

Anarchism, Bombs, and all that

THERE IS A POLITICAL bomb explosion. There is no evidence of exactly what kind of people are responsible, though there are indications that it was the work of a group called the Angry Brigade which seemed to resemble the American Weathermen (and which has been active in London for some months). But there is the usual suggestion that it must be the work of anarchists, because anarchists throw bombs, and anarchism after all means throwing bombs. We are used to this. This is where we came in. And if by any chance any anarchists are actually arrested and tried for this or any other bomb, we may be sure that all the old shit will start to fly (a few odd turds are flying already), and we shall once more be put into the false position of having either to accept or to repudiate what is really an irrelevant action. It has happened before, and it will happen again. So let's take the opportunity of explaining exactly what our position is.

Ignorant and malicious people have associated anarchists with bombs for nearly a century now; regardless of the fact that those few anarchists who did resort to political assassination or even terror were in fact copying techniques developed by earlier groups—such as Italian

nationalists, Russian populists, and Irish republicans—who killed far more people than the anarchists did; regardless of the fact that the well-known descriptions of anarchist bomb-plots in fiction—such as Zola's *Germinale* and Conrad's *The Secret Agent*—are largely pure invention; regardless of the fact that many of the most important bomb-plots in history—such as the Chicago (Haymarket) Affair of 1886 and the Barcelona (Corpus Christi) Bomb of 1895, or the Walsall Plot of 1892 and the Greenwich Park Bomb of 1894—were the work of police spies and agents provocateurs; and regardless of the most important fact that the main users of bombs—as of all kinds of violence—have always been not anarchists at all, but governments.

Of course, many anarchists have favoured violence, some have favoured the assassination of public figures, and a few have even favoured terrorism of the population, to help destroy the present system. Not only have anarchists thrown bombs, but at some times and in some places the use of bombs has been taken seriously as an anarchist method. There is a dark side to anarchism, as there is of every political ideology, and there is no point denying it. But it is only

one side of anarchism, and a small one. It would be absurd to exaggerate this particular aspect of anarchism, and it is probably true to say that the general anarchist view of bomb-throwing has always been roughly as follows.

As anarchists, we will not condemn any person who feels impelled by a passionate hatred of the present system to use its own weapons against it. When a social and political structure is maintained by violence, it is tempting to try and destroy it by violence. And when normal methods of action are ineffective, it is tempting to lose patience and strike what is hoped to be a more effective blow. We understand such feelings, and we sympathise with them. Who has never felt the same way? But we do not believe that this is the way to establish anarchism. This does not mean that we are necessarily against the use of force, any more than we are necessarily in favour of it. There are circumstances in which it is the only possible method of action.

In many countries in the past, and still in Spain and Greece, in Russia and its satellites, in much of Southern

Africa and South America it is difficult to know what kind of non-violent action is open to opponents of dictatorship. When even the mildest and most passive resistance is smashed by overwhelming force, what is left on the other side but force? Violent resistance may be the only alternative to no resistance at all. In such circumstances we cannot condemn violence—not only sabotage of property, but even the assassination of people in certain cases; though we could not accept the use of techniques which would endanger innocent people, let alone the resort to mere terror.

But violence even in extreme circumstances is not a method of political action. Violence may be necessary to win back the freedom of action of a people, or of an individual person, but real political action begins only when violence stops. The urge to destroy is not a creative urge; it is simply a prior condition for the possibility of creation. Where there is freedom of thought, speech, assembly, organisation, and agitation, there is nothing to be gained by violence. On the contrary, the deliberate use of violence will in fact endanger the

political rights won for us at great cost and after bitter struggles lasting for hundreds of years fought by our ancestors for our sake. Even if we do not condemn violence because it is immoral, we must condemn it because it is unwise.

It can be argued that political rights are part of a system of repressive tolerance, and that violent provocation is necessary to force the authorities to drop their mask and bring their real intolerance and violence out into the open. There is some truth in this argument, but in practice it is very dangerous to provoke a superior counterforce in this way. It can also be argued that ordinary propaganda, propaganda by word, is not enough to persuade people of the need for radical changes, and that it must be supplemented by more persuasive propaganda, propaganda by deed. There is some truth in this argument as well, but the point is: what kind of deed? When the phrase was originally used, during the 1870s, it meant demonstrations, riots and risings which were thought of as symbolic actions designed to win publicity, and this kind of deed is surely much

Continued on page 2

WHAT SORT OF PEOPLE DO THEY THINK WE ARE?

IN TIME OF WAR we are told what noble freedom-fighters we are; in time of 'peace' we are told to shut up and do as we are told. Although every tiny aspect of British freedom—and it's all pretty tiny—has had to be fought for against the bitter opposition of the government of the day, when any British Government has had to be dug out of the mire it has called upon the British people in the name of those very freedoms which were so reluctantly granted.

It is always the foreign tyrant and his servile hordes who would enslave the upstanding British worker; gag the liberal intellectual; turn the legal system into a dependent part of the police state; force us to live in penury so that the overriding interests of the ruling clique and its savage economy may be served.

Against these dire threats the brave British Tommy marched forth to do and die; to defend his hard-won freedoms against the filthy foreign scum who would take them away!

WELL, TOMMY, WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO NOW?

All the threats we have just listed are threatening you again. But not from without, Tommy. This time, from within.

It is not an exaggeration to say that there is a bigger threat to individual freedom and to civil liberties in general facing the British NOW than at any time since the dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell.

