marauding war lords and central government, peasant associations—loosely described as bandits (though this is strenuously denied by those which accepted the anarchist label)—offshoots of the secret societies. According to Prof. Franke, 'occasionally they succeeded in gaining control of large areas and their supporters numbered millions'—but this figure includes both bandits who succeeded in becoming



time; then, the twists of international policy made Moscow a stronger opponent of Japanese militarism than Chiang himself, and a new generation of Communist war lords arose—first from the retreat of the Long March (1934), then in the struggle against Japan—ending in Chiang acting out his Nation State in Formosa and the CP victorious. Nobody at any time had consulted the workers or peasants who were passive spectators as the military swept past them to victory—or commandeered as cannon- and work-fodder.

By this time the Communist Party had freed itself from Moscow spies as great national leaders (the last of them was Nguyen who as Ho Chi Minh became a nationalist leader in his own country, Vietnam).

Prof. Franke in his book touches briefly on the bandit movement which deserves closer attention. War lords and bandits seem to us another world, more remote than that of the Wild West—something out of a Japanese samurai film—but they were effective forces in

states-within-a-state and new war lords, and the libertarian peasant movement.

The seizure of land and the building of peasant communes reached such a pitch that both the CP and the KMT joined in to fight for their own areas of influence. But such associations as that of the 'Red Spears' or the 'Long Knives' were totally independent of both and proceeded directly from the secret societies. Amongst them were many anarchistic peasant associations which liberated particular territories from government and this was a constant feature of the '20s and '30s to which little attention has been drawn. Only Pa Ch'in has written about them and since 1948 his books have been rewritten, deleting the references to anarchist fighters and making them 'communist fighters'; and altering the picture of Bakunin on the wall to that of Mao Tse Tung! (Again, see *Origins*). In the next round, however, improved communications will see that these struggles are not so totally ignored.

A MELTZER.

Occultism and Fascism

THE RETREAT to religion taken by many hippies includes the sinister turn to black magic, the occult term for fascism. It can be seen in a short film by Kenneth Anger, music by Mick Jagger—*Invocation to My Demon Brother*. Anton Lavey—who heads San Francisco's Jesuitical Church of Satan—makes a cameo appearance in his horns. I used to see the poor devil on Haight Street during its prime. Jayne Mansfield, a disciple of Lavey's, had just lost her head in a car accident. This pink plastic lilit was the epitome of *Hollywood Babylon*, and Anger naturally used her picture on the cover of his book by that name—a sister in Christ, or Lucifer, or Shiva, or what-have-you. Lavey was a publicity hound at that time, and the *Chronicle* carried precious human interest stories about the fool. They had no idea that he was going to be a star.

Kenneth Anger makes technically fine films. The subject matter is fetishism, whether motorcycles, leather, jewels, shiny custom cars, net-stocking painted feet, swastikas, homosexuals, silver buttons, penises, blood. . . . His films are deep, ornate and religious, and though he makes fun of Jesus at Lucifer's expense, he is undoubtedly a believer like the fascist genius Wagner; or Hitler himself, who never completely gave up the Catholic Church, despite Bormann's whispers.

Anger is supported by the underground culture because he is an *artiste*, he is poor and doesn't deal with the capitalists, and he has shown his films for FSM and Filthy Speech Movement benefits. He's very good at portraying modern totemism, and he is anti-establishment. But then the National Socialists considered themselves revolutionaries completely opposed to the status quo. And it's obvious that Anger reveres the Nazis. In *Scorpio Rising*, the motorcycle hero sniffs his methedrine/cocaine, emulating the Mani-ish SS, and after a few flashes, falls into the role of a neo-Nazi haranguing the invisible crowd from a church altar decked with Nazi flags, death rings, and checkers, each emblazoned with that ancient 'mystic' symbol, the swastika. Professor Heinemann and Aleister Crowley, Anger's guru, are credited with laying this symbol on the National Socialists; many books have been written about the black magic

mysticism of the Third Reich. Himmler, Rosenberg, Ley, Goebbels, and Hitler (who sometimes mocked Himmler's theories) were all involved in occultism.

Two of the other stars of *Invocation to My Demon Brother* are Lenore Kandel and her boyfriend, Sweet William of the Hell's Angels. Lenore Kandel will be remembered as the author of *The Love Book*, which our perceptive albeit murderous constabulary busted for obscenity. It was obscene; it had nothing to do with love. But Lenore became a heroine, persecuted by the blue moonies; and Ferlinghetti, whose City Lights store was busted for selling the book, did his bit for freedom of the press and testified to the great artistic merit of the hippy heroine's book. She became one of the resident poets of the Diggers, along with that other great revolutionary, Richard Brautigan, the gentle Ogden Nash of the seventies. The Diggers did many positive things, but their anonymity was a lie—their leaders were egotistical junkies who dropped out of the Mime Troupe in order to perform more significant roles. Sweet William, Lenore's old man, was also a former Mime Troupe. Then he joined the Storm Trooper Hell's Angels, and stayed close to the Digger scene.

Long after the Haight was dead, several members of the Grateful Dead family organized a second Travelling Pleasure Circus Prankster Trip, modelled on the first Kesey excursion immortalized by Tom Wolfe in *The Electric Cool-Aid Acid Test*. Kesey went on this second trip too, a flight to London which included a Digger leader, as well as Pete, head of San Francisco's Hell's Angels, and Sweet William. They were tired people, and they spent most of their London week in a third floor room at Apple, thanks to the goodwill of George Harrison. They sat around their imported God's Eye, and talked about what a mind-blowing event they were. The two Angel's motorcycles had also been flown overseas, thanks to the generosity of another ex-Mime Troupe. The tribal leaders met with Mick Jagger, King-Queen of their Satanic Majesties, and made tentative arrangements for a 'free' concert, which was to become Altamont, that event where 'the blackman with a knife' (actually a gun) was ritually

Continued on page 10

Lousy Conditions in Luxury Hotels

HAVE YOU EVER had a meal at a hotel, or even stayed in one? And if you have, did you really notice the people who carried in the food and took away the dirty plates? Or did you think about the workers behind the scenes, doing the cooking and the washing-up? Like hell you did.

Neither did I, until I worked this summer as a waiter at the Nethybridge Hotel, Inverness-shire—a three-star hotel in a small village, surrounded by quiet, beautiful countryside, ideal for the well-off middle-aged and retired. Here I was to discover exactly how bloody awful the conditions of hotel workers are. Consider the wages for a start: most of the male workers were averaging £12 a week, before deductions. The women, who did just as much, only averaged £10. After income tax, national insurance and pension contributions, you aren't left with much. Admittedly bed and board were thrown in, but the bed wasn't great and the board not much better.

As for work—if you cherish the illusion that hotel work is easy, discard it. We worked a six-day week and couldn't take our day off when we wanted to, but when we were told. Sometimes, when it was busy, you could go for a few weeks before getting your time off. On top of this, the hours were pretty grim, as I soon found out. Working in the dining room on a bad day, you would start at quarter to eight in the morning, and go on, with perhaps a break of half an hour, until half past 6.30 till almost ten. It doesn't leave you much time for enjoyment. You would spend the afternoon recovering, bathing, washing clothes, etc. If you had time in the evening, you would dive into the pub for a few pints of oblivion, and thence to bed. Overtime! . . . I once asked the manager about it; never have I seen a man look quite so pained.

