

THE POSTAL STRIKE is over.

The workers have taken a hiding. They have been literally forced back to work. The sellout is now complete. The Government has won. And the Union of Post Office Workers has not even had a guarantee that its members will get the 8 per cent offered by the Post Office when the strike first began on January 20. In the words of one angry Postman, 'It has been seven wasted weeks. Why?'

The Union claimed an across-the-board increase of 15 per cent, plus a demand for a reduction in the incremental scale which would have given many of the younger workers an increase of around 19 per cent. The Post Office said that it could not offer more than 8 per cent. Later, it increased its offer to 9 per cent if the Union withdrew its opposition to the use of part-timers and additional Postwomen. The Union could not agree; nor would it go to arbitration. Its executive had already called all the 205,000 members out on an indefinite, do-or-die, strike—without a strike fund and less than £350,000 in the bank!

Two weeks ago, the Union lowered its 15 per cent demand by 2 per cent and did not press for any reductions in the incremental scales. On March 4, after Mr. Jackson and his negotiating team had been with Mr. William Ryland and the Post Office Board for 14 hours, a settlement was reached. Both sides have accepted a three-man Court of Inquiry which will investigate the circumstances of the dispute, the finances of the Post Office, its present and future utilisation of manpower and make recommendations for the settlement of the dispute—which both sides will have to accept. In practical terms, this will mean that the Union will have to accept an offer of as little as 8 per cent in wages and the use of part-timers, and the re-introduction of the Household Delivery Service and unaddressed circulars.

'LIONS LED BY RATS' SEVEN WASTED WEEKS

The recommendation that the 'agreement' be accepted and that the workers return to work was agreed unanimously by all 31 members of the UPW executive. Previously, the executive had voted 27-4 in favour of Mr. Jackson's so-called peace initiative. The only members of the executive who voted against the sell-out were the four rank-and-file Postmen. All the Communists voted for a return to work. Indeed, loud-mouthed, bullyboy Comrat assistant secretary, Mr. J. R. Lawlor, had already prepared UPW members for a betrayal when he said in a speech at a rally in Glasgow as long ago as February 23, that the Union would continue its fight for better conditions after the return to work. I have no pleasure in reminding readers that I said in this paper ('Don't Knock The Postmen', 30.1.71) that such people as Lawlor would most likely 'shop' the postal workers. I also pointed out that Tom Jackson and the other 'leaders' of the UPW were very popular with the membership at the time, and that this was only to be expected; but I warned that Post Office workers should be wary of them all the same, as history has always shown that leaders can never be trusted—and UPW leaders were no exception.

THE OTHER UNIONS

I also said that other Post Office workers, in the other Unions, and workers in transport and on the railways must support the UPW. Did they? Like hell they did!

The Post Office Engineering Union

has, at the present time, a similar claim in the pipeline. The outcome of the UPW's struggle, therefore, should have been of paramount importance to its members. Did the POEU call its members out? Did it instruct its members to refuse to service or repair Post Office telephones? Did it even substantially help the UPW with financial contributions? No, it did not! Individual POEU members and branches assisted their UPW colleagues. Many engineers refused to service equipment, and others gave money to the UPW Defence Fund. On a number of occasions, some thousands of POEU members took as much as four hours off from duty and marched behind their Union banners into Hyde Park and elsewhere. And at one such rally, Tom Jackson said that it was like the relief of Mafeking. Officially, however, all the POEU did was to contribute the measly sum of £10,000 to the Defence Fund and give the UPW an interest-free loan of another £20,000. Rather belatedly, the *Morning Star* wrote on March 5: 'The Post Office engineers should come out in sympathy at once. Had they done so earlier, the strike could by now have been won.' You can say that again!

And what of the National Union of Railwaymen, who also have a 25 per cent claim on the table? What did they do to help the postal workers? They gave the UPW £5,000 and loaned them £100,000. And that was all the solidarity the UPW got from the NUR. Throughout the

strike the railwaymen were handling parcels and letters usually sent through the mail. As for the locomotives, all they could bring themselves to doing was to give the UPW Defence Fund £500! Hugh Scanlon's AEF managed £5,000 and a loan of £50,000, and Jack Jones' TGWU gave nothing but managed a loan of £50,000. So much for the paper tigers of the TUC.

But the first prize for backstabbing must surely go to the secessionist Telecommunications Staff Association (formerly the National Guild of Telephonists). On the very day that Tom Jackson threw in the towel this scab outfit issued the following statement:

'Any post strike settlement between the UPW and the Post Office Board affecting Telephonists would not be "morally" or democratically acceptable to the Telecommunications Staff Association.'

It is a false premise to allow discussions of Telephonists' wages and working conditions without reference to the loyal body of workers who have, in accordance with their individual contracts of employment, maintained the telephone service during the postal strike.'

Just how far can they crawl?

THE UPW'S TACTICS

At the beginning of the strike I said postal workers should have used different tactics. I am even more convinced now. They had—and still have—considerable sympathy from 'the public'. By voluntarily manning the counters to pay

out Old Age Pensions, by answering emergency calls and by delivering Blood Donors' cards and the like, they were rightly praised. But as Peter Jenkins wrote in the *Guardian*:

'You don't go on strike without the necessary financial resources and you certainly don't take on the Government with an empty strike fund. Put not your trust in the TUC or the brotherly love of your fellow Trade Unionists.' (4.3.71.)

Had the postal workers concerned themselves less with 'the public', had they banned overtime, worked-to-rule, staged one-day strikes and walk-outs at different times in different parts of the country and engaged generally in guerilla warfare with the Post Office and its Big Business customers of large-scale, and mainly cheap, items they might have won. In fairness to Tom Jackson, it should be pointed out that he, too, was in favour of such tactics rather than an all-out strike advocated by the Communists and others. Once on strike, however, had they had active support from other Post Office Unions and the transport and railway workers, they might have also won. As it was, the UPW got more practical support from Continental postal workers than they did from most British unions. Indeed, during the strike French Post Office workers staged a three-day strike of their own; all-in-all 300,000 came out!

After the 1926 General Strike, it was said of the workers that they had been 'lions led by rats'. Forty-five years later UPW members can well understand what was meant by that phrase. However, the postal workers' struggle must continue—but the tactics will have to change. Non-co-operation with the management will do for a start. . . .

RANK-AND-FILE
TRADE UNIONIST.

SEX AT 16, WRONG by Moralistic Medicine Man

'If she had come to him in the first place, he said he would have talked her out of it, and by the time he had finished talking to her there would have been no need for her to have any contraceptive.'

'Enough time should be taken to convince these people that it was not God's Will for them to have intercourse before marriage.'