As the financial crisis deepens, the administration takes typical measures: it turns sharply to the Right and sets about bashing the working class and all those who speak up for it.

The Industrial Relations Bill will force you, Tommy Atkins, to work for wages on which you cannot live; it will enable the Government to send you to prison if you strike against conditions you find intolerable.

THIS IS SLAVERY.

And you have no allies in high places

at all. No Parliamentary opposition can be effective because the rules of the game ensure that the ruling party wins the voting in the House. Since the Labour Party wanted a similar Bill to be passed when it was the Government, its opposition can only be hypocritical and at best half-hearted. And when it comes to the crunch—the TUC will accept it as well.

YOU WILL BE DEFENCELESS—EXCEPT FOR YOUR OWN STRENGTH. And that can only be used in the very means of direct action that they are trying to suppress—because they fear it. The strike is your first, but not your last weapon.

If the workers' present methods of defending themselves are made illegal—then the present distinction between legal and illegal protest disappears. And the distinction between peaceful and violent protest will disappear also—whether we like that or not!

Already the bomb attacks on Robert Carr's house tell us that there are some militants who are not going to wait for the Bill to become law. Whether we care for this type of propaganda or not IT IS GOING TO HAPPEN BECAUSE OTHER FORMS OF PROTEST HAVE NO EFFECT.

The ordinary working man knows whose side the Law is on; he is not sold on this 'freedom under the Law' rubbish that tells him that he is free only when he does as he is told.

The ordinary working man may not be able to find the necessary anger to take extreme forms of direct action—but some extraordinary working men will.

After all, the British ruling class tells the ordinary British working man that he loves his freedom and is prepared to fight and die for it—when it suits them. They cannot be surprised if he is prepared to fight and die for his freedom when they come along to take it away.

After all—what sort of people do they think we are?

THE DEMONSTRATIONS and strikes of January 12 against the Government's labour relations bill did not get the overall support that was expected. What distinguished it from December 8 was the widespread nature of the support and the different forms that it took. This was, of course, partly due to the TUC's call for lunch-time and other meetings outside working hours. It was obvious that many of these would either be extended, start early or end with strike action.

The strongest support came from Merseyside and the Midlands. It was a day on which workers in their own areas and industries organised their own meetings and demonstrations. In London many meetings took place but the main focal point was the meeting at Speakers' Corner and the march to the Albert Hall. Speeches both at the Park and outside the Hall centred on urging the TUC to act. Kevin Halpin, Chairman of the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions, called upon the TUC to 'take action, real action'. This line has in fact been pushed by the Communist Party. Certainly from their point of view it is a realistic line since they aim to gain official power within the unions rather than organising mass rank and file opposition. Their dilemma is and always has been of how to create just sufficient consciousness to be channelled for their own ends.

The Liaison Committee's efforts to organise opposition are, of course, tied to the Party's dictates. But since December 8, their efforts to make January 12 a success must be criticised. Except for a general call, nothing was really organised. The meeting at Speakers' Corner was, for instance, agreed upon by building workers before Christmas.

What is happening is that more groups of workers are campaigning and organising action independently of both the Liaison Committee and the TUC. They are relying on the organisation that exists at shop floor level. The Trades' Councils are playing a much bigger part now as well. For too long most of them have been mere talking shops and have followed the TUC. Now they are playing an important part in mobilising opposition at a local level to the Tories' Bill.

ALBERT HALL MEETING

The TUC's meeting in the Albert Hall turned out to be a fiasco for them. Vic Feather had to abandon half of

After January 12th

his speech when an estimated 10% of the audience kept calling for a general strike. His response to this was, 'If I thought a one-day stoppage would end this Bill I would be for it, but it won't.' Mr. Wilson was given similar treatment with slow handclaps and shouts of 'Sit down!' and 'We beat you'. Both Feather and Wilson had to be protected by the police when they entered the Hall.

No one would deny the truth of Mr. Feather's remark and one of the criticisms that can be levelled at the Liaison Committee is that they try to give the impression that a one-day stoppage can be successful. Only a campaign of action could achieve the aims and this will not be mounted by either the Liaison Committee or the TUC.

The TUC has become too interested in its governing role and too full of plans for running an economic system that should be abolished. It is only too willing to co-operate if the terms are right and just such terms were offered last week. Although the plans they put forward to hold down wages were unacceptable to the Government, it nevertheless shows that they are concerned with inflation.

'TRIPARTITE PACT'

Lord Lever, millionaire member of Wilson's Government, writing in the *New Statesman* has said: 'The TUC has, in effect, offered to create, with the Government and the employers, a tripartite pact. In so doing, it has openly acknowledged that the self-defeating and dislocating evils of our currently excessive rate of inflation threaten the continuation of even the modest increase in our well-being that we have lately enjoyed.' He argues that the Tories' rejection of the TUC's co-operation 'will mean that the Government will continue to tackle inflation relying only on some long-term generalisations and an undefined policy of tight money. The great probability will then be that inflation will continue and will commence to erode our balance of payments surplus. The Government will feel obliged to undertake further and sharper

monetary deflation. If with the economy stagnant or in recession inflation is still not contained, the Government will ultimately be driven to some form of direct action on wages, incomes and prices.'