Some were better off, others worse. Take, for example, the kitchen porters

and the dishwashers. There were two of each of these, working on an eight-hour shift basis, six days a week, doing the dirtiest, most soul-destroying labour. However, so that one of the pair could have his day off, the other had to work a double shift once a week, without being paid a penny extra. Work it out—that's a 56-hour-week. And all for an insulting wage packet. A few of the staff drank away their wages on Friday and Saturday. It wasn't difficult—and, Christ, could one blame them. That, for some people, is a life.

Now let us examine, like cockroaches beneath a magnifying glass, the management, the people who make the money. Apart from being hopelessly inefficient, they showed a consistent lack of consideration for the staff, always being ready to please the guests at the expense of those who did the work. Should Brigadier Prendergast want breakfast at half past seven (and I quote an actual case), up you got at seven, prepared everything for his breakfast, but bugger—all did you get in return.

Now, if this were an isolated example of exploitation, it wouldn't be so sad, but the shameful fact is that the Nethybridge Hotel is pretty average as far as conditions go. This is what gives the preceding paragraphs their relevance, for the general picture is the same in most hotels. Nor do conditions improve in the bigger hotels. Edinburgh's North British Hotel, which boasts four stars, a clientele including Ted Heath and Sir Alec Douglas-Home, and exorbitant charges, must be raking in the shekels. Yet wages are even lower than at Nethybridge and for most of the staff lodgings aren't provided. The only thing they get more of is work.

Why do catering workers allow themselves to be so appallingly exploited? Firstly there is almost no organisation among them. By the nature of the work, hotel workers are scattered all over the place; furthermore, as the hotels run on a largely seasonal basis, there

is a large turnover of labour. This makes it virtually impossible to organise catering staff on a mass basis. A union is rumoured to exist, but most people don't bother to join it. A second reason is fear of the sack—a very justified fear in a trade where the boss has all the advantages. If you try to get improved conditions, all you'll get will be a week's notice, an advertisement will go into the newspaper, and someone else will always be found. The management can afford to sack a lot of people without undue two, and then, in the evening from worry: there are so many people—students and unemployed—after the jobs, that it's relatively simple to replace trouble makers. Thirdly, as everywhere else, the old principle of 'divide and rule' comes into play. One might think that hotel workers are on a fairly equal footing, but, in fact, there is a hierarchy. The chef, the head waiter and the house-keeper are the foremen, and like most foremen are on the boss's side. They would certainly be more liable to help rather than stand alongside their fellow-workers.

It must be recognised that it is very difficult to find an effective means of combating this exploitation. Even a total strike may fail. When hotel workers in Torquay succeeded, through rare organisation and solidarity, in withdrawing their labour some years ago, the hoteliers closed down for the season, rather than give way to their demands. It seems to me that only by the occasional lightning strike organised in the individual hotel would there be a real chance of success. If all the staff were to refuse to work before dinner one evening, unless promised improved conditions, the management would be caught in a cleft stick, for they would have little alternative to giving in to the workers except that of leaving guests unfed, unattended and angry. Admittedly this requires a high degree of solidarity, but it is a tested means of

Treason Doth Never Prosper

many informers. Not only was it an age of conspiracy, it was above all the Golden Age of espionage. Robert Cecil, Secretary of State and real ruler of England, is described in these terms:

'Living as we do in an era of super-spies, counter-counter-espionage and top secret government intelligence agencies, we can yet feel a little awed by the cleverness of the man. While it is true that he inherited an already efficient spy system, established by Walsingham, one cannot help but feel that if it had not already existed Cecil would have invented it. Certainly he refined and improved it to perfection, employing forgers, thieves and counter-agents, extending the system till it covered, with frightening efficiency for the late 16th century, all the major capitals of Europe. It is said of Cecil that so thorough was his system that he knew the tonnage, cargo, disposition and destination of every ship of the Spanish fleet.'

All this without electronics! The Jesuits, themselves of course equally ruthless and equally well organised, alone had successfully defied him, and they continued to circulate in England. Cecil used the Gunpowder Plot to discredit them, and give him the excuse to increase the pressure on the Catholic community. Once the pews of the plot became public his agents moved in and rounded up among others Father Garnet, who had for years been the leader of the Jesuits in England. In fact the English Catholics were struck a near-mortal blow. Suspicion rested on them for centuries after, and has not perhaps been quite extinguished yet.

When Mr. Durst began his researches, he found to his surprise that historians had copied each other's mistakes for generations. Generally the official Government line had been followed,

achieving a desired end and not mere theorizing.

However, before hotel and other catering workers look after people who have earned their holiday, and themselves are able to enjoy a just reward for their services, there is a long way to go. For catering workers too the answer lies in anarchy.

DAVID C. KENWORTHY.

Continued from page 4 though the official account is a tissue of improbabilities.

On the Catholic side however things are not much better. In an appendix Mr. Durst criticises Father Edwards' recently published book, *Guy Fawkes—the Real Story of the Gunpowder Plot?* Father Edwards is the Historian and Archivist of the English Jesuits. His book is a work of detailed scholarship, but it is a fantasy all the same. (I read it immediately before Mr. Durst's.) According to him the whole plot was contrived by Cecil. There was, not even any gunpowder under Parliament. Fawkes and the other conspirators, or most of them, were *agents provocateurs*. This seems to me to be going too far. Governments move in devious ways their wondrous to perform, but not that devious.

Oddly enough the effect of this theory is to rob Guy Fawkes of all dignity. In the official version he is a terrifying figure, seated beside his powder barrels with burning match. Father Edwards makes him a pathetic and inadequate neurotic. According to Mr. Durst he was brought into the conspiracy because he was a soldier who had distinguished himself in mining operations. (The original plan had been to dig a tunnel under the Parliament house, but this operation ran into difficulties, and then a cellar under the House of Lords became available.)

It seems certain that the Jesuits and the other priests working in England had nothing to do with the plot. They had always counselled peaceful methods, not out of non-violent convictions but out of a realisation that they had no chance of winning in a violent struggle. When the conspirators realised that the plot had failed they tried to start a rising in the Midlands. No one joined them, and their own servants slipped away.

The story ends gruesomely with the dreadful rite of hanging, drawing and quartering, the penalty of treason.

Sir John Harrington, who plays a marginal role in the story, composed the cynical jingle, which sums up the politics of his age and ours:

'Treason doth never prosper: what's the reason?
For if it prosper, none dare call it treason.'

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

'Colchester is an ancient and beautiful town. The walled area, which now comprises the town centre, was an early Roman Colonia and one of the original centres of civilization and trade in this country. The styles and fashions and the very ways of living of the ensuing ages have all left their mark upon the area, making it unique in its beauty, charm and character.'

THUS WRITES the chairman of the Essex County Planning Committee in his foreword to the *Colchester Town Centre Plan*, which is based upon the Colchester Draft Town Centre Report published by Colchester Borough Council in 1968. But, continues the chairman: 'Now, almost suddenly, the conflicting pressures of modern living, with more people having more money and greater mobility and leisure time, threaten this heritage and make it even more precious in this rapidly changing environment.' And, of course, he is right. Colchester, Britain's oldest recorded town, is in many ways more threatened by the 'rapidly changing environment'—an euphemism for commercial property developers and profit-hungry chain-store, supermarket firms—than most; mainly because most of its buildings were not destroyed or damaged during the last war, and commercial development did not begin on a very large scale until two or three years ago. Land values, compared with many of Britain's towns and cities, have not been all that high. Land-grabbers—and there is only really one worth talking about—have not been operating in Colchester for more than four years.

THE PLAN

Essex County Council's policy in relation to the design and placement of buildings within the town centre was first published by the County and Borough Councils in 1967, in *Colchester, An Historic Townscape*. Under the Civic Amenities Act of that year, Colchester was supposed to have been designated a Conservation Area. This Act requires that local planning authorities designate such areas of special architectural and, or, historic interest, the character and appearance of which it is desirable to conserve and enhance.