THERE'S THE CRUX of it. It's 'these people' being made to live by God's Will—that's the real issue behind the case of the doctor who betrayed his patient's confidence. No doubt he saw the fact that one of 'these people' was a minor of only sixteen as a heaven-sent opportunity to interfere with full support from the old fogies. And how right he was.

Dr. Robert Browne, aged 63 or 64, according to which paper you read, of Pershore Road, Stirchley, Birmingham, took it upon himself to inform the parents of a 'mature girl of 16' that she was on the Pill. She had been having intercourse with her boy-friend for several months, using sheaths, which she described as 'unsatisfactory' when she went along to the Brook Advisory Centre (set up specifically to advise young people on contraception). She said she wanted a more reliable means of birth control.

At 16, this girl showed herself to be socially responsible and sexually positive. Both attitudes disturb the moralistic bourgeois, and the Doctor, who clearly sees himself as fulfilling the role played by the priest in even more ignorant times—the role of purveying moral and ethical guidance as well as succour for the sick—put his grimy little moralistic mind to work to frustrate her, by betraying her confidence to her parents. Something, incidentally and to be fair, which a real priest would never do.

'Morals and truth, medicine and fact,' said Dr. Browne, 'are all intertwined. It is difficult to separate them.' What a glimpse this gives us of the cloudy muck and confusion which must fill his head, as he sits up there on Cloud 9 contemplating with satisfaction his medical work as an expression of God's Will. Doesn't he ever ask himself whether curing 'these people' of a God-given sickness might not be interfering with God's Will? Why does God give us cancer and kwashiorkor, pox, plague, pestilence, famine and flood if they are not his mysterious ways, his wonders to perform? If war, as the General said, is Nature's pruning knife, might not disease be God's pruning knife? It is after all, the medical profession's interference with God's Will which is keeping us all alive longer, and thus creating the population explosion. What is wrong with interfer-

ing a bit more to balance this by controlling the birth rate?

Ah-ha! This is where morality comes in. Sex!

Asked whether he could keep a secret, Dr. Browne replied, 'I was in the Armed Forces—I can keep secrets.'

And so we can suppose that he had no morality about war, the killing and the deception. It is only about sex that he has this morality which overrides professional integrity. Typical!

During the course of the BMC proceedings, Dr. Browne shifted his ground. He started off with the 'God's Will' bit, but ended up on 'the well-being of his patient'. But surely a moment's clear thought, if he is capable of it, would have told him that it was to his patient's well-being that she should be on the Pill if she was making love? But his mind is so gunged up with 'God's Will' that he is not capable of clear thought—certainly not on behalf of a sixteen-year-old. It was precisely the making love that he objected to.

Making love is beautiful at any age (someone should tell him!) but before marriage it's not God's Will. So much the worse for God's Will then!

To their credit, the parents seemed reasonable. Father, given the terrible news that his daughter was on the Pill,

did not fall back with a heart attack, but said, 'Can I discuss this with her mother?'; Mother said, 'Thank God she had enough sense to protect herself!'; Mother and Doctor, it seems, should get together about God's Will!

The Brook Advisory Centres, who brought the case against Dr. Browne (that he had betrayed the confidence of his patient by revealing to her parents something which had been revealed to him on the supposition of complete confidence) have only relatively recently been set up to provide a very necessary service for young people. They have up till now taken the responsible attitude that a girl's own family doctor should be informed about her going on the Pill, since there are medical reasons why this information should be on her medical record. There are, after all, what are called 'contraindications' which make the Pill inadvisable—for medical reasons, not moral.

It is to be hoped that the Brook Centres will find a way around the dilemma presented by this case, and that young girls will not be deterred from seeking the advice so vital for their secure happiness.

Meanwhile, Dr. Browne and all like him must be boycotted (at least). Somehow he must be made to feel the cruel and bumptious arse that he is.

JUSTIN.

Another 4-page leaflet. Two articles from FREEDOM: *The relevance of Anarchism today* and *Anarchism and Nationalism*. Available from Freedom Bookshop for 30p a hundred including postage.

HERE WE ARE AGAIN!

WE HOPE you have missed us, but you should receive two January issues, one double number for February, and this issue all in succession. We held them over during the postal strike. We did not publish ALL issues but they will be made up by the end of the year to your forty subscription issues. This issue is Nos. 6 and 7 (librarians and others please note) whereas you'll see that No. 5 is the double number, but that's just one of those things.

We have sustained some financial loss owing to the strike, not as much as the postmen suffered or as the Post Office would have us believe they lost. Because of the strike we have not had much for the Press Fund, let this bumper bundle of 'Freedom's' remind you that we need money.

ART IN REVOLUTION

A MAN IS only free in a revolutionary situation. In that hour when death takes to the streets and when the only right is the right to survive the master and the slave are free men. All morality, all principles, are exposed in their legislated falseness and existential man knows that his own physical survival can only be guaranteed if he accepts a self-imposed responsibility for his fellow man. Not through some State or Church edict but through the most basic of animal values, self-interest.

That the transition from the evils of our present societies to a planned community of free and contented men living their own lives within the cocoon of mutual aid should come into being without bloodshed or violence is devoutly to be wished. But there must always be that acting out of the permanent revolution for every change in our way of life demands a new and fresh approach to the manner and the methods by which we live out our daily lives and the enemy is always within our own ranks ready to feed off our cowardice or our indifference, always on

ROUND THE GALLERIES

hand to rationalise his own self-interest into a claim of the greater good. Every revolution dies the moment it succeeds for it is the revolutionary act that is the single, clean and unifying flame for the revolutionary vanguard can only clear the path for the time-servers and the very forces that the revolution seeks to overthrow. It is because of this that the anarchists must always be the voice of vigilant protest and their constructive actions never dictated by material rewards of peace or power.

The Arts Council of Great Britain and the Russian Ministry of Culture rightly named the exhibition at the Hayward Gallery as *Art in Revolution* for no one ever painted a painting at a

barricade or on the picket line or penned the *major opus* crouching in a ditch. For the artist there is a unique and heady freedom when revolution is lord of the streets for in that hour when men and women fight out the dictates of yesterday's editorials and sign it with their lives the artist is a free man. Long live the poster and the polemical play but the very audience that they play to are corrupt by the very nature of their presence, for the man or woman scurrying like beasts across the bullet-gleaning fields or measuring their material world and their cosmic vision within the broken walls of a burning building have no place for the chairborne battle.

The engaged worker and peasants will have little understanding of the theological disputations of the dialectic or the political philosophy of the middle-class manifesto that caused so many a tight and angry lip in the university debating clubs for until these people take to the battled streets all is but intellectual dross. The artist and the intellectual can never be free until the peasants and the workers decide to throw off their own social and economic chains but, little comrade, the worker and the peasant will not lightly barter their fragile claim on life to prove an academic thesis.