It has often been pointed out in these columns that a 'package deal' could even come about between the Tories and the TUC to cope with the present economic situation. Harold Wilson mentioned such a deal at the Albert Hall meeting and said that he himself had already had talks with the TUC. Certainly they have their own plans to deal with unofficial strikes and to keep wage claims to an acceptable amount. Such a 'tripartite' with any Government would mean that trade unionists' demands would be trimmed to ensure high profit margins. The independence now threatened by the Tory legislation would be equally at stake with a 'package deal'.

THE ALTERNATIVE

Although the trade unions could not be described as revolutionary organisations, their independence from state control of any sort is essential. They should not help to solve the problems of a capitalist system at the expense of their members, for any deal with the Government of the day would do just that. In their role as producers, workers will always receive a raw deal and be expected to make the sacrifices to ensure the continued rule of capital. Whatever agreements are made between the TUC and the Government, the workers' position in society will remain the same. The present bargaining is only concerned with the amount of money the economy can afford in wages. The only way to break from inflation, wage freeze, legislation, daily routine of work and unemployment, is by way of revolution and this is the only alternative to any plan the TUC may have.

They will not fight the Bill. They will live with it and salvage what they can in order to maintain their power. To demand a lead in opposing the Bill from them is a waste of time. If this is to be done then it can be achieved by the workers themselves.

P.T.

WITH THE RAPID growth of various forms of Leninism with the student left and what goes for the revolutionary movement, combating Leninist myths on the Russian revolution has become a high priority for the libertarian. In many spheres we can only advance to the extent that we can refute the theory that Bolshevism is an efficient means of attaining socialism—or indeed a means at all.

This booklet provides a magnificent weapon in this struggle, and in the anarchist armoury for debate, against all shades of Leninists. As such it is essential reading for any serious anarchist propagandist; for though many, if not most, anarchists, who have studied the subject at all, will know most, if not all, the material, it nevertheless assembles—with (at first reading) very few significant and notable omissions* (almost as a reference book) an amazing number of facts in a way that, as far as I know, no earlier work has done, and from these demonstrate the evolution of the Soviet Union as a class-exploitative society.

There is some evidence manifested in the booklet—despite the fact that only one author is named, Maurice Brinton—of internal-Solidarity divisions and disagreements. For even though the normal Solidarity penchant for including snide attacks on anarchists—in order to demonstrate their neo-Leninist orthodoxy—is satisfied to the full, this does not—as in the Aberdeen Solidarity pamphlet on Germany, in the preface to Ida Metts and elsewhere in Solidarity works—set the general tone.

On the contrary, a number of passages suggest that the writer (or a writer) holds Solidarity to be within the general anarchist or at least anarcho-syndicalist tradition and therein forming its own anarcho-Marxist tendency. This is not without some relevance as, given that different people use the same words in different ways—a point which this pamphlet explains at long lengths—there is a distinction between the same Solidarity arguments advanced within a general anarchist context and those advanced consciously and deliberately outside that context.

Both the attacks on anarchism and this semantic point are demonstrated as (in some ways) the very basis of the booklet, for here, as in the very early *Solidarity* (and earlier *Agitator*) pamphlets, much of the argument turns on the peculiarities of language which the translation of Leninist concepts into English dictates. Once again we have the distinction drawn between workers' management

*One such is that though mention is made of the 1918 attack on the Moscow anarchists, none such is made of Trotsky's attack, with troops, on the Vyborg Quarter—a more significant episode since it was not merely anarchist headquarters in Petersburg, but also a centre of wider working class militancy; another perhaps less relevant is that there is none of the protests—recorded in the Trotsky Archives (Brill)—by the Democratic Centralists about Trotsky's autocratic handling and punishment of oppositional groups of and in the Red Army in the Ukraine; certainly not workers' control, but nevertheless rank and file democracy, so that even if Makhno is considered irrelevant to the topic, the Red Army internal relations were not.

The Solid Stuff - but not Unflawed

and workers' control and once again *Solidarity* equates control with mere surveillance and defines management as meaning that the workers directly manage industry.

This of course ignores the fact that in everyday English a management is a body of people set aside from the commonality with the task and function of managing others. So that workers' management is in English a concept not unlike a 'Workers' Government' or a 'Workers' State'—concepts which are to anarchists manifest impossibilities and absurdities for precisely the same reason that in normal parlance the government and the state is not and cannot be identical with the totality of society and population and that a federation of workers' and peoples' councils would not in any normal usage of language be a government or a state; so by the same token a factory committee constituted as a federation of rank and file autonomous groupings sending mandated delegates subject to recall would not conform to any picture conjured up by the concept management. Incidentally *Solidarity* makes much of the fact that anarchists, syndicalists and others have, since they raised the issue, used terms such as 'direct workers' control' and 'full workers' control'; having been responsible for the adoption—by the SWF—of the former, I can state that this was a concession to the fact that Marxists do not understand the English language as it is normally spoken not a 'tacit admission of the inadequacy (or at least ambiguity) of previous formulations' (p. iii).

On page 20 Voline is quoted in favour of this linguistic distinction as agreeing that workers' control does not mean control by workers of production but only of those who control production; I cannot recall that Voline was a noted exponent of the English language—indeed as I remember people who met him always said that his command of English was somewhat less than perfect.

The author(s) is (are) forced at one stage to stand on his (their) head(s)—on p. 25—where, referring to the 'Practical Manual for the implementation of Workers' Control in Industry' (a pamphlet brought out by the Petrograd Central Council of Factory Committees—in which the syndicalists had some considerable influence) this booklet says, 'Neither in Lenin's view, nor in that of the authors (despite the title)—was there any confusion between "control" and "management"'. As the factory committees were arguing against the Leninist perversion of control, and as to do they chose to entitle their pamphlet as they did they plainly did not agree with Leninist-Solidarity semantics, and in fact did not confuse pseudo-control or surveillance with control. (Again the booklet—on p. 31—records that, at an All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions, the anarcho-syndicalists moved a resolution 'calling for "real workers' control, not state workers' control"'.)