Colchester has, as the Town Centre Plan admits, many historic buildings listed under the 1962 Town & Country Planning Act; it also has 'a fine sky line, across the areas of predominantly historic buildings, and a historic layout of the town dating from Roman times, adding up to a beautiful town'. Indeed, the Council of British Archaeology lists Colchester as one of Britain's towns '... so splendid and precious that ultimate responsibility for whom should be a national concern'. But times are changing. Few will object to that—but what kind of change? And in whose interest? Says the Town Centre Plan:

'Colchester with its distinguished history still visible has the means to attract trade, and residents. Both "locals" and "visitors" cannot fail to be attracted to the town by some aspect of its character developed during past times, and the attraction is not to a monument or shrine but to an abundance of smaller things each of importance to the individual. The tourist trade has advantages and disadvantages. It provides income for trade, and to subsidise public amenities, but may divert resources from more important uses. It also generates traffic which may help to damage the character of the town. ... Colchester thus has a centre for trade, commerce, learning and the arts. ... Technological and economic changes demand increased office and shop space, so producing traffic and parking problems. Shops are becoming larger making difficulties of integration with existing small-scale buildings. As the commercial area spreads, office and shop space is required within buildings originally designed for other purposes. Vehicles and parking make demands on space, which the street pattern, developed for pedestrians, is unable to satisfy. The population trend is still towards the towns so land becomes scarcer and more valuable, and pressure to redevelop at higher standards and densities mounts.'

The population of Colchester and its surrounding villages in 1960 was a little over 70,000; the County Council's Development Plan for Essex provides for an expansion to 118,000 by 1981. Plans are also in hand for a Northern outer by-pass and an inner relief road cutting through Colchester just to the south of the town centre. Whilst the Colchester Town Centre Plan states that 'the number of car parks should be kept to an absolute minimum', it envisages about ten multi-storey car parks and public car parking spaces for 6,300 cars at any one time. And, comments the Plan: 'The above provision is to serve the day-to-day needs of long- and short-term parkers having business or work in the central area' (emphasis mine).

The purpose of the Town Plan is, it argues, to 'balance the need to redevelop and the need to conserve'. This, claims the critics, is not being done. In its 'Statement of Policy and Principle', the Plan says, under 'General (i)'—'The Central Area should continue to serve as the shopping, business and administrative centre of Colchester and the surrounding district; it is the appropriate location of the theatre, library, museums and similar institutions'. Critics of the scheme, however, say that they are dissatisfied with

the commercial bias of the Council's plans; and in particular with the lack of social amenities in a large area—to be developed—just south of the High Street. This area is at present a picturesque conglomeration of old and new, with shops, car parks, warehouses, a number of churches—including the famous, but now redundant, Holy Trinity—and many private residences. Under the Proposed Town Centre Plan, it will become—except for the library—an area of offices and large shops and supermarkets. As a sop, a proposed dance hall has been suggested. Critics of the scheme have suggested, among other things, a day nursery, a children's recreational centre, a swimming pool, coffee bars and pubs, and meeting halls. Of the Council's Plan, one critic, David Britton, wrote to the *Essex County Standard* (10.7.70):

'Holy Trinity Church could be used as a children's art centre, on the model of London's art centre at the Horniman Museum (any councillor who is at a loss over Trinity Church should visit the Horniman Museum).

Instead of this, we have a perfect recipe for deadness—more shops, more offices, no houses, and a dance hall thrown in to make the whole sad thing look respectable.

The Council's explanation of this development of the library area is curious. The eastern end of the town was already developed, so the western end must get its share—which is to say they've ruined the Minorities area with their big stores and car park plans, so, to make matters right, they had better ruin the library area as well.'

THE DEVELOPER

A glance at another map of the town, showing who owns what, will help to explain why office blocks, supermarkets and multi-storey car parks take precedence over children's playgrounds, day nurseries, houses or even pubs and coffee bars. Certain areas of Colchester, marked in black on the map, are owned by 'Frincon'. Indeed, the word has been heard on the lips of Colchesterians more and more of late. So what are Frincon and what do they do? We can now thank the *Colchester Express* (22.10.70) for, at last, giving us 'Frincon—The Inside Story'.

Says Nicholas Butler, who managed to interview Mr. R. Tomkins the boss of Frincon in 'a rare interview': 'Not many people in Colchester know about Frincon.' It is, in fact, a commercial development company formed in 1964 as Frincon Holdings Limited, and 'is the principal executive of a physically

changing Colchester'. They first owned some property in the town in 1958. No other firm of developers have built new buildings in Colchester. They have monopolised the town. Why?, asks the *Express*.

R. Tomkins, the Managing Director, comes from Frinton-on-Sea, where he was born in 1926. His father founded the firm of Tomkins, Horner & Ley, the estate agents. Young Tomkins was evacuated during the last war, and was then 'dragged' into the army. Then, after that, he went into his father's firm. In 1953, the firm expanded their activities by entering the residential property field. They bought land for about eight years. Then, 'One day Mr. Tomkins was walking through Colchester and saw that the Alton Estate and Investment Trust, owned by the Chambers family, was for sale. Since he had not got all the money at the time, he managed to sell some property to people it was already leased to before the completion date. From that the firm really got started.' Three years later they began to build. For this purpose a construction company was formed; but because of the restrictions as to the amount of money any one firm might borrow, Tomkins 'formed' other firms with different names, each to finance a different project. Then, in 1964, all these small 'independent' companies were merged into a parent company. And, remarks the *Express* writer: 'There was some difficulty in satisfying the Companies Registry with a title that was different from anything that had been used before, but finally the two words "Frinton" and "construction" were abbreviated and run together and Frincon Holdings Limited was born.'

In 1965, Frincon formed an association with Ashmole Investment Trust. The Tomkin family held 45% of the shares, and a Mr. Wells who is also on the Frincon board held another 10%. 'But,' said Mr. Tomkins, 'I found that

I was a bad partner.' So, Tomkins and Wells bought themselves out again. They considered themselves to be inefficient builders, so from then on they contracted other builders to do the building for them. They just got control of the land in places like Colchester. They turned exclusively to commercial development. Last year, the gross annual rentals from completed properties built and leased from Frincon were running at a rate of £390,000. They mainly operate in East Anglia, but also own property in London and elsewhere.

Now, that the new plans worked out for the Colchester Town Centre are pending, and it has almost been decided to proceed with a scheme that would involve the development of Lion Walk (an area largely owned by Frincon), some public suspicions have been aroused. And not surprisingly, the official Report, *Redevelopment in Colchester Central Area*, published by Colchester Council, has the following to say: 'There is a special case for partnership (i.e. between the Council and Frincon) in the Lion Walk area, where Frincon Holdings Ltd. already owns or has options over a large part of the land. By virtue of this, the Company would probably be able to put forward a more favourable financial offer than other companies without an existing interest in the land.' Mr. Tomkins has, of course, kept well out of the way during these last few years. He speaks well of Colchester Borough Council. And he says that he doesn't know 70% of the names of Colchester's town councillors. However, one interesting fact which the *Colchester Express* doesn't mention is that just over 18 months ago, the Borough Architects' Department, the Department of Engineering and Planning and the Main Drainage Section all moved into a brand new office block in St. Peter's Street—that, too, is owned by Frincon. Not surprisingly, moreover, the Town Development Committee also holds its meetings on Frincon property.

Welcome to Sunny Frincon! Britain's Oldest Town!