The Hayward Gallery was well chosen for the Russian Government sponsored *Art in Revolution*, for this bleak prison-type building squatting on the wrong side of Waterloo Bridge can only be a black joke to all those artists and intellectuals that successive Russian Governments have imprisoned or murdered for trying to put into practice that intellectual freedom that was one of the fundamental backroom points of the 1917 Revolution.

On the grey and sterile concrete walls of the Hayward Gallery, Mayakovsky and the Stenberg brothers' posters offer an idealistic window into the past and

one can still sense the excitement that the artistic freedom of the day gave to the makers of these expressionist, journalistic, collage propaganda visual news-sheets and, of the 3,000 listed in *Sovetskii Plakat*, the exhibition offers an honest sample of the work of the time.

It is the huge model of Vladimir Tatlin's *Monument to the Third International* that dominates the exhibition and, to quote from the catalogue, 'Tatlin's Tower was the initial symbolic crystallisation of a Constructivist aesthetic which on subsequent occasions would occur as the direct expression of a utilitarian rationale' which in the language of that common man means that the artists and builders of that short-lived revolutionary period were attempting to put into practice the lessons of Fry and of Morris of truth to material and art not as a decoration but as a functional and inseparable part of our living and it was left to the Bauhaus, once the exciting and worthwhile experimental period was finished, to turn it into a rationalisation of all that was ugly and brutal and its final and inevitable end was to become a short-arm aid to industrial mass production where beauty in relation to the curve was jettisoned for the easily manufactured straight line.

It was, I believe, fortunate for Tatlin that the mechanical Pisa 'homage to Eiffel' was never built, for Tatlin's huge girdered staggered building of revolving floors was meant, from the very beginning, to house the elite committee men of the new Russian Government and like Eiffel's Tower it would have become no more than a boring object of the tourist's cameras.

At the beginning of the 15th century Leonardo exhorted Ludovico Sforza, the ruler of Milan, to replan his city to a design of Leonardo's. Leonardo's Milan-of-the-Ten Cities, like Tatlin's Tower, was never built so we are left not with another medieval city that would have been despoiled by every generation of speculator, but with plans to dream over and the idle thought of an idle hour that once there were fabled cities like unto Camelot, Atlantis and of Troy and an age when dreams were realities. Beauty is eternal and the functional only valid as long as the mechanic's tools do not change.

I would give every block of office buildings in London to the Americans to be allowed to keep the Titian and Velazquez paintings soon to be hawked

off by the Tory Party to any international dealer who wants to profit from them and I would willingly tear down the Eiffel Tower and use its iron girders to prop up the decaying glory of Venice rather than it should be sacrificed to the rising sea and in doing so know that the restaurant at the top of the Eiffel Tower was well lost that the human race might save part of its greatness.

John Berger in his *Art and Revolution* asks 'What can Tatlin's Monument to the Third International mean to a peasant with a wooden plough? The majority of the Soviet population were peasants at an extremely low cultural level. Yet what does the existence of the Third International—quite regardless of any monument—mean to such a peasant? There is a tendency to expect the artist to solve—as by magic—problems whose solution depends upon there being more factories, school-teachers, roadmakers, radio engineers, etc.' and rightly concludes that 'if Gabo's radio station had been built, Tatlin's monument would have made sense more quickly'. They are games, little comrade. Games that the artist and the intellectual play to a small self-admiring audience while millions of men and women fight out the issue of the day unconscious of the latest polemical play filling the city's theatres.

Within the Hayward Gallery much is made of two lines from Vladimir Mayakovsky's *An Order to the Art Army*. The Hayward highlight two lines from this 1918 poem, by a man hounded to his death, and they cry from the walls of the Hayward, 'The streets our brushes / the squares our palettes'. What is missing from the walls of the Hayward is Mayakovsky's concluding lines, 'Futurists, dreamers, poets, / come out into the street'. It is all within the Hayward Gallery except the police records of the imprisoned and the dead. There is

Meyerhold's plans for his theatre, his sets and stills from his most successful plays but no mention of Meyerhold's spirited defence when forced to stand before a public drumhead courts martial of producers presided over by Vyshinsky, or of Meyerhold's arrest the following day and his reported death in prison.

All this is pure gallows humour and the black jest for the Town within the Hayward Gallery is the room containing the abstracts of Lissitzky and Malevich sealed off from the public by request of the Russian Government. On the press day I stood and watched the workmen sealing off Room AD from the public gaze and was amused. As long as we know that this stupid act has taken place and as long as we can find reproductions of the works of these artists within any competent public library then let the Russian Government wipe their collective arses on the originals and let our various culture councils pull the chain for them.

What really should have the Town and his broad kicking their heels in the air with sick laughter is the sight and sound of Richard Crossman, Bernard Levin and BBC's James Mossman dashing around their plush editorial offices crying liberty liberty at an enemy two? three? thousand miles away and question the silence that flooded the Town when the Tate Gallery performed a similar little scene at the time of the Gonzales exhibition and the Paris dealers threatened to withdraw their loaned castings unless alterations were made to the writing of the catalogue and, when this paper was the only sheet to cry 'murder', even the unfortunate victim rushed into print to deny the words publicly ascribed to him. Stalin may be wormbait but his values still survive and that is why anarchism must make its voice heard now and always. For Uncle Joe is still dealing a stacked deck even from the grave.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

An End to Power and Privilege

THE EMPLOYERS and members of the Government have again been busy deploring the 'political nature' of the one-day stoppages called against the Industrial Relations Bill. Mr. Bryan, junior Minister at the Department of Employment, referred to the one called on Monday as an arrogant attempt to hold Britain to ransom and to kick democracy in the teeth.

'Democracy' to these people means voting in a new set of political masters every five years, but whichever political master is elected, the economic masters remain the same. Everything might change at Westminster but the realities of the workplace do not alter whether

it is a Tory or Labour Government.

As trade unionists are being attacked for such action, it is worth examining how much democracy has been operated in the House of Commons. Only two days before Mr. Bryan made his verbal attack, his Government's guillotine fell on the committee stage of the Bill. So far only 125 hours have been spent on explaining and discussing the clauses contained in the legislature and this has meant that of the 150 clauses in all, 109 have not been debated. It is true that there are another six days allotted under the Government's timetable for the report stage and third reading in the Commons, but most of this time will be

given over to debating the Government's amendments to the Bill.

So much for 'democracy'! Having been elected, the Tories, like all governments, presume that they have some divine right to rule. When they see people taking industrial action against them they are appalled. To them it is not really playing the game. But as Justin pointed out in last week's *FREEDOM*, 'every government fears industrial action.'