On another topic—and it is a pity that reviewing a booklet of this excellence I should be forced to concentrate on its imperfections, but to praise the booklet without answering attacks on anarchists would be tantamount to accepting their validity—anarchists are accused of being simplistic and atheoretical; cf., for instance, p. 23 footnote: 'It is not a question of counterposing, as various anarchists

do, the movement of the masses" to "dictatorship by the state" but of understanding the specific forms of the new authority relations which arose at that particular point of history.' This refers to a passage which said:—

The problem can be envisaged in yet another way. The setting up of the Vesenka represents a partial fusion—in a position of economic authority—of trade union officials, Party stalwarts and 'experts' nominated by the workers' state. But these are not three social categories representing the workers. They were three social categories which were already assuming managerial functions—i.e. were already dominating the workers in production (yes, sic—despite the insistence on 'workers' management' they so define managerial functions—L.O.). Because of their own antecedent history, each of these groups was, for different reasons, already somewhat remote from the working class. Their fusion was to enhance this separation. The result is that from 1918 on, the new state (although officially described as a 'workers' state' or a 'soviet republic'—and although by and large supported by the mass of the population during the Civil War) was not in fact an institution managed by the working class.

Well how justifiable then is that footnote? We have a state, a significant sector of which *Solidarity* very ably analyses as a fusion between three management strata, already separated from the masses and by their fusion further separated—whose precise social form has yet—even now—to be given a satisfactory name, which is not—in Marxist terminology—either a dictatorship of the workers or of the traditional capitalists, but is a dictatorship of a

salariat integrated into a new state form—in brief a 'dictatorship of the state'. Socialist theory insists that where a class society exists—whatever the precise nature of the class divisions—there is bound to be a conflict of interests between the classes, and the aims of the rulers are in conflict with those of the ruled and the actions and movements of the masses conflict with—are counterposed to—the interests of the ruling class and its executive body, the state, through which it exercises its 'Diktat'. No doubt the simple-minded anarchist who counterposed the movement of the masses to the dictatorship of the state may have used less words than *Solidarity* (or this present writer) usually needs to explain such a point but this is not altogether a fault (even if it were one I would lack).

Solidarity's desire to say that no one else has ever said or done anything worthwhile raises its ugly head here as elsewhere, and is in some degree supported in Bill Turner's review of the booklet in the *Socialist Leader* where all earlier work on the subject is dismissed as anarchism and simplistic. Even if it were true that anarchists are all simplistic—and the debates that existed in the 'thirties within the anarchist movement on the subject hardly testify to simplism—the Ciliga, Pannekoek, Korsch, Marlen tradition of Council Communists and Russian writers like Victor Serge are not usually accredited by *Solidarity* to anarchism even though they may themselves have acknowledged a debt to the thoughts of anarchist writers—and nor would *Solidarity* normally dismiss them as simplistic—yet the booklet's author(s) does not feel it necessary to acknowledge their work. Nor indeed was Bordiga (certainly no anarchist) notably given to neglecting theoretical considerations. L.O.

FLEET STREET WILDCAT STRIKES

JOURNALISTS on the national newspapers are now feeling themselves in the position of the discontented and unfairly treated workers which their papers spend so much time attacking.

Barbara Castle touched on the irony of the situation by pointing out that the *Daily Mirror* journalists were indulging in the kind of wildcat strike their editorials were always condemning. This was replied to by the *Mirror* father of the chapel that the editorials were written by or under the direction of executives on the paper.

You can understand his anger at Barbara Castle sounding off about hypocrisy but it's an inadequate reply really for, although the executives write them, the union members accept this passively. For example, when the printers on the *Evening Standard* took action against a revolting cartoon aimed at the power workers in the most appalling taste, the journalists on the paper denounced this as an attack on the right of the editor to decide what goes in the paper. In other words they accept the arbitrary right of one person, responsible only to the management, to censor the paper without anything approaching democratic obligations.

The point is made very well by a union member, Bernard Sluman, in the January issue of the union's magazine.

He writes, 'I have always been puzzled by Press reporting of industrial affairs. How many members of the Union are actively engaged in writing and subbing the column miles which attempt to discredit trade unionists and trade union actions? Can those members who contribute to the anti-union campaign explain their reasons?'

'For instance how many NUJ members were involved in December's wholesale onslaught on the power-workers' official action?'

'How many helped to ensure that the majority of the nationals—other than *The Times*, *Financial Times* and *Morning Star*—carried no major quotes explaining the views of trade unionists (about 400,000 of them) addressing the mass rallies on December 8 against the Government's proposed industrial relations laws?'

'How do NUJ members explain their complicity in these and other anti-union activities? How do they see their contribution in relation to the union's support for the TUC campaigning against anti-union legislation?'

'Or, if they protest at being involved, what action do they take to secure a better coverage of industrial events?'

But as long as the union accepts that the content of newspapers must be decided entirely by the management and their capitalist backers who are bound to be anti-union, how can you expect anything else? This is why the cry of so many journalists that

they are just ordinary workers and not responsible for what goes into the paper is inadequate. If they have any 'professional ethics' as they claim, they should make it their responsibility to see that industrial and all other matters are given fair and balanced reports—and take the sort of action demonstrated by the printers to make sure they are.