PETER E. NEWELL.

Depressing Press

WE ALL KNOW just how dishonest the papers are. We—anarchists—have always pointed out when reporters seemed nice people that it is not they who decide what goes in but the sub-editor; but I for one did not know till recently the ins and outs of it all (no doubt I still don't but I have bitterly learnt more).

I can remember in the past frequently wondering how a national reporter had got a particular story, had known of stringers, and thought they were perhaps useful adjuncts to reporters, knew that some unsigned articles might be from agencies, but had never guessed that not merely most unsigned stories, but many that have gone in under the signature of a night news editor or resident journalist are similarly the work of whoever may be the agency in that particular area (which explains why most papers have the same tripe).

Apart from one East Anglian reporter, who runs or-used to run on the BBC a quite interesting and liberal programme geared to exposing the ills of petit bureaucracy and anti-social acts by East Anglian bigwigs; and apart from the fact that the only happenings ever on the Dorset-Hants. border appear to be remarkably trivial but who sends the papers forelock-tugging articles on the Royal family of a quite extraordinary nauseous-

ness there are many examples that could merit a detailed analysis by someone better qualified.

But perhaps the most immediately interesting are those who colour their copy with racialism. Not surprisingly perhaps the lily-white Black Country has agencies that mirror the views of Eunuch Foul. One reporter—not the worst offender in that area—on one occasion headed his copy 'immigrant', then started to give a story of a tax dodger; in the final short paragraph, there was a mention, quoted from the local inspector of taxes that this was the 94th such offence in this taxation year.

One was obviously meant to draw the deduction that all 94 were immigrants, but the fact that none of the previous 93 had been reported suggested quite the reverse. Not only was 'the heading suggesting that tax-dodging was an immigrant practice (more of the 'they live on the taxpayers' money-national assistance' syndrome) totally unsupported; not only was one minor offence built up purely because it was an immigrant, but in fact the case showed that the incidence of immigrant tax-dodging was peculiarly low. (Though I suppose one shouldn't say that, there'll be an outcry against 'these people, who, by telling the truth to tax officers, endanger our own dodges'.)

JOLFE ROSS.

Occultism and Fascism

Continued from page 9

murdered by the Hell's Angels, in tribute to Mick. At Altamont, there were 200 swastika-bedecked Angels, and long hair and dope met with a couple of large Nuremberg banners.

In Kenneth 'I-Love-Lucifer' Anger's film, Lenore and Sweet William smoke dope from a death skull pipe and form part of the Funky Old San Francisco black magic procession. Anger appears as the priest, or whatever Crowley calls it, swirling madly around a dance floor with a large Nazi flag.

It is amazing that people who call themselves humanist-revolutionaries can not only permit this occult-fascism to flourish, but encourage it in the name of Art—the great enemy of life. They forget that Wagner and Hitler were artists, and that the truly great creator, such as Nietzsche, repudiates genius when it falls

on its knees to Parsifal, Shiva, Christ or God. Religion, whether dry dogma or wet occultism, defeats the human soul and takes its political shape in authoritarian forms. Lucifer appears more attractive to young 'rebels' than Jesus—but it is the same thing, and Anger flashes pictures of Hitler and Jesus throughout *Scorpio Rising*. The tolerance of the enemy 'on our side' could lead to a new swastika—the peace cross (let's give the John Birchers an 'A' for calling it Satan's crowfoot); to a new Hitler—a Tim Leary hedonist invoking Shiva as his rationale for revolutionary violence; to a new SA-SS—the Hell's Angels and their thousands of sadistic fetishist admirers; and to a new National Socialism—in the guise of Aquarian Consciousness. This time, the worshippers of Death should receive their self-destruction wish before they take control.

TED BURNSIDE.

A SAD DECLINE IN RATIONALITY

IN A RECENT programme on BBC radio (a transcript of which appeared in *The Listener*, 7.1.71) Sir Karl Popper lamented 'a sad decline in the rationality of discussion'. It is no longer fashionable, he said, to argue with one's opponent, or to try to find out what is wrong in his argument: 'one just accepts some impressive theory wholesale'. This tendency, Popper said, 'shows a decline of intellectual standards and of intellectual responsibility. An example of the thoughtlessness of this kind of anti-rationalism is the present vogue of anarchism.'

So anarchists, according to Sir Karl, are anti-rational, thoughtless, intellectually irresponsible, of low intellectual standards, and unwilling to argue with their opponents or to examine their arguments. (At least, however, he seems to admit that they have an impressive theory! Perhaps he thinks they stumbled on it by accident.)

Why, anarchists may wonder, does Popper take such a poor view of them? What rational and thoughtful argument would he advance against them? Let us read on.

'Surely,' Popper continued, 'we should oppose the growth of bureaucracy, and the growth of the power of the state. But it is incomprehensible to me that the same people who must realise that, on the international level, anarchy means atomic war can believe that we can have anarchy on the national level without getting involved in atomic war.'

There, then, is Popper's argument—an argument which this eminent philosopher evidently regards as thoughtful, rational, and intellectually responsible. Let us now examine it.

What Popper means, presumably, is something like this. At present there is no such thing as a world government. Anarchy, then, in the literal sense of the word, actually exists on the international level. But there is not much harmony on that level. On the contrary, there is a state of discord and strife which, if it persists, is bound to end in atomic war. Therefore anarchy on the international level is causing discord and leading to atomic war. Therefore anarchy on the national level would cause a similar state of discord, which (since atomic weapons would not disappear with the coming of national anarchy) would also lead to atomic war.

Now, it is true that, on the international level, a state of anarchy and a state of discord both exist. But does it follow that the discord is caused by the anarchy? Surely not.

International discord, surely, is to be accounted for quite differently. It is caused, not by the non-existence of an international government, but by the existence of dozens of national governments, each out for its own interests and competing ruthlessly for supremacy. And the existence of such governments is made possible by the confused and fear-ridden people who believe that to support a ruthless national government is the only means of getting security for them-

selves and their property.

Fear—the deep-seated fear of material and psychological insecurity—is obviously the root cause of discord and strife at every level of human society. Any really thoughtful man (as opposed to one who is merely clever) can see that. And a thoughtful man, realising that the demand for security simply leads to chaos and insecurity, must cease to believe, not only in national or international governments, but in any form of coercion or compulsion on any level.

After all, how can there be genuine co-operation, on any level, between the governors and the governed? How can there be any human understanding, sympathy, or affection, between the compellers and the compelled, between those in power and those subject to power? Only men who have discarded the whole authoritarian, hierarchical mentality can live together in true partnership, without envy or bitterness. And only such men can build a world in which there would be real security for all, a world without war.

Is it anarchy, then, that is leading to atomic war, or is it rather the fear of anarchy? And is it the anarchist who is necessarily anti-rational, thoughtless, and intellectually irresponsible, or is it the eminent philosopher—the respectable and comfortable doyen of the cultural establishment of a corrupt and disintegrating society?

FRANCIS ELLINGHAM.

WE WORK TOO MUCH!

THE TOTAL of 721,143 unemployed is the highest for 31 years and this number does not include the 40,011 workers without jobs in Northern Ireland. This figure raises the spectre of the '30s in the minds of the older trade unionists who lived through this period. The vast majority of workers have only experienced relatively full employment.

However further sackings are likely to increase these figures. The reasons for this are managements getting rid of their labour force in an effort to cut costs and where trade unions are negotiating productivity deals the outcome will certainly mean more people without jobs. Another reason is that more and more firms are feeling the economic squeeze and are going bankrupt. These trends are expected to continue.