The employers, for their part, have decided not to prosecute the executive of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers. Mr. Jukes, of the Engineering Employers' Federation, said it would not suit everybody to make 'martyrs out of them'. He said the 'EEF does not wish to turn this into a battle between employer and employee. These strikes are against the Government and we do not want to get into this battle ourselves. The logical consequences of taking action would be to put union leaders in prison, if they ignored the injunctions—and this is no time for provocation. The strikes are illegal, political strikes, to which we take the strongest exception. But you do not take a sledge-hammer to crack the nut of two one-day strikes'.

UNLAWFUL ONE-DAY STRIKES

From this it is plain that even without the Bill industrial action is already hedged in by legal sanctions. Both Monday's action and that proposed for March 18 are unlawful because they are not in connection with a trade dispute. Mr. Jukes does not want to provoke the AUEW executive as they are still negotiating a new procedure agreement and prosecution would hardly make for easy agreement on this matter. On the whole, the employers would lose far more by prosecuting than they would gain. Let us face it, these strikes are but a nut and the use of the sledge-hammer would only harden attitudes and even win over many

who are at present against taking industrial action.

The moderate TUC leadership is showing just enough opposition to the Bill to keep things under control and so the action of the AUEW is an embarrassment. The vote against support was 21 to 4 and was taken by the General Council. That stalwart right-winger of the AUEW, John Boyd, moved the motion for support and was seconded by Len Edmundson. The other two were Dan McGarvey of the Boilermakers and Richard Briginshaw of NATSOPA.

Boyd is well known for a very conservative view and was only moving the resolution on orders, but McGarvey and Briginshaw both pose as 'left-wingers'. McGarvey was a member of the Cameron Inquiry which reported on the strikes at Horseferry Road and Barbican building sites. The recommendations of this Report not only meant that pickets on the Barbican lost their jobs, but also set out changes in union rule-books concerning the appointment of stewards.

Briginshaw has tried to expel members who disagree with him over the break-up of SOGAT and only a court injunction prevents these men from losing both their union tickets and their jobs. Really the rank and file trade unionists have little in common with even these 'left-wingers'. Mr. Scanlon and Mr. Jones are, it is true, proposing a far more militant attitude towards the Bill, but both of these men have been involved in productivity deals resulting in the loss of jobs. While welcoming their stand, they are however easily outnumbered on the TUC and a proposal that unions should be 'instructed' not to register under the planned new laws was rejected by 20 votes to 10.

A 'CONFRONTATION'

No doubt many unions can and will put up cases for registering but the effect will be to undermine a stand made by others. If the trade unions just refuse to co-operate the whole thing would fall. This would then lead to what the *Economist* calls a 'confrontation' in which 'only the Government can win; Britain could not remain a democracy if it did not. Mr. Heath and his Cabinet are far too sensible to want to smash the unions. On the contrary, the prime object of their policy—as it would have been the policy of Mr. Wilson, had he won the election—is to improve the quality of union leadership, and to give it the opportunity to discipline its own anarchistic elements. That is what the Industrial Relations Bill is all about. It is, no doubt, too much to hope that there will be enough courageous votes to halt the drift to that confrontation at the special congress of the TUC at Croydon on March 18. But it is high time that those men who profess to be the moderate majority on the TUC's General Council asked themselves what they can really achieve by taking on the Government'.

I do not think that we, as anarchists,

would disagree with this analysis of the policy behind the Bill. Certainly a Wilson government would not disagree with a more disciplinary approach by trade union leaders towards their members. Many of these leaders would welcome the chance to come the heavy hand.

A DISCIPLINED WORKING

CLASS Industry wants a disciplined working class that carries out agreements made behind their backs in which they have had no say. This 'moderate majority' wants no confrontation for it realises that it could not take on the Government without challenging 'democracy' and the 'constitution'. If they took that step the whole movement could get out of hand and they would lose control. Workers might desire something better than wage slavery and start to occupy their workplaces. The 'anarchistic elements' might start to conclude that anarchism has something to offer and that workers' control of the means of production and distribution is the only answer to defeat the Tory Bill.

The fact is that it is the only answer. The Bill means industrial dictatorship, but if enough people challenge and defy it, it could mean a social revolution and an end to the power and privilege that the State, the employers and the trade union leaders now exercise.

This is the situation of which all those in privileged positions are scared. It is up to us to help to make this a reality and to scare the pants off them once and for all.

P.T.

*Vol. 32, No. 5.

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



All correspondence to
Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road,
Rotton Park, Birmingham 16

ANARCHIST FEDERATION of BRITAIN

AFBIB—To all Groups.

Next AFBIB Meeting and Production, Sunday, March 28. Please send a delegate to Birmingham. (Accommodation provided if necessary.) Address all letters to:

Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road, Rotton Park, Birmingham, 16. Tel. 021-454 6871. Material that cannot wait for the bulletin to be sent to R. Atkins, Vanbrugh College, Hougham, York. The Contact Column in *Freedom* is also available for urgent information. Groups should send latest addresses to Birmingham. New inquirers should

write direct to them or to the AFB information office in Birmingham.

AFB REGIONAL GROUPS

There are now anarchist groups in almost every part of the country. To find your nearest group write to:

North West Federation: Secretary, Les Smith, 47 Clarence Street, Preston, Lancashire.
Cornwall: A. Jacobs, 13 Loder Road, St. Austell, (M. Ma. B.)
Essex & E. Herts.: P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (Q.M. FL.)
Surrey: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.
Yorkshire: Martin Watkins, Flat D, 90 Clarendon Road, Leeds, LS2 9L.
Scotland: Temporary Secretary, Neil Munro, 203 Cornhill Drive, Aberdeen.
Wales: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).
N. Ireland: c/o Freedom Press
S. Ireland: 20 College Lane, Dublin, 2.
University and Student Groups: c/o P. L. Mare (Abbreviations: M—meeting, Ma—magazine, B—budget, Q—Quarterly, FL—free leaflet)

The Function of an Anarchist Newspaper

THE FUNCTION of an Anarchist paper is to talk about anarchism; so much must be fairly obvious. But having said that, one realises how much is involved in 'talking about anarchism'.

Anarchism is not just a body of ideas. For many it is a way of life, and acceptance of the ideas brings responsibilities and disciplines and freedoms which have to be expressed in one's way of living. Often of course it happens in the reverse order, and one has certain ways of living and certain attitudes to life which are discovered only afterwards to be anarchist.

Other anarchists live in ways which cannot by any stretch of imagination be called anarchist, but they embrace the ideas—perhaps almost in desperation—because they represent the only acceptable alternative to the problems and stresses of life as it is forced upon them. It can then become, perhaps, little more than an intellectual consolation, or, it becomes an imperative call to action.