The two main grievances of journalists at present are concerned with house agreements and redundancy pay.

Journalists on the richer papers, such as the *Mirror* and *Sun*, feel they have been 'grossly betrayed' by the union leaders (see Paul Carden's letter in January issue of *The Journalist*).

Until the last few years wages were negotiated nationally for all papers. This meant artificially depressed wages geared to the financially weak papers. The richer papers were paying the same wages even though they could afford much more.

In the last couple of years, though, journalists have been allowed to negotiate above the national rate agreements for their own papers—so that the richer ones have had to pay much better money. This has led to 'chapel power' which, seemingly, the union leaders do not like for, in agreeing the latest national agreement, they have accepted a freeze for 18 months on all house agreements.

According to Paul Carden, the union officials gave 'categorical assurances that after the proposed national negotiations were settled chapels would be able to try to improve on the terms by way of house agreements'. He therefore feels grossly betrayed by the leaders and feels they have killed off chapel power.

It is encouraging that the *Mirror* men are fighting this attempt.

As for the redundancy dispute, this concerns the *Daily Mail* mainly. After granting many concessions over the years to get a generous redundancy pay agreement (compared with others), the workers are now being told by the management that they intend to practically halve it now there is a chance that it will actually be used.

The original agreement is for four weeks' pay for every year of service. The management now intend to cut this to two weeks' pay for every year from seven upwards. For seven years or more there will also be a pension—but considering most journalists branch off into other industries by the time they are 40 this pension will be practically worthless in real value by the time it is drawn.

So, after giving all the concessions for a good redundancy agreement, they are now being betrayed by the management who refuse to keep their side of the bargain.

M.P.

BOOKS

Books

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

PAPERBACKS

Fear of Freedom	Erich Fromm	12/-
The Sane Society	Erich Fromm	16/-
The Art of Loving	Erich Fromm	7/-
Authority and Delinquency	Alex Comfort	7/-
The Anxiety Makers	Alex Comfort	8/6
Sex in Society	Alex Comfort	3/6
Autobiography of Big Bill Hayward	(ed.) Maximov	21/-
Political Philosophy of Bakunin	(ed.) Victor Serge	30/-
Case of Comrade Tolayev	Victor Serge	7/6
Birth of Our Power	Victor Serge	7/-

HARDBACKS

Memoirs of a Revolutionist	P. Kropotkin	40/-
Revolutionary Pamphlets	P. Kropotkin	70/-
Fields, Factories and Workshops	P. Kropotkin	105/-
Anarchy and Order	Herbert Read	21/-
A Question of Living	R. F. McKenzie	18/-
Kronstadt 1921	Paul Avrich	80/-
Talking of Summerhill	A. S. Neill	25/-
Wilhelm Reich (Biography)	Ilse Ollendorff Reich	42/-
The Hawkspur Experiment	W. David Wills	24/-
Throw Away Thy Rod	W. David Wills	18/-

Freedom Press

publish
FREEDOM weekly
and ANARCHY monthly
84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 01-247 9249
Entrance Angel Alley,
Whitechapel Art Gallery exit,
Aldgate East Underground Stn.

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	

SAYING OF THE WEEK

Barnet Reporter: Apart from all that, Mr. Carr, what do you think of the Industrial Relations Bill?

THIS WEEK IN IRELAND

FOR THE LAST three nights there has been considerable rioting again in the Ballymurphy district of Belfast. The people say this is provoked by the British troops, who dash around in armoured cars, and apparently accelerate and try to run inhabitants down. The defence is that if you expect to have petrol bombs thrown at you, you naturally try to get out of the way as fast as possible. Being biased, I tend to believe viewpoint 1. I've seen British troops in action all over the world since the days of the Tans here, and they can be brutal beyond belief.

The Crumlin Gaol has been visited by Gerry Fitt, Ian Paisley and other Stormont and six county MPs. To hear them talk one would think it was a holiday camp. However, the recently-released Eugene Cassin tells a very different story. On December 22, a nineteen-year-old prisoner, Gerry Loughan, asked to have a few words with the Governor about a pending court case. Two warders, Madden and Hutton, grabbed him and pushed him into a cell and beat him about the stomach and arms. Other prisoners saw the bruises afterwards. Cassin himself was threatened with a kicking on his genitalia, while a third first offender prisoner, John McDonagh, having had a squabble about tobacco

with another prisoner, was badly beaten up by warders McFarland and Young. McFarland likes to boast of having been present at the last hanging in the prison. When the prisoners complained to the Board of Visitors about very inadequate food after a hard day's work, the Board saw nothing wrong with the food and two JPs were called in and the eleven prisoners were sentenced to 22 days solitary confinement with no papers, letters, visitors or tobacco and only 10 minutes recreation and exercise each day. 'Nothing but the Holy Bible, lads,' said the Governor.

This is the Government that is proposing to have great goings-on and celebrations to celebrate their fifty years of misrule next June, and 'To improve the unfair image of Ulster that our enemies have put out about us'.