Mr. Feather, the General Secretary of the TUC, has said that he fears that a million will be unemployed by the end of the year. He said, 'With present policies in operation, economic growth will be only 2 per cent this year. Merely to get total unemployment down to 600,000 by the end of the year means pushing economic growth up to 5 per cent.' Both Mr. Feather and Mr. Jack Jones of the Transport and General Workers' Union are demanding a reduction in the bank rate and an encouragement in capital investment.

THE WILBERFORCE REPORT

One of the points made in the Wilberforce Report was that they regarded 'the early introduction of productivity payment schemes for the overwhelming majority of the industrial staff as by far the best way of ensuring an efficient and well-paid labour force'. All this is true but the well-paid jobs left in the industry

are only there because the rest of the men have been sacked. Managements in both the public and private sectors are only too willing to negotiate deals of this sort.

The trouble has been that trade union leaders are equally keen to serve the 'national interest' by sacrificing the jobs and livelihoods of their members. Mr. Frank Chapple, leader of the electricity supply workers' union, said as much himself when questioned by his members on a radio programme. He said that this was the only way to increase earnings because these increases had to be paid for by higher productivity and redundancies. In fact the Wilberforce Report is a recipe for further unemployment.

There is obviously a parallel at the moment that high wage increases can create unemployment. Equally it is true that higher wages increase the spending power and therefore the demands for goods. But the effect of unemployment can also mean that the fear of it will make unions pitch their claims much lower. Whichever way the worker turns, he is confronted by the much more powerful employer who is determined to maintain his profit margins.

The trade unions have only been defensive organisations satisfied in gaining wage increases with better working conditions. When unemployment has threatened they have usually been unable or unwilling to defend their members. Such a defence could turn into a challenge to the very wage system. However trade union leaders are only interested in wage packets and conditions and to look further would mean an end to their present position. They do not want to assist in the destruction of a system that maintains them in a privileged position.

A JOB AND A WAGE PACKET

However it is equally true that the vast majority of workers see no further than jobs and wage packets. These are the things that count. The job or rather the mere employment to provide the money to buy the food and shelter, with enough left over for entertainment, is the important thing. The whole approach to work is wrong. Rather than thinking about working to live. On the whole we work too much at unnecessary useless employment rather than the necessary useful work of providing for needs.

The trade union leaders call for the expansion of the economy, that is an expansion of anything, whether important or not, as long as it provides jobs. No employer would disagree with this providing that it also produces a profit. With today's science and technology we can provide for everyone's needs, but instead of doing this we leave a large proportion of the world in poverty. It is a crazy situation when abundance is possible.

In any sane society such a situation would mean that all material needs could be provided for with far less time being spent at work by individual workers. However such a demand could not be met by the employers and the State. It could only be fulfilled by people who had a conscious desire to do so. To demand full employment is not enough. The only defence against unemployment is for workers to take over their industries and prove that they can be run to provide for the needs of the community rather than the enrichment of the management and the shareholders.

P.T.

LEEDS CONFERENCE

ARRANGEMENTS had been made for the conference to be held the first weekend in March. But because of the postal strike, comrades in Leeds are postponing the event until April.

If comrades can get in touch with the organisers with any pre-conference literature, money or suggestions for the conference, their addresses are:

Trevor Barage,
Flat 35, Richmond Road,
Leeds 6.
Martin Watkins,
Flat D, 90 Clarendon Road,
Leeds 2.
Phone: Leeds (0532) 59762

4-page leaflet

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE— THE POWER TO STRIKE

5/- per Hundred

Plus 1/- per hundred Postage
(4/6 on 500 and over)

50/- per thousand,
postage extra

from Freedom Bookshop

(facts and training) required to slot them into their proper places in the labour market; to make them into profitable producers, distributors and administrators for capitalism. And this applies as much to university training as any other kind of training or schooling. Money spent on university 'education' is seen by our rulers as an investment, a calculated return on capital. Thus, Lord Butler wrote recently of university students 'as the type of capital investment which will accrue with every year, and which has enormous value'. An even more blatant example of this is the close liaison between Warwick University and Big Business.

Warwick University's spectacular growth is due almost entirely to its links with Big-Business. Of the University, the *Sunday Times* (21.2.70) has the following to say: 'The relationship with business can be seen in the examination of the University's power structure. The ruling body is the council. It comprises a chairman, Sir Arnold Hall, chairman and managing director of the Hawker-Siddeley Group; treasurer, Mr. R. J. Kerr-Muir, a director of Courtaulds; eight members of the academic senate; two members of the academic advisory committee, and nine co-opted members. The members co-opted by the vice-chancellor are the most intriguing feature of the council's composition. One is the Bishop of Coventry, while the other eight are men in influential business positions. . . . With the aura of the boardroom pervading the University's hierarchy, industry has shown no reluctance in giving generous financial support. The academic staff lists a Pressed Steel Fisher Professor of Industrial Relations; a Barclays Bank Professor of Management Information Systems; Clarkson Professor of Marketing; an Institute of Directors Professor of Business Studies and a Volkswagen senior lecturer in politics (we're all democrats now!). Four distinguished outsiders from Imperial Chemical Industries, English Electric, the Motor Industry Research Association and the Building Research Station act as part-time professors in the engineering science department. . . .'

Traditionally, universities were for sons of the rich. This is no longer so. Many university students today come from the working class and so-called middle class ('white-collar' workers). They are then trained, as 'a calculated return on capital', for the labour market. Once employed in State or industry, they may command a higher salary than, say, a road sweeper or garbage collector (this is because of the much larger amount of capital invested in their training), but they will still be members of the working class—with working class problems. They will, together with their less 'fortunate' brothers, be running industry, and the State, for a ruling class, and not for society as a whole or for themselves.

Student revolts and demonstrations against conditions and methods of study, against university administration and discipline, for real education (drawing out rather than stuffing in), for the democratisation of university structures, etc., may infuriate reactionaries; but students have, or should have, every right—like any other workers—to protest about the way they are treated and trained as an investment for future exploitation and manipulation.

PETER E. NEWELL.

Books

Any book not in stock, but in print can be promptly supplied. Book Tokens accepted. Please add postage & cash with order helps.

PAMPHLETS

Letter to a Hindu	Lee Tolson	0.20
Benjamin Perot—Survivalist		
Radical America		0.37
G.M.W.U. Scab Union	Solidarity	0.82
Listen Marxist		0.12
An Appeal to the Young		
Peter Kropotkin		0.10
The General Strike	I.W.W.	0.10
About Anarchism	Nicolas Walter	0.12

PAPERBACKS

Sex in Society	Alex Comfort	0.17
Roads to Freedom	Bertrand Russell	0.00
Enquiry Concerning Political Justice (Abridged & Edited)		1.00
Risinghill	Leila Berg	0.30
The Incompatibles Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus		0.30
Birth of our Power	Victor Serge	0.35
Anarchism & Other Essays	Emma Goldman	1.25
The Biological Time-Bomb	G. Rattray Taylor	0.42
Memoirs of a Revolutionary	Victor Serge	0.60
Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist	Alex Berkman	1.00

Freedom Press

publish
FREEDOM weekly
and ANARCHY monthly

84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 01-247 9249
Entrance Angel Alley,
Whitechapel Art Gallery 84b,
Aldgate East Underground Sta.