This is basically how it grabs those who work in industry and who do not want to, or cannot, pull out. For these, the responsibility of

attempting to change their working environment becomes the most important aspect of anarchism; becomes their driving motivation. Anarchism as a body of ideas seems worthless if it cannot be expressed in terms of the day-to-day struggle. Whatever you are and whatever your interests are, anarchism has an aspect which offers you either intellectual justification or a means of action—as long as you are a libertarian.

AUTHORITARIANISM AND ANARCHISM

If you are an authoritarian, anarchism has nothing to offer you at all. After many years of propaganda work in the anarchist movement, in speaking, writing and attempts at action in various ways, I am convinced that I have never 'converted' anybody to anarchism who was not already a libertarian in the sense that they wanted more freedom for themselves and for others and who was in fact looking for alternatives to the authoritarian ways of life forced upon us by politics, religion, capitalism and all that.

The authoritarian personality creates such barriers, builds up what

Wilhelm Reich called character armour, of such an impenetrable strength and rigidity that intellectual arguments cannot get through, and the only emotional appeals which call up a response are those which feed the rigid personality already imprisoned within.

Since authoritarian social and political and religious patterns predominate around the world, it is not surprising that the authoritarian personality predominates, and so the forms of revolutionary thought and activity which get popular support are those which are themselves authoritarian.

If your own frustrations and dissatisfactions tell you that you are oppressed by System A, under which you were brought up and have suffered all your life and which tells you what to do all the time, it is very easy to switch your allegiance to System B, which also tells you what to do all the time, but which offers you relief from System A. You have got to make a great leap of imagination to believe that System C will work at all if System B will not tell you what to do—because you are conditioned to do what you are told.

Hence the ease of switching from Czarism to Communism, from Communism to Catholicism to Fascism to—anything which offers an alternative authority. Hence the difficulty of leaping out of the chalk circle altogether.*

ANARCHISM THEN AND NOW

It is now 75 years since Peter Kropotkin founded Freedom Press and FREEDOM—a *Journal of Anarchist Communism*. I don't know what the circulation of that first FREEDOM was, but I doubt if it was very different from our present-day figure. Nor is the present-day anarchist movement very different in size or influence from what it was 75 years ago, in spite of all that has

*An intruder broke into the house, into the bedroom, hauled the husband out of bed, drew a chalk circle on the floor and ordered him to stand in it under threat of having his throat cut. The intruder then proceeded to rape the wife and made off. When the wife, humiliated, berated the husband afterwards, he gleefully replied, 'Ah, but you didn't see me! While he was doing that to you, I was jumping out of the chalk circle, and back again, out again and back again—ever so many times, and he never saw me!'

happened in revolutionary or reactionary terms since to prove the validity of our ideas.

There have been three great near-misses in libertarian revolutions in that time—in Russia, in Mexico and in Spain. Each time the authoritarians have won by making a comeback after central authority had been destroyed. Whether, in view of the enormous power of the modern state, revolution will ever again get within striking distance of such near-success; whether the very concept of violent revolution on the old terms is even viable today, is a matter for interminable debate.

What is obviously and absolutely without argument, is the necessity for maintaining the discussion and dissemination of libertarian ideas and keeping open the channels of communication between libertarians which the anarchist press—and no other—provides. By which I mean, not that there are no other 'libertarian' channels for communication, but that the specifically anarchist contribution must be maintained. One of FREEDOM's special functions is to do this and to do it in a way which is sharply relevant to the needs and possibilities for anarchist advancement today.

ANARCHISM AND THE MOVEMENT

One of the sad things about the anarchistic scene today, as I see it, is the lack of constructive debate and discussion and polemic and even action. In spite of the many thousands of young and not-so-young people who are obviously 'anarchistic' nowadays, there is no reflection of this potential support in terms of *The Movement*. Perhaps it doesn't really matter, since if libertarian ways of life and thought are actually on the increase among the people—whatever the State may be doing—it is going to make a difference to society whether it is called anarchist or not. But it is a bit frustrating for those concerned with the publication of anarchist papers to be continually on the defensive in a potentially supportive time.

In fact, discussion has started on the role of the anarchist press, although so far on a fairly superficial level, directed mainly in terms of criticism of FREEDOM. This is OK by me, as long as it leads on to real reappraisal of the needs of the movement and of the press and of their joint responsibilities. FREEDOM suffers, in my opinion, by trying to do too many things and ending by doing nothing very well. Perhaps other anarchist papers should emerge to do some of these things better and leave FREEDOM a smaller field to cover—better.

But that we need a paper to talk about anarchism and to relate it to the world of 1971—surely of this there is no doubt?

PHILIP SANSOM.



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

	£p
The Spanish Labyrinth	Gerald Brennan 1.10
The Bolsheviks and Workers' Control	M. Brinton 0.25
The Sane Society	Erich Fromm 0.70
Anarchism and Other Essays	Emma Goldman 1.25
Biography of James Larkin	Emmet Larkin 0.25
Listen Marxist!	Anarchos 0.15
What is Property?	Proudhon 2.10
Political Philosophy of Bakunin	Maximov 1.55
To Hell With Culture	Herbert Read 1.50
Biography of Wilhelm Reich	Ilse Ollendorf Reich 2.10
Man Versus the State	Herbert Spencer 0.40
A Plea For Captain John Brown	Thoreau 0.10
Anarchism	George Woodcock 0.40
Socialism in One Country (2 vols.)	E. H. Carr 1.50
IN FRENCH	
La Commune; Histoire & Souvenirs (2 vols.)	Louise Michel 1.00
Ni Dieu ni Maître (4 vols.)	Daniel Guérin 2.00
IN SPANISH	
Hacia una Vida Mejor	Fontaura 0.40
El Movimiento Obrero Español	Buenacasa 1.00
Paradigma de una Revolucion	Paz 0.45
El Anarquismo	Miro 0.60

STRAWS IN THE WIND

(March 2)

SHARE VALUES have dropped faster than for a long time before, suggesting that the City's confidence in the Conservative Government has also dropped, especially since stockbrokers have recently been hammered, and the Rolls and V&G bankruptcies (almost certainly with more in the offing). The fact that the Government has pursued policies that have provoked more union militancy than we have seen for a long time in an attempt to crush what was never a threat to capitalism, may well seem more than a little tactless to the average City financier. 'Militants' are for the first time growing really militant and some even being rapidly given a political education in the nature of the state.

Near the back of the AUEW strike march on March 1 there was to be seen the banner of the shop stewards committee of Westland helicopters—presumably taking time off from making arms for South Africa—though the size of their contingent did not suggest that many people were willing to forgo the inflated piece-rates that come with their present pressing production.