Last weekend a very nasty thing happened in the six counties. Four men were found chained to lamp-posts after having been tarred and feathered by the IRA. One of these men was a sexual deviant. What good these brutal arbiters of Fascist-like punishment imagine tarring and feathering can do to a sick man who is in need not of punishment but of psychiatric help, I cannot fathom. Tarring and feathering is a form of punish-

Continued on page 4

ANGUS MAUDE, MP, attacks us (Sunday Express, 17.1.71) in the above terms for the attack on Mr. Carr. The BHC, which interviewed Sebastian Scragg, Mary Goldman and myself for its 'World this Weekend' programme, did attempt to put the affair in some perspective when it was made clear that the vast majority of anarchists here would not condone violence in the present circumstances in Britain. The point about Maude's attack and the headlines during the week is that anarchists make good scapegoats for popular propaganda and for the police if they should fail to discover the identity of those actually responsible.

The situation is not without its humour. Predictably all the politicians closed ranks on the issue and Mr. Wilson, in describing it as a 'major crime', said that even his wife had been threatened after her book of poetry was published. Was it so bad that lovers of good literature had to resort to such an extremity?

History has demonstrated that politicians are the most ghastly murderers of all. Private crime falls into insignificance by comparison with the horrors of war and persecution—the life of the state. Most of us are unlikely to think the lives of politicians are specially precious or that the demise of one is a unique tragedy. The man who threw CS gas into the House of Commons to enable the politicians to get a taste of what they are responsible for in Belfast was guilty of nothing more heinous than poetic justice. And if a Brazilian or South African victim of British arms were to bring retribution back on the heads of those responsible here could we blame him?

Murderers Unite!

A comprehensive list of details of our Wednesday night meetings should appear next week. (Julius has asked me to announce an evening with the Ranters.) If you have ideas for same perhaps you would ring Graham (247 9249) or myself (248 4690, 248 3771, 9.30 a.m.-5.30 p.m.). Or come along any Wednesday night to Freedom at 8 p.m. and any Sunday night to the Marquis of Granby, Cambridge Circus, 7.30 p.m. onwards. Yes, we do want to kill the State!

Squatters' Choice

Messrs. Ron Bailey and Jim Radford

THIS WORLD

came to the East End last Thursday when a public meeting was held in Toynbee Hall. The idea was to start a local squatters' organisation. Complete with bureaucracy. I have already stated in this column that this development in the squatting movement will, if allowed to spread, ruin the revolutionary nature on which it was based. Already the reformists have made the distinction by referring to themselves as the 'Legal Squatters'. We were told at Thursday's meeting that the public resented those who lived rent-free and it was mooted that rents be collected. Taken with the suggestion that paid officials be employed it seemed obvious to me how the rents were to be spent. Jobs for the boys! At Burrell House the now departed leader there said at one meeting (in my hearing) that he felt he was entitled to spend the money which was collected every week from the families as he saw fit—including trips to the public house. They learned their lesson there and have a sound, leaderless, co-operative organisation. Significantly, all the representatives from Burrell House left the Toynbee Hall meeting at the point when a leadership for the new group was to be appointed.

From their very lips

'Politics is a very dirty game. Those who play the dirtiest get off the best. To your prospective candidate I would say that the dirtier he can play the game in this division, the better it would be for the Party as a whole.'—Mr. F. W. Harris, MP.

'I have been making dirty shabby compromises all my political life.'—Mr. (now Lord) George Brown, MP, as quoted by Kevin McGrath in PEACE NEWS, October 11, 1968.

Love In Jail

Great indignation was expressed by the Home Office last week when a solicitor maintained that his client had fucked his now pregnant girl friend while serving time in Aylesbury prison. As it turned out the story was invented by the girl friend to win sympathy for her man. What is interesting to us is that while

some countries have progressed sufficiently to permit even a prisoner's sex life to continue normally (or partly so) it is a characteristic of the British establishment to perpetuate puritanism to the present day. Others have realised that there is, in practice, a very vicious aspect to puritanism in terms of malformation and perversion. The consulting rooms of psychiatrists are filled with the victims of sexual repression. And prisons are breeding grounds not merely for further crime but for sexual abnormalities to boot.

Hitting where it hurts

The Prime Minister, Mr. Heath, has expressed anger at the heckling which greeted him in Delhi over the issue of supplying arms to racist South Africa. He protested against making ethical judgments on the internal politics of other countries. Nobody will be impressed by this nonsense that surely Heath himself recognises as such. He, for example, has been one of many who have denounced the tyranny of Nazi Germany, not to speak of the incessant attacks that he and his fellow politicians make on the communists—with as much justification as their attacks on the capitalist West. Readers will remember the irony of 1956 when Russia denounced Britain and France for their attack on Suez and the bombing raids on densely populated slum areas with the inevitably large casualty list, while at the same time the West bitterly criticised Russia for its undoubted imperialism and terror in Hungary.

Civilised people are not going to restrict their thinking and actions at the behest of partisan politicians. One aspect of justice involves the concept that we are all responsible for one another and if Mr. Heath chooses to engage in crime with South Africa we are not just going to ignore him. No doubt it would suit him if we connived at his most vulnerable weak-point. We anarchists do not exist for the comfort of mankind's common enemy, the politician.

All Come Tumbling Down

OF THE MANY CLAIMS made in our present-day society, one that never fails to amuse (and sadden) me, is that of the capitalist who says, that because he has financed a business venture, that very fact justifies him taking a greater share of the rewards of that venture. Anyone who has studied even basic economics, will know that the four factors of production are Land, Labour, Capital and Organisation. If one of these factors is absent, then production cannot take place. This fact thus leads to the premise, that all these factors are correspondingly of equal value. Thus, it follows, that Labour is entitled to as much a share of the end rewards as the person providing the capital, each being dependent on the other. Of course, the capitalist will claim that he is risking his capital by putting it in the venture. But, by the same token, the worker is risking his labour. If the venture fails, the financier might well lose his capital, but the worker loses his immediate livelihood. As long as production is geared to profit motives and not needs, then this situation is likely to continue.