SPECIMEN COPIES ON
REQUEST

Bookshop

Open Afternoons
Monday to Saturday
2 p.m. to 6 p.m.
Open Evenings
Wednesday 8 p.m. to 10.30 p.m.
Thursday close at 8.30 p.m.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, 1971

INLAND			
Freedom	12 months	£2.50	(£2 10s.)
	6 months	£1.25	(£1 5s.)
Anarchy	12 issues	£2.00	
	6 issues	£1.00	
Combined	12 months	£4.50	
	6 months	£2.25	
ABROAD (in \$ U.S.)			
Freedom	12 months	\$6.00	
	6 months	\$3.00	
Anarchy	12 issues	\$5.00	
	6 issues	\$3.00	
Combined	12 months	\$11.00	
	6 months	\$6.00	
AIRMAIL			
Freedom	12 months	\$10.00	
	6 months	\$5.00	
Anarchy	12 issues	\$10.00	
	6 issues	\$6.00	

Another 4-page leaflet.
Two articles from FREEDOM: *The relevance of Anarchism today* and *Anarchism and Nationalism*. Available from Freedom Bookshop for 5/- a hundred, plus 1/4d. postage.

WHETHER ONE IS prepared to admit

it or not, our universities and colleges of further education are basically institutions which exist to serve the interests of a ruling, capitalist, class. 'Education' is not what it was! Its aim is primarily to give the individual student the knowledge he or she needs in order to function in an industrialised society, to form the character-structure into the mould which is 'needed' by such a society—ambitious and competitive, co-operative within limits, respectful of authority, yet partly independent and resourceful, friendly yet not too deeply attached to anybody or anything in particular. Schools, colleges and universities provide students with knowledge they must have to fulfil their practical tasks in life, and with those character-traits needed on the personality market. In the main, they do not succeed in imbuing them with the faculty of independent thought. Compulsory education, however, has expanded somewhat slower than the needs of the capitalists, but expand to their needs it does!

The time has long passed when the employing, capitalist, class took any part in production itself. Today, employers hire specially-trained workers to administer the State and manage the businesses which, in the past, they did themselves. Indeed, modern industrial society is run from top to bottom by paid members of the working class (though many of them imagine they belong to 'the middle class'). Almost all jobs in the administration, planning, production, and distribution of wealth, are carried out by wage or salary workers.

At one time, the main task of the schools was merely religious indoctrination, and a kind of disciplining necessary to prepare children for hard work in mines, mills and factories. But with the development of science and its application to industry and production, employers began to demand better 'educated', that is better trained, workers. Capitalists expected more of schools than mere indoctrination; they wanted workers whom they could leave to get on with the job, whom they could trust, who understood what they were doing. Thinking became desirable, but only within very narrow limits. Many schools, even today, still merely 'push' facts into children.

REFORM

Surprisingly, considering it was the first great industrial nation, England was one of the last great nations to organise a system of national education. In 1823, George Birkbeck founded mechanics' institutes, and Lord Shaftesbury interested himself in founding night schools for the very poor of London. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which had been somnolent throughout the eighteenth century, stirred themselves, raised the standard of examinations and increased their numbers. But they still restricted their membership to Churchmen, and until 1871 the 39 articles of

Education— For What?

the Church of England were a condition for going to a university. Industry, therefore, was faced with the problem of turning these bastions of privilege into 'knowledge factories', and of driving out learning for its own sake. A new 'Red-brick' university was founded in London without religious tests, where the emphasis was on science and commerce rather than Latin and Greek.

The nine old public schools where rich men's sons fought, drank and bullied one another, took the lead from Dr. Arnold who was headmaster of Rugby during the 1830s, and changed their character. Arnold's influence spread to the county grammar schools, and was a powerful force moulding a whole generation of administrators (in the civil and colonial services) and managers. England, at that time, actually had quite a good system of secondary 'education'. Many of these grammar and secondary schools were endowed to teach 'the poor' *gratis*; but, in fact, 'the poor' who mainly benefited by them were not the labouring class, the real poor, but the not-so-poor, the so-called lower middle class, the sons of the small gentry, the yeoman farmers and the burghers.

In 1832, there were about 12,000 elementary schools in England. They had been founded by two private religious societies, the British and Foreign Schools Society (1804), which was Whig and Nonconformist, and the National Society for the Education of the Poor, which was Tory and Church of England. In 1833, the Government interested itself in the schooling of the poor by granting £20,000 a year to the two societies, and by establishing seven years later a Board of Education at Whitehall with inspectors to supervise the spending of grants.

By 1870, the State—which was now very much a capitalist institution—began to devote a great deal of attention to the schooling and training of the working population. And with the passing of the Elementary Education Act (the Forster Act of 1870), an attempt was made to set up a national system of education in England. Under the Act, School Boards were established in all places in which there was insufficient school accommodation, and where there were no Church schools. The Church of England, of course, was hostile to the Act. Partly because the State now needed far more Civil Servants who were at least schooled in the three Rs, 'education' became com-

pulsory up to twelve years of age.

In 1888, the Tories reformed Local Government by setting up elected County Councils (on a very restricted franchise) to replace nominated justices. They also went a long way towards abolishing payment by results, whereby grants from the State depended on individual examination in the elementary schools; and in 1891 elementary schooling generally became free of school fees. The School Boards were also allowed some latitude in providing some education of a higher type. Moreover, after 1889, there was a steady, though not spectacular, growth in technical education. The Education Act of 1902 increased the possibility of schooling beyond the three Rs and a little undenominational religion for children of the working class. And some of the more 'intelligent' children went on to trade schools until they were sixteen, but most left at fourteen. The Fisher Education Act officially raised the school-leaving age to fifteen, but few local authorities raised it to that age. That became universal much later—in 1948. The 1944 Act gave some sort of secondary education to all children, though some of its sections (40 children maximum to a class in primary school classes and 30 in secondary) have yet to be implemented.

Speaking very broadly, then, a three- to four-fold system evolved in the English educational system; and with the present arguments on comprehensive and/or grammar school education, is still evolving. A form of elementary schooling, plus possibly some technical training, was considered suitable for turning out factory workers; secondary or grammar, plus university for the 'bright' (aspiring salesmen, administrators, managers, teachers, and the like); and, of course, the public and fee-paying private schools (with or without Oxbridge) exclusively for the sons and daughters of the rich, ruling, class—teaching, training and conditioning them to be the rulers of the future. Such was, and in many ways still is, the pattern.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT

Unfortunately, most of the arguments about 'education' today have very little to do with education in the real sense of the word (*e-ducere*, to draw out that which is within). They are mainly concerned with the most efficient and economic ways of 'stuffing in', of providing children with a certain kind of knowledge

SINCE GOVERNMENTS assume the right of death over peoples it is not astonishing that sometimes people assume the right of death over governments.

Wednesday evenings

Meetings in Freedom Press every week at 8. Please advise if you can give a talk or arrange some other activity. Scheduled at present:

- February 24: Sebastian Scragg—'Towards the Abolition of Money'.
- March 3: Tomasina—'William Reich'.
- March 10: S. E. Parker—'In Defence of Anarchism'.
- March 17: SOCIAL (bring your own grog and food)
- March 24: Bill Dwyer—'A Libertarian Case for LSD'.
- March 31: Arthur Uloth—'The Urban Crusade'.
- April 14: Tomasina—'Montessori'.
- April 21: Peter Neville—'The Reference Group of the Anarchist Revolutionary—1971'.

Gunner Robert Curtis . . .

. . . having been killed in the Belfast riots, is now being represented in our popular press as a national hero. The *News of the World* proclaims that he died in 'a noble and just cause'. The other papers dwell on sorrowful interviews with his next of kin. The three civilians killed at this same time rate no such prominence: in fact two of them were killed by soldiers. Ironically, the Army refers to the soldier's killers as 'gunmen'.