Both on South African arms and on the new Immigration Bill, there are believed to be more than 20 Tory 'liberal-rebels' that is enough to end the Government's parliamentary majority on the issue; one may well look to the event with something less than confidence. Again on the Common Market Tory solidarity is minimal; and as in 1962/3 one sees an alignment of right-wing Tories and 'left' Labourists to Keep Britain Out. This time the unholy wedlock is without benefit of King Street which normally solemnizes such matches.

Not among the million or so strikers on March 1 were the workers of Rolls Royce, in Derby. With unemployment hanging over their heads they understandably kept those heads down. Also not participating was the larger division of my union—Sogat. (Regrettably the smaller division, now by bureaucratic diktat converted into a breakaway union, couldn't even be expected to participate.) The leaders of the larger division—whether from conviction or in an effort to outbid the breakaways—evinced a fiery flush of militancy last December, but this does not seem to have outlived the imposition of an injunction. If they are not prepared to defy the law now, it does not promise much for the future if this Bill becomes law.

Though I had expected the Labour Party to win the last election, I had hoped that the Tories might pull it off as the Left was not last year strong enough to break out of its isolation, was not ready for a direct confrontation with a Labour Government, had—as would

surely have happened—Barbara Castle reintroduced her Bill.

Now the situation has changed in some measure. The Tories—only just two-thirds of a year after the election—have already lost their grip totally and are falling apart. Industrial 'militants' who for years have—under CP influence—kept any real issues out of the factories (insisting that nothing be raised that would divide the workers); and who for years (when appearing as 'trade union advisers' at various leftist meetings) have managed to sound almost syndicalist in insisting that all organization be at the point of production (that people handing out leaflets outside factories are not identified with the workers and are no substitute for organization inside), while steadfastly opposing raising issues such as arms to South Africa, the making of nuclear weapons . . . within their factories; are now by the threat of the Bill forced to talk within their factories as if the world does not after all end at the factory gates (and as if issues other than ones of pay and hours within their particular factory are relevant to the workers in that factory).

This 'pure and simplism'—as De Leon called it (which because it insists, in terms that sound like syndicalism, that political organization must be rooted at the point of production, the Leninists use to smear true syndicalism), has broken down, because if the Act goes through and could be enforced then to call a strike without being certain of almost 100% support would be suicidal. The Communists, who have stressed leadership always in a way which has meant that they were more interested in getting leadership positions than they were in converting their fellow workers and persuading them to oppose racialism or militarism, are in peculiarly exposed positions for dealing with the Tory Bill and so realize that they are literally fighting the Bill for their political survival.*

(Lest any Tory, mistaking this journal for another of the same name, should read this and rejoice, let me stress here that after the closed shop, Communists are the biggest myth in this business. The Tory public believes that if you abolish the closed shop and get rid of the Communists you will then have no strikes. For reasons of its own the pseudo-Left encourages this myth. The closed shop has never existed in France which has a much higher strike record, and the Communists here as there are a conservative force. When the CP 'militants' lose out, then the door will be open to real militants.)

Caught by L.O.

*The CP ingredient was overwhelming on the AUEW march.

The Law is Open to All

ONE OF THE foundations of English justice, one of the pillars of Magna Charta and (we are assured) one of the reasons for not going into the Common Market is the principle of *habeas corpus*. The foundations are built on sand, the pillars are crumbled and we might as well be in the EEC since the principle of *habeas corpus*—the production of 'the body'—has been discarded for some time. It means (and Latin is only used by lawyers to obscure the law) that the accused must be available, even if in custody, so that he can be seen by outsiders proving that he is not dead, has not been put to the torture or fallen down the cop-shop stairs. There is also a charming, old world article of faith that one is permitted to get in touch with (or see) one's lawyers when one is arrested. This too, is a myth.

It may be remembered that our comrades Barlow and Carver were held *incommunicado* for hours and refused contact with their lawyers. Lawyers for Jack Prescott, charged with causing an explosion at the home of Robert Carr, accused the police of an 'outrageous use of their power' by not

permitting Prescott to see his lawyers. Tony Smythe of the National Council for Civil Liberties has sent in a protest to the Home Office describing complaints from five people detained by Barnet police for questioning in the Carr case. Ian Purdie has been charged with unlawfully and maliciously conspiring with Prescott and other persons unknown to cause by explosive substances explosions in the United Kingdom of a nature likely to endanger life or cause serious injury to property. His solicitor was informed at 8.30 p.m. on Saturday that Purdie was in custody. On Sunday the solicitor contacted the station at 11.05 a.m. but again was not allowed to see Purdie, at 4 p.m. he was told by the police that Purdie was being charged and the solicitor was allowed to see him at 5 p.m.

This common situation of a man under suspicion 'helping the police with their enquiries' being held in isolation for twenty hours and questioned continually smacks of the Inquisition, the OGPU and the Gestapo.

J.R.

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	

'The basis of all political action is coercion: even when the State does good things, finally rests on a club, a gun or a prison, for its power to carry them through.'

—Voltairine de Cleyre.

EVERY WEDNESDAY at 8 p.m. Please advise if you can give a talk or organise an evening. All dates from June 30 are free. (May 19 and May 26 also available.)

Dates and activities:

- March 10: S. E. Parker—'In Defence of Anarchism'.
 March 17: Social Evening.
 March 24: Bill Dwyer—'A Case for LSD-25'.
 March 31: Arthur Uloth—'The Urban Crusoe'.
 April 7: Peters Lumsden—'The Only Good God is a Dead One'.
 April 14: Tomasina—'Montessori'.
 April 21: Peter Neville—'The Reference Group of the Anarchist Revolutionary 1971'.
 April 28: No Meeting. The Conway Hall has been booked at 7.30 p.m. for a seminar on 'Anarchy 3—the Acid Issue'.
 May 5: Albert Meltzer, Stuart Christie, Gerry Bree—'Anarchist Black Cross'.
 May 12: Bill Turner—'The Futility of Anarchism'.
 May 19: John O'Connor—'The Interior Decorators'.
 June 2: Philip Sauson—'Make Anarchism Relevant!'.
 June 9: Mark Kramrisch—'Human Nature, Individualism and the Anarchist Revolution'.
 June 16: Miguel Garcia—'The CNT in the Spanish Resistance'.
 June 23: Bill Dwyer—'Island (Dublin)—an experiment in co-operative living'.