The solution will never be found in the goodwill of the capitalist (state or individual). The answer is in the hands of the workers themselves. 'All power to the workers' is no empty slogan, although power in itself is not a desirable object. Control is perhaps a better word. If the workers would only realise their own potential as a force for change, the ultimate results could, in a very short time, be astounding.

The strike is one weapon. The general strike a better one. But, as has been shown in past history, it only leads, in the long run, to limited achievements and has established a union bureaucracy that is little more than an extension of the employees or state's means of manipulation. What is required is real workers' control. The seizing of the means of production and the continuing of that production by the workers themselves. Of course, in isolated conditions, it would most likely be doomed to failure but a really strong co-ordinated movement could well succeed. Sympathy for capitalists and employers might well, at first, be widespread by most distributors, retailers, etc. But, even-

tually, as supplies dwindled in stocks, these very same distributors would soon come to terms with the events and eventually deal direct with the workers' councils themselves and no doubt the workers would soon find their own outlets. The important factor is to ensure that the councils don't merely replace the employers.

Obviously, whilst all this is going on, the state and employers wouldn't stand idly by. No doubt, as usually happens, the forces of repression would be called upon to take over. But, unlike in a strike, and here is one of the strong points of a factory take-over, they would be very hesitant to attack a barricaded factory, especially when a large number was concerned. A factory in this situation is most vulnerable, an attack by Army methods could well destroy the building and its contents. At any sign of the powers of repression gaining the upper hand, there is always the inherent threat that the occupiers themselves might retaliate by destroying their own means of employment, they'd have nothing to lose anyway. Wholesale destruction would become the alternative to real workers' control in such a situation. The choice would be that of the employers and the state. Nothing succeeds like success. In no time at all, such ideas would spread out tentacle-wise into all other walks of life, until control from the bottom could become a reality and not just the dream of the few.

Perhaps the most obvious hope of the present, is that a large, industrial, technically complex society is in danger of becoming top heavy and eventually collapsing under its own weight. Allied with the fact that the young of today, the very ones who have experienced all the so-called advantages of this very industrial society, are the ones who, one day, will be expected to keep the industrial sprawl going. But will they? The evidence is that more and more of today's youth have had enough. From hippy drop-outs to student militants, youth has never before shown so much dissent, a situation which is bound to gain momentum.

The highly skilled needs of modern technology requires qualified fodder to run it. Higher education is imperative and, increasingly so, for more and more

people. In spite of the indoctrination inherent in the education system, more are beginning to see through it and are using their education, in one way or another, to combat the very system they were meant to serve. The real fear which motivates state action against hippies, drug addicts and the like, is not caused by some charitable concern with the individual's health, but by the fact that a society of peace loving, pot-smoking persons would not be capable of serving or maintaining a complex, industrial society. The whole lot would come crashing down.

A handful of striking workers can nowadays paralyse a whole industry, reliant as they are on separate component factories. Already the powers-that-be are expressing concern over this very fact. But they are powerless to act. Industry has become too massive for even them to do anything to halt it. Never has a worker's potential for control been so great, if only he would grasp it and, he must always remember, he doesn't need the approval of a union to strike; striking is an inalienable right of the individual.

At one time, the ultimate threat of inflation being halted by unemployment, could be held over the worker's head. But this is no longer so. We have, at present, a situation in which there are more unemployed than there has been for years and yet galloping inflation is rampant. The simple fact is that industry needs skilled workers in order to continue. To obtain this labour, it has to offer reasonable wages, the mass of unemployed are unskilled. The employer can no longer drop his wages and take his pick of the unemployed. Those with special skills are in a minority; to get them, he has to pay. This of course doesn't help those who are unemployed. However, it does mean, that those in power have lost the use of an age-old industrial weapon. Mass unemployment, in itself, is no longer on their side. In fact, one of the brightest spots on the horizon is that capitalism (state and individual) has already sown the seeds of its own destruction. Perhaps the truly free society of the future, which has been the dream of so many individuals for so long, may, sooner than many think, become a reality, even in the oppressive atmosphere of present-day society. There is room for optimism, and we may yet see a society in which the worker is not exploited of the products of his own labour.

Kronstadt

'The oppression of the Communist dictatorship has provoked the indignation of the working masses. . . . In place of the old regime there has been established a new regime of arbitrary power, intolerance, favouritism, theft and speculation . . . a regime of slavery and degradation. The whole of Russia has been turned into an immense concentration camp.'—From *Isvestia* of Kronstadt, March 15, 1921.

This is the fiftieth anniversary of the revolt. The second issue of *Anarchy* this year is devoted to the topic and it is not my purpose here to pre-empt what will appear there. More generally, Kronstadt provides graphic evidence for the validity of Bakunin's anti-authoritarian stand within the International as opposed to Marx. It also provides practical proof for the ideological position of people like Oscar Wilde who pointed out, in his essay, 'The Soul of Man under Socialism', that the tyranny of state capitalism would exceed that of private capitalism. Wilde's own aspirations could barely be described as anarchic.