The situation in the North of Ireland is largely one of the Government's own making—bedevilled by religious differences that were systematically nurtured and exploited in the past on the principle 'Divide and Conquer'. The death of the Government's 'gunman' may be a personal tragedy to his relatives—as indeed must be the deaths of civilians to their relatives—but the cause was neither noble nor just. It may seem a tragedy that a young man should die but soldiers are employed to bring terror and death to those singled out by the Government.

The underlying cause for the disturbances in the North of Ireland are economic depression, bigotry promoted in the past by the establishment, and a desperate resolve to change the present order. Indeed, people like Ian Paisley owe

THIS WORLD

much of their popularity to their 'gut' appeal to the underprivileged—who are as numerous amongst Protestants as with the Catholics. And both sides are involved in the disturbances with police and military. The problem is complex but the Government solution is absurdly simple—brute repression. The simple-minded British taxpayer is astonished that this solution is not working!

'The Suffering Majority'

'For years ten million trade unionists have often and suddenly made the lives of the other forty million of us miserable, difficult and sometimes dangerous.' So commences an expensive advertisement inserted in the daily papers last week and sponsored by The Citizens' Union headed by The Dowager Lady Birdwood who last made the news with her efforts to stop us from seeing *Oh! Calcutta!* and is generally renowned for her moralistic efforts to supervise our sex lives.

For years bludgers and parasites like Lady Birdwood had enjoyed an unimpaired idyll at the expense of those who have now got themselves sufficiently well organised to do something about improving their lot. When trade unions rebel—and striking is just this—against present conditions they are taking the only possible step to alter the status quo.

The Citizens' Union is unlikely to get off the ground as the Government and daily press are already doing the work of attempting to discredit the trade unions and rallying the people against them. It is part of the establishment and its efforts are directed to prod the Government into more repressive laws under the phoney slogan of the public interest. With complete justification the Trades Union Congress has described such efforts, centred as they are in the Industrial Relations Bill, as a directive to the workers—'Shut up and keep working'.

Teach-in on Drugs Bill

With another commode I attended the above in the London School of Economics last week. Most of the under-

ground organisations (Release, Agitprop, Advice, RAP, Beat, Street Aid) and the more conservative Civil Liberties Council were represented. There was a time when the teach-in was an occasion of conflicting viewpoints with reasoned discussion. Those on Vietnam, for example, had Government Ministers present to give their views and if these honourable gentlemen were eventually overwhelmed with derisive jeers at least they had the opportunity to express their view and, in turn, the audience had the chance to hear their 'leaders' at first hand—if nothing else the poverty-stricken argumentation and immoral position of the politicians were exposed.

Unfortunately, the LSE teach-in comprised only critics of the present Bill and the audience was already converted—from the number who openly rolled 'joints' there I would say there were quite a few potential victims of the law included. The principle of interfering with a man's personal life is odious quite apart from the fact that the campaign against illegal drugs is based on both hypocrisy and ignorance. Hypocrisy, for such is the role of the whisky-swilling politician who is responsible for the imprisonment of those who have different tastes from his in their cultural drugs; ignorance since substances such as cannabis are described as harmful and addictive when the medical evidence and experience of millions is the very opposite.

To give the organisers their due, they had invited the Home Office to send a spokesman. The authorities, on this subject at least, are content to act from a purely moralistic and dictatorial position, feeling no obligation to consult or discuss the matter with their critics. And they can rely on their hired intellectuals

to produce their brains as a shield and savage campaign (which in practice involves humiliating searches in the public street, having one's residence burst into by 'paps' and draconian prison sentences such as that the other day when the importer of a quantity of cannabis was sent to gaol for six years) that has all the marks of a police state measure.

Recently, Dr. Alexander Guthrie, Medical Officer of Health for Reading, delivered a public address against the hallucinogenic drug, LSD. As the third issue of 'Anarchy' this year is dealing with this subject it was considered a good idea to invite opinions from advocates and opponents and, accordingly, I wrote to Dr. Guthrie inviting him to write an article with the understanding nothing would be cut from it. At the conclusion of some correspondence with the doctor he finally told me that he did not have sufficient knowledge of the subject to write an article.

The debate in the Houses of Parliament revealed the same ignorance and fanaticism. Lord Hankey described cannabis as 'a disastrous drug' whose 'misuse led to extraordinary illnesses'. 'People,' he continued, 'who consumed too much of it went berserk.' Apart from a total lack of evidence for these statements, they also seem shockingly true—too much of, or the misuse of, anything presumably is undesirable.

Of interest to the social observer is the determination of heads (as those in the psychiatric culture are sometimes known) to defy the law—indeed, as Dr. Birdwood, the speaker at the teach-in from APA, indicated, the more severe the law, the greater the determination to defy it and the closer the bonds of mutual aid and community between the oppressed. Of particular interest to the anarchist is the growth of a mass sub-culture which disputes establishment values including violence and materialism. This sub-culture is often baffling to the traditional anarchist who finds the hedonism of the new movement disturbingly irrelevant of revolutionary participation. Perhaps it is in this field we

have, up to now, missed our greatest opportunity in modern times.

Living through a revolution
Tony Gibson, writer, academic, psychologist, started the new series of Wednesday meetings at FREEDOM with a provocative talk titled as above.

The revolution in question is his own. But the changes that have occurred over the years are all part of the story. In 1948 he wrote a pamphlet 'Youth for Freedom' with the theme—take the world into your own hands and make your own society. Much of the point of this, he said, has been superseded by the social changes that have since developed and modern youth often does not need this enlightenment.

The key point remains that the revolution is here and now—'you are the city' or any sort of utopianism is to be achieved as fate. Anarchism itself, the speaker maintained, has somehow percolated to the consciousness of people and is no longer an unknown. When he first became an anarchist one could count the number of anarchists in Britain on the fingers of two hands. Today the movement has much wider ramifications even if there is a large contingent of fellow-travellers who have a very basic acquaintance with anarchist thinking or principle.

Anarchism is not to be seen as part of the Left-Right dichotomy and indeed one of its contributions to social thought is the refusal to be involved in narrow political class thinking. Accordingly it is not concerned with partisan politics of any kind including the sacred scriptures of Karl Marx. Anarchism, the speaker maintained, studies power.

Who, then, are the anarchists? Gibson, partly in jest I suspect, gave the simple answer—'Criminals'. But he went on to elaborate that anarchists were those who consciously felt the world around them cramped their aspirations. And it was in this field of thought that the individualists had made a substantial contribution to the movement at least in terms of sophisticated thinking. Self-emancipation is the real revolution—an enlightened self-interest is the prime motivation.

A vigorous discussion followed the talk in which it transpired that the speaker's individualism (leading individualist S. E. Parker was holding a watching brief) was not the authoritarian version while others thought he did not have a sufficient social conscience. On this score Gibson pointed out that self-interest and social conscience were not mutually exclusive.

Bill Dwyer

Social Left

PAMPHLET REVIEW

JEAN-PAUL SARTRE ON FRANCE 1964. Published by Liberation Press, 25-26 White Street, London, E.C.4.

DESPITE THE RECENT TV serialisation of his trilogy, *Roads to Freedom*, Jean-Paul Sartre has not been exactly well known in Britain—having been thought of as a rather 'difficult' and esoteric writer. Once, one has heard Sartre spoken of in the same terms as Albert Camus—dismissed as a mystic indulging in wordy metaphysics.

The student/worker uprising of May 1968 gave the West a fleeting vision of a new society . . . and appears to have brought out a 'new' Sartre. The Sartre who appears in this pamphlet is far from 'mystic'.

The pamphlet is an English translation of an interview with Sartre which originally appeared in the German news magazine *Der Spiegel*.