Art in Revolution

For those with particularly keen eyes one of the most interesting aspects of the above exhibition, currently being

THIS WORLD

staged in the Hayward Gallery, is a sealed off corner which has very recently been papered over. This had been a reconstruction of a room designed by Lissitzky. We now know that other drawings and designs both by this artist and Malevitch had been hastily removed from the exhibition just before it opened. The clue to the mystery is partly given in the catalogue where Meyerhold's work—which did appear—is referred to as giving 'a tantalizing glimpse of what Meyerhold might have achieved' but 'He never lived to see its completion'. The artist, as Edward Braun points out in his book 'Meyerhold on Theatre', had been savagely tortured to death in one of Stalin's prisons, his wife being murdered under gross circumstances later.

I went to the exhibition reluctantly and came away absolutely disgusted. True, part of the exhibition is taken up with the genuine and fervent art that blossomed after the 1917 Revolution. But this exhibition is in the hands of the Soviet authorities who are entirely responsible for the censorship indicated above. Because the Lissitzky room could not be removed without wrecking the show it was not too artfully sealed off. (The Anneley Juda Gallery is enterprisingly exhibiting the banned works.) The artists, poets and designers involved in the renaissance of the revolutionary years were subsequently suppressed, exiled or murdered by the Russian authorities.

For the rest the exhibition is a vulgar display of chauvinism and communist

hero-worship of Lenin and his heirs. Soviet technology is highlighted but how the development of state capitalism can be related to revolution is a feat of deceitfulness and chicanery of which the Bolsheviks have become masters. Several film screenings scattered throughout the exhibition, largely showing Lenin addressing huge crowds and the formation of the Red Army (its first commissar Trotsky was carefully excluded), no doubt were intended to entertain and divert one's attention from the puerile nature of the show. When I looked at the propaganda posters directed against the German soldiers I immediately saw the identical twins in Prague and Buda Pest (the swastika legs being fully interchangeable with hammers and sickles). Some day the heroic efforts of people in revolution and the artists who were inspired by them will be paid tribute. But not by any government!

Tomasina on Reich

Few anarchist women are prepared to speak about their ideas in public. Last Wednesday Tomasina gave an exceptionally fine talk in Freedom Hall on Wilhelm Reich to a large audience which showed its interest by participation in discussion and questions for nearly two hours afterwards.

From the anarchist viewpoint the Reichian principle of psychology that every encroachment on the freedom of the individual tends to destroy the personality is of the first importance. Reich

was severely persecuted in his own lifetime and died in prison. They said he was mad and no doubt anyone who is systematically assailed by authority (Reich had his books publicly burned by it—and this in the twentieth century!) may well be reduced to mental withdrawal from their world. He, a brilliant physician by ordinary academic standards, came to see that the institutionalisation of knowledge was as evil as that of power.

Reich answered the question 'is freedom a realistic proposition?' with an emphatic YES! He believed that people are basically peaceful and self-regulating—their potential for these are limited and aborted by authority. According to Tomasina, Reich is entitled to stand with Kropotkin and the other great anarchists who advocated mutual aid and liberty—on the basis of her talk I would fully agree.

Revolution Postponed

One hundred thousand of us marched from Hyde Park to Trafalgar Square (and beyond because it was not big enough to hold us) to protest against the Industrial Relations Bill. I observed a considerable ground swell for a General Strike but the whole affair was too well managed by the TUC hierarchy for any such move to develop. 'Place not your trust in princes' said court favourite Thomas Wentworth before going to the scaffold and the lesson for the workers is the same—trade union officials are a class apart with privileges and interests to protect.

Strolling down

Portobello Road any evening you may see young people being stopped, lined up against a wall with their hands above their heads like in the old gangster

movies, and searched. I suppose it is accepted as a fact of life down there because no one sees anything particularly remarkable in it. As a new resident I must admit I was stunned (there's a vast difference between hearing about something and actually witnessing it). The searches, of course, are plainclothes police—often well disguised. The legal grounds for the searches—which are fortunately often unsuccessful—are that the officers 'have reasonable grounds' to suspect that their victims are carrying illegal drugs. In effect the police are anyone with long hair or unusual dress as a pot-smoker and the law enables them to submit suspects to public humiliation on no evidence at all.

There is in Britain today no section of the community so harassed and persecuted as the 'head' sub-culture. The police have been armed with astonishing powers which they fully use.

Even anarchists—not to speak of the indifferent or hostile majority—have failed to recognise the gross intrusion on privacy and freedom which is involved. This is all the more difficult to understand when it is appreciated that the values of the 'head' community when expressed intelligibly (I admit they often are not) are close to anarchist principles of mutual aid and rejection of authority. Perhaps part of the anarchist attitude can be understood in that it is too readily assumed that 'heads' are drop-outs in every sense of the word and hence deserve little sympathy. And it is true that many who reject the present system have little or nothing to put in its place. But, surely, if there is a vacuum, we can do something to fill it.

To this end I am trying to start an anarchist paper which will be aimed at this section of the community—it is difficult to accurately estimate its size since it is rapidly growing and its influence permeates all levels of society. If it is to be successful those producing it must be both anarchists and 'heads' with talents for some aspect of literary production. This is an open invitation to writers and artists to contact me so that, together, we will attempt a social function now almost entirely neglected.

BILL DWYER.

THE LEAFLETERS

I DO NOT visit London very often these days, but I did go there the other Sunday and, together with an estimated 140,000 other Trade Unionists, demonstrated against the Government's Industrial Relations Bill.

As I waited over three hours to march out of Hyde Park with the 5,000-strong Public Employees' and Local Government Officers' contingent, I was handed leaflet after leaflet by members of 'left-wing' political groups and parties, mostly representing various Trotskyist factions and all claiming to be the true heirs of the 'Old Man', the late and unlamented Leon Trotsky. Despite the obvious antagonisms between these groups, the similarities of their aims and policies are only too apparent to the outside observer. I will mention but a few.

Perhaps the most verbose, and unreadable, of the leaflets comes from the smallest faction, The Revolutionary Workers' Party (Trotskyist) British Section of the IVth International, which has almost no support in Britain. They saluted the 'workers' Vanguard' for making the magnificent demonstration possible, though they could not have possibly known that it was going to be a magnificent demonstration when they wrote the leaflet. The leaflet then informs us that '... there are now 16 Workers' States, 16 Revolutionary States, where Communist parties and Workers' States are beginning to regenerate ... all of which ... feeds the confidence of the Vanguard, whatever that is supposed to mean. Already, continues the leaflet, the elements exist for a general strike of unlimited duration. All that the workers need is the right leadership. And what is the policy of our Revolutionary Workers' Party? The return of a Labour Government on a socialist programme! And that, dear comrades, is what you will get if you support the 'revolutionary' Trotskyists of the RWP.