Anarchists have always argued that the very possession of power is in itself degrading and, for the revolutionary, self-defeating. We admit that power has its glamour and seems the easy solution to human problems. But an analysis of the nature of power—which apparently is only attempted by anarchists objectively (the classic works by Aristotle and

IRELAND

Continued from page 3

ment that must degrade both those who suffer it and those who carry it out. Punishment is usually useless and can only be of benefit if it reforms the person who committed the misdeed. One feels physically sick. The IRA are the military branch of Sinn Fein, an organisation which talks a great deal about Socialism and always behaves in the most bourgeois-fascist manner possible. They seem almost devoid of any real political sense, and their idea of pleasure is to have a row with the police on often no excuse whatsoever except making trouble, and in the case of one exhibitionist young woman getting herself into the papers. Actually I think she is their evil genius, for some of the wiser members have done good work in ground-rents and against the EEC, etc., but they let her spoil all they do and alienate all other left-wing groups.

The enquiry into the expenditure of the £100,000 allotted for six county relief goes on and becomes more incredible every day. Directly it started a quantity of receipts in the six counties were destroyed. It becomes increasingly obvious to anyone with a glimmer of common-sense that actually, whatever lies Fianna Fail choose to tell, a considerable amount was used to buy guns. If the 26 counties had only been honest and said 'Yes, we did buy guns for our persecuted countrymen to have for defence', no one would have a word to say, but lip-service must be paid and Lynch goes on blathering about 'We never contemplated the use of force or helped with arms in any way'. This, on the top of the Arms Trial, is just TOO MUCH.

There has been a lot of picketing this week. Anti-Apartheid held a very good one yesterday outside the British Embassy about the sale of arms to South Africa, handing in a note of protest. Then we marched carrying torches to the French Commercial Counsellor's office and handed in another protest about the sale of arms by France. On Tuesday and Wednesday a lot of people picketed the children's court, where Justice Eileen Kenny, after having admitted the conditions in our so-called industrial schools are appalling, still continues to make criminals of seven-year-olds and send them there. Also we picketed the head Electricity Supply Board Office about the rise of 6% in the cost of electricity by the Government after they had announced a price freeze. The public received this protest exceedingly well and some even were unwilling to pass the picket to pay their bills, and we were told by real old Dubliners 'God bless you. If only there were more like you,' etc.

The last picket was one by Sinn Fein when Lord O'Neill visited the Inter-Continental Hotel to talk with Lynch. This was a violent picket with them all screaming 'Imperialist' and the aforementioned young woman trying to rush into the hotel so that she could have her photo in the paper as the gardai removed her, screaming.

I hold no brief for Lord O'Neill and Imperialism, but there is a way to conduct pickets, and a way not to. Sinn Fein always use the latter and they bring all protests into disrepute and harden the hearts against any kind of reform of those who are sitting on the fence and could be converted by tact.

Machiavelli only give practical advice on how the different types of power can be best manipulated—reveals that the holder of power must necessarily have his laws obeyed and to that end must employ policemen, wardens and judges along with a vast bureaucracy. That is to say a government must have a special class of supporters as distinct from the general population. That class, where a government like the Russian one has succeeded in destroying the old ruling class, will inevitably arise. Therein is contained the defeat of Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. Revolution and government are incompatible.

Bill Dwyer

Contact

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

STUART CHRISTIE is alive and well, and living at home!

—Black Cross

Leeds Conference. Pre-Conference Bulletin, an information service giving views, dates of conference, views wanted, etc. Send to Ray Brooks, 79 Norfolk Street, Lancaster, Lancs.

Dave Smith, formerly of Southall, can now be contacted at 10 Berwick Avenue, Hayes, Middlesex.

Help Required for Community/Social Action. Hammersmith (Barons Court, West Kensington, Shepherds Bush). Several Projects under way. Comrades who live locally needed. Plenty of work to do. All interested phone Reg 603 0550.

To: John Underwood and Peter Howley, Nr. Tadcaster, Yorks. As we have not heard from you since we replied on November 23 in answer to your letter of November 19, we can only assume something happened to it. From January 23 we will have someone nearer to you, so why not contact Dave and Ella, c/o Graham & Jeanette, 11 Melton Road, Kettlethorpe, Wakefield, Yorks.

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

Stop The Cuts Campaign against the attacks being made on our Social Services. To Plan our Campaign against the implementation of these cuts we are organising a Public Meeting, Central Library, Bancroft Road (off Mile End Road), Thursday, February 4, at 7.30 p.m. Support and financial assistance are needed to: M. Houlihan, 85 Swanton Road, Lincoln Estate, E.3, phone 987 8665.

Peggy King. Please contact Geoffrey Hazard still at same address.

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.

History Workshops. Saturday and Sunday, February 13 and 14, 1971. Send for full details to: Ruskin College, Oxford.

The Anarchists. 1/- P.O. Box A 389, Sydney South, NSW 2000, Australia.

Exeter Group. Anyone interested in getting a group together contact: Nigel Outten, Westeria House, Cullompton Hill, Bradninch, Exeter. If possible, please write first.

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

Durham Anarchists—new group being formed. Contact Mike Mogie, 8 Mavin Street.

Proposed Group: Kingston-on-Thames and surrounding area. Write to Roger Willis, 69 Woodlands Avenue, New Malden, Surrey.

Comrades in Plymouth wishing to form group or just meet other anarchists. Contact: John Northey, 16 Adelaide Street, Stonehouse, Plymouth.

Urgent. Help fold and dispatch FREEDOM every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.