The sharply written introduction states, 'The May Revolution is of interest to us because it marked a specific/actual break from the "vanguard" theory of revolution. The vanguard was caught running backwards. In its place were the dominant themes of the new sensibility: individualism, spontaneity, mutual trust and generosity.'

Sartre is asked whether the Left 'failed' in May '68. He replies . . . 'That depends what you mean by the "left". If you are talking of parties, formation men who represent the "political" left, then the answer is yes. But there is another left, which I shall call "social", and was to be seen, during the month of May, in the strike-factories, demonstrations and occupied faculties. They, on the contrary, did not fail in their task. They went as far as they could, and were finally betrayed only because their own "representatives" betrayed them.'

Further, asked how come De Gaulle had been returned to power so soon after the events of May, Sartre comments . . . 'Workers or members of the middle class can only take up radical positions through action. If you make the mistake—or are clever enough—to reduce their movement to a choice between similar politicians, you can bring them to condemn in the polling station what they have just done in the streets.'

Sartre, in the past, while having reservations about the Communist Party, believed it to represent the working class. Now? 'I even came across this extraordinary sentence on a Communist poster: Vote for the CP which has done this . . . which has done that . . . and "has prevented civil war".'

'I think that the CP has maintained an attitude, throughout this crisis, which

was in no way revolutionary, and, moreover, not even reformist. The CP and the CGT came to an agreement to reduce the demands of the workers to a simple "wage claim"—which was certainly justifiable as such—and made them abandon their demands with regard to changes in the overall structure. As soon as De Gaulle mentioned elections they were soon falling into step with him.'

Sartre is not an anarchist, although he mentions the anarchist tradition in France. His interview is a clear and interesting view of the events of May '68. Why not buy the pamphlet and ram it in the hands of your friendly neighbourhood Stalinist?

IAN S. SUTHERLAND.

'To be governed is to be watched over, inspected, spied upon, directed, legislated at, regulated, docketed, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, assessed, weighed, censored, ordered about, by men who have neither the right nor the knowledge nor the virtue. To be governed means to be, at each operation, at each transaction, at each movement, noted, registered, controlled, taxed, stamped, measured, valued, assessed, patented, licensed, authorised, endorsed, admonished, hampered, reformed, rebuked, arrested. It is to be, on the pretext of the general interest, taxed, drilled, held to ransom, exploited, monopolised, extorted, squeezed, hoaxed, robbed; then, at the least resistance, at the first word of complaint, to be repressed, fined, abused, annoyed, followed, bullied, beaten, disarmed, garrotted, imprisoned, machine-gunned, judged, condemned, deported, flayed, sold, betrayed, and finally mocked, ridiculed, insulted, dishonoured. Such is government, such is justice, such is morality.'

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.

THESE DAYS IN IRELAND

THINGS GO TO WORSE from bad over here. In the Dail the Bill of 'Forcible Entry' has passed its second reading and will almost certainly become law. This Bill makes not only squatting a crime for which the gardai have the power of arrest without warrant, but if anyone is even known to associate with a squatter they too may be arrested. For example, if Mrs. X's baby was taken ill one night and the doctor was not available and I went over to use my skills, I too could be carted off to three years in prison. The sacred cow of private property MUST be defended at all costs on both sides of the border come what may. To turn the gardai into crowbar boys to serve this corrupt Government seems the most indecent act even this corrupt Government has committed.

The enquiry into the funds for relief in the six counties goes on and each day it becomes more crystal clear that Gibbons DID buy arms for the six counties with this money, and the wretched Captain Kelly is the scapegoat. It was Gibbons who remarked during the farcical arms trial that lies and perjury were two quite different things.

After having accepted Captain Kelly's book *Orders From the Captain*, Collins backed out on the excuse that they had committed their solicitor who had said it contained libellous passages. It is far more probable they backed down against publication on direct orders from the Government at the Taoiseach's behest. The next move was for the Dail to order Captain Kelly to hand over the MSS to them. If he did so they could have published just what they liked of it and sold these extracts for their own profit. Captain Kelly has very properly refused, though it is possible he may be sent to prison for contempt of court for so refusing.

In the six counties Frank McManus is serving a ten-month gaol sentence for exactly the same 'crime' for which the other MP, John McQuaid, was arrested, namely taking part in an illegal march. The difference is that McQuaid, being a Unionist, got off with a small fine, while Frank, being an Opposition MP, goes to prison.

The second the ban on parades was

lifted Paisley and Co. held very provocative ones, burning effigies of Lundy where their Catholic neighbours could see. These were not provoked. There were two outbreaks of fierce rioting, the first in the Catholic Ballymurphy district of Belfast. After this one, Roy Bradford, MP, said it was entirely a Catholic affair. The words were hardly out of his mouth when the Shankill Protestants rioted. Presumably a purely Protestant affair? This time he held his peace and made no comment. The common enemy in each case was the hated British troops.

If only the people of the six counties could forget their religious differences and combine to fight their common enemy, the rich, greedy landowner and speculator, determined to hold on to his privileges to the last, something might be accomplished. Those in power know this, so do all they can to foster religious hatred and distrust. Lord Carrington and Mr. Sharples came over from England. Their solution to the problem was to say they are introducing a new weapon for riot control, a secret weapon more fierce than CS gas or rubber bullets.

A very real tragedy in the six counties is that not only are the privileged class fostering hatred, but alas, the IRA are at the same game. They go round the pubs and threaten and cajole people to go out and riot. Some children have been taken by the snatch squads from the crowds and left from their families and put first in prison and then transferred to some sort of reformatory. The people both fear the IRA and in their despair consider them their only saviours. It is obvious that the amazing foolishness of the IRA only hardens the Unionists and lends power to men like Craig and Paisley who are yelling for the recall of the B-Specials and the re-arming of the police. To blow up isolated customs posts, to rob shops and banks and booty-trap cars and so on has failed in the past and will fail again. United solidarity by all the underprivileged is the only hope for Ireland either side of the border. Until that day dawns we will continue to suffer.

H.

Contact

Contact Column is for making contact. Use is free, but donations towards operating costs are welcome.

Urgent. Several new families have moved into Burrell House and urgently need electric cookers and beds and mattresses. Would anyone able to help with these—or any other pieces of furniture—please contact us via Freedom Press, phone 247 5249—or direct. The Tenants of Burrell House, The Highway, Sepoy, E.14. Somerset cottage available for one year in return for repairs and gardening. Own transport essential. Ring Peggy King c/o Freedom or write to Box No. 001.

Room or flat wanted in London for young woman Anarchist from Scotland with young child and another baby due. Due to take up voluntary social work. Douglas Kepper, 23 Sutton Court Road, London, W.4.

1971 World Anarchist Congress, August 1 to 4 in France—exact place will be notified. Contact CRIFA, 132 Rue de Paris, 94—Charenton, France.

Meetings at Freedom: Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. For details see 'This World' column.

Socialist Medical Association. A Day Seminar on the 'Social Causes and Consequences of Addiction'—to Drugs—to Alcohol—to Smoking—to Gambling on Sunday, March 28, 1971, at the NUFTO Hall, 14 Jockey Fields, London, W.C.1 (off Theobalds Road), Holborn. Two sessions: morning 10 a.m. to 12.45 p.m.; afternoon 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Fees: 5/- per session, 10/- per day, per person. Send to 54 Finchley Court, London, N3 1NH.

George Foulser, now squatting at No. 090123, HM Prison, Jebb Avenue, Brixton, S.W.2. Letters, books welcome.

Urgent. Help find and dispatch Freedom every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.