The leaflet prepared by the International Marxist Group (British Section of the Fourth International) and the Spartacus League, that is the Tariq Ali Fan Club, is almost as wordy. It asks us to 'Prepare the General Strike!'. And 'comrade' Ali's solution to our troubles? 'The Tories must be driven out of office and they must be replaced by a Government which will help to run Britain in the interests of the mass of the people—the working class'. And how do these so-called internationalists, who want a government to help run Britain, hope to achieve their aims? By 'complete nationalisation', of course! But, the Labour Party is not an instrument for doing this, they say. Only the Trade Union movement could provide the basis for that.

And now we come to another group of so-called International Socialists, or Cliffites as they are called for short. Their leaflet is called 'Kill the Bill! Kick out the Tories!'. Their policy also advocates a general strike and proposes a number of extremely 'revolutionary' demands such as a minimum wage of £25 a week, the demand of work or full pay for the unemployed, defence of the social services, and a fight for a 'living

pension for the old'. They want to sack the Union leaders who won't fight. They, too, stand for nationalisation of the land, banks and major industries. They say: 'We work to build a revolutionary workers' party in Britain' ... but there is nothing revolutionary about the string of reforms advocated by the so-called International Socialists.

What can one say about the next 'official' section of the Fourth International—the Socialist Labour League? They had no leaflets, but I did pick up a copy of the *Workers' Press*, The Daily Organ of the Central Committee of the Socialist Labour League, to give it its full title, which had no doubt been thrown on the ground by an irate Stalinist. Well, it is beautifully printed—in full colour! And there are pictures of Mr. Gerry Healy (there always are) and other leaders of the SLL. But what of their policy? Yes, dear comrades, they also want a general strike, and of course the election of 'a Labour government pledged to socialist policies'.

The old ILP published a considerably better leaflet and, unlike the former groups, actually explained the Bill as well as attacking it. Unfortunately, however, the ILP's proposals are no more revolutionary than those of the other parties. After stating that 'Only a mass defiance of the law will save the Trade Union movement as we know it today', the leaflet limply suggests that 'In the meantime, a campaign must be mounted throughout industry to defeat the proposals'. And how? 'A petition should be launched in every factory to ensure the collection of millions of signatures each one giving notice to Heath and company that we have no intention of operating his new industrial laws.' At least the ILP do not advocate a socialist 'government' or the nationalisation of the banks.

And now, last but not least, the SPGB. With the title 'The Right to Strike', the SPGB leaflet rather patronisingly tells us 'You are right to demonstrate your opposition to the government's Industrial Relations Bill which is designed to restrict the right to strike'. But it correctly points out that 'As long as the means of production are owned by a privileged minority, either privately or through the State, the strike will remain an essential weapon to defend the living standards and working conditions of wage and salary workers'. The SPGB says that it supports 'the proper use of the strike weapon'. But it claims that industrial action under capitalism is basically only defensive. What the SPGB advocates is 'conscious socialist action aimed at winning political power democratically through the ballot box ...'. They are against the general strike advocated by 'leftwing' groups in order to further their anti-working class political objectives. 'When the majority do want Socialism,'

says the SPGB leaflet, 'a general strike would be quite unnecessary since the socialist majority could achieve its object much more easily through the ballot box.' Just like that!

Besides those mentioned above, there were other 'leftwing' political groups; but, except for the SPGB (who almost cross themselves every time the words Parliament or Ballot are mentioned) and

possibly the old ILP, they all seem to advocate with monotonous regularity not only the most unrevolutionary reforms of the present system, but also the most authoritarian political demands of nationalisation and State ownership of the means of production. None, except the Parliamentary SPGB, conceive of a society where the wages and monetary system has been abolished. That would be too revolutionary for our 'revolutionary' Trotskyist vanguards—of all 57 varieties! And all of them, including the SPGB, want to get control of the State, instead of striving and organising to get rid of it.

N.

Why we Struck

THE NORTH WESTERN Polytechnic and the Northern Polytechnic are on the point of merging to become the Polytechnic of North London, with nearly five thousand students, one of the largest educational institutions in the country. The man proposed as director of the new Poly was selected by a committee sworn to secrecy throughout the proceedings. The first students (and staff for that matter) knew of the proposed appointment was in a report appearing in the *Guardian*. Professor Miller, the director-designate, succeeded Dr. Walter Adams as Principal of University College, Rhodesia. With this in mind, the students initiated an investigation into the eighteen months of his principalship in Rhodesia. Subsequent to the report being published, general meetings of students were convened, at which nearly one thousand (at North Western) and over eight hundred students (at Northern), after being addressed by the Professor, voted overwhelmingly in opposition to his appointment. The students felt that apart from his collaboration with the Smith regime, he had also shown himself completely unsuited to lead an institution of Higher Education. The students and staff have challenged the right of the Court of Governors, consisting mainly of representatives of big business, to make such an appointment. The students further demanded that the college authorities convene, within 28 days, a general assembly of all students and all staff to reconsider the proposed appointment, and failing this would embark on an indefinite occupation of the college. Staff of the college, through their Union, have called for a 24-hour strike in protest against the appointment of Professor Miller. The time is running out for the college administration.

The *Sunday Telegraph* (whose editor Mr. B. Roberts, is the chairman of our Court of Governors) together with the *Daily Telegraph*, is leading the attack against both students and workers. The editorial in the *Telegraph* of January 28 in attacking students who were merely

demanding their democratic rights, suggested methods for controlling them, i.e., suspensions, expulsions and prosecutions. Substitute 'workers' for 'students' in this context, and what do you have?—The Industrial Relations Bill. The Industrial Relations Bill is a direct attack on the working class's right to defend itself. If this Bill becomes law it will be a major defeat for the Labour movement and the forces of reaction will feel themselves to be in an extremely powerful position; as students do not have any labour power to withdraw they are dependent upon the strength of the Labour movement to achieve full participation and real democracy within their colleges.

We therefore appeal to all Trade Unionists to give full support to the students of the Northern and North Western Polytechnics. We ask you to move motions of support for our action, at all levels of the Labour movement—Trade Union branches, district committees, Trades Councils, Trades Council Action Committees and Councils of Action.

N.W.P. STUDENTS.

4-page leaflet
**THE RIGHT TO STRIKE—
 THE POWER TO STRIKE**
 25p per Hundred
 Plus 7p per hundred Postage
 (31p on 500 and over)
 £2.50 per thousand,
 postage extra
 from Freedom Bookshop

Contact

Contact Column is for making contact! Use is free, but donations towards typesetting costs are welcome

There is Free Admission to the 'Art in Revolution' Exhibition at Hayward Gallery, Tuesdays and Thursdays 6-8 p.m.

AFBIB needs subscriptions urgently. Any other donations would be very welcome. To Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road, Rotton Park, Birmingham 16.

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 9249—or direct, The Tenants of Burrell House, The Highway, Stepney, 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 fold and dispatch **Pravdom** every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.