

EVERY COUNTRY with a government and a state apparatus is an occupied country. The land and the natural resources have been requisitioned by the occupying rulers who have imposed their laws and their regulations upon the population, who are compelled by want and fear to work on the masters' terms in the masters' factories for the masters' profits.

The rights of occupation, dignified and made permanent by the word 'ownership', were originally fought for with sword and lance; now they are defended by prison and bayonet. Disraeli's description of England as 'two nations' was, and is, absolutely right. It was and is 'Us' and 'Them'. They are the occupiers, we the occupied. The myths of nationalism; the shoddy confidence trick of patriotism, misusing one's sense of identity with place and people, these smother the reality of occupation when government and governed are of the same 'nationality'. The distinction is made abundantly clear when the occupying forces speak a 'foreign' language, swoop by plane or ship into your familiar environment wearing unfamiliar clothes and by force of arms conquer you and compel you to obey their commands.

The British in their days of Imperial glory; the Germans in France; the Americans in Vietnam; Russia's Mongolian troops in Budapest or Prague—they were and are all as unacceptable as aliens from another planet. The foreign invader sticks out like a sore thumb and can be seen as the hated, imposed, master race. When it is a master class, the image is blurred.

But in Northern Ireland today, the image is not blurred. Although 'the province' is legally part of the British Isles, the presence of the British Army is as insulting as if they were men from Mars—and just about as bloody helpful. Although we were assured that the original

BRITISH ARMY—OUT!

occupation was welcomed by the Catholics, the most sorely oppressed part of the community, who went in fear of the hidden arsenals of the Protestants, it is now Catholic gunmen who are escalating the conflict because the hated presence of troops has not brought—and cannot ever bring—any solution to the problems of the Northern Irish people.

All that the British Army is doing in Ulster is to try to put the lid on the boiling pot—to keep law and order. This sterile excuse for a policy was doomed to failure. The very fact of military occupation was an admission of failure.

What the Northern Irish were asking for was jobs and homes and equality between the religions in the securing of these pathetic demands. It seems that this was too much to ask for, and instead of an attempt to bring the communities together, division was institutionalised by barbed wire down the middle of the street.

This mindless occupation is now in its second year. We wrote nearly a year ago (FREEDOM, 11.4.70, 'All Law is Gun Law') that the Catholics who originally welcomed the troops were now on the streets stoning them and that disillusionment with the British occupation was setting in.

Well, the iron must really now have entered the soul of the people of Belfast and Ballymurphy. Nearly two years of tension, conflict and curfew. Nearly two years of rubber bullets and CS gas. Nearly two years of the face of the State glaring in at your window.

Now they have had the lesson; now they have had the portrait of the enemy drawn for them on the pavements outside their very own

doors. Now perhaps Catholic and Protestant alike can see that the State doesn't give a rat's piss for their homes or jobs or children.

In fact the State is sending in other mothers' children to fight in the streets—for the 'soldiers' who were pulled out of a pub the other night and shot down were no more than 17—repeat **seventeen**—years old.

Over and over again, reporters have referred to the youth of the rioters. Ugly stories have circulated about the IRA (either the 'official' IRA or the New, more militant 'provisional' IRA) pushing kids forward on to the barricades. The fact is, of course, that the kids can't be kept off the barricades. But the question we must ask is—what are we to think of the Christian State which sends seventeen-year-old boys into a hot spot like Belfast?

Inexperienced and innocent, these stupid children have fallen for the kid stuff about 'A Man's Life in the British Army'. Ignorant of damn nearly everything after ten years of British education and particularly ignorant of Irish politics (and no wonder, by Christ!), at an age when a girl is not allowed to decide for herself whether she can have the contraceptive pill, these boys are shovelled into uniform and into a situation seething with hate for what they stand for.

Oh yes, now we know. The British Minister responsible for the Army has decided that no soldier under 18 must be allowed to serve in Northern Ireland—or any other combat zone. Oh, big deal!

Well, WE have made a decision too. It is that NO British soldier should be serving in Northern Ire-

land!

We maintain that the presence of the Army has solved nothing. On the contrary it has made matters worse. It has aggravated the situation until now the population can see no other solution but that which the British Government have taught them: the gun.

Where is the education programme, where the conciliation, where the social reconstruction, where even is the cooling-off that the troops were supposed to bring about? Nowhere!

In only one way has the presence of troops done any good—and that by accident and not at all in the way the Government wanted. It has brought together some militants from both sides of the religious barriers in a common hatred of the

troops. The soldiers have in fact presented a picture of occupation so clear that even Protestants and Catholics can recognise it. They have all had more than a glimpse of the State and can now see who the real enemy is.

Fellow workers of Northern Ireland! Can you not recognise NOW that it is not your neighbour of the different faith who is your enemy; it is the Institution which grinds you both down. The State cynically uses people just like you from this side of the Irish Sea, to keep you divided and to keep you down.

And on both sides of the water, we can unite in one call, at least: **BRITISH ARMY OUT OF NORTHERN IRELAND—NOW!**

JUSTIN.

SOME OF MY BEST FRIENDS ARE PATRIALS

MR. HEATH has tossed another carcass to the Tory wolves following his sledge. The Immigration Bill now going through Parliament out-Powells Powell in its concessions to the worst side of the Tory nature. Not only does it make it necessary for immigrants to register regularly at a police station but it creates an absolutely new category—by dredging the classical dictionary—of 'patrials' which would seem at first sight an elegant way of saying 'white'. However if you have a nasty thing to say politicians have found it saves their face to put it in Latin, hence 'redundancy' and 'liquidation'.

'Patrials' are the superior class of people whose parents (or parent) were born in this country so they are eligible to stay on if they can work, are well off enough not to, or can stand the climate.

We are now entering into the category of nations with pass laws, the South Africans finished up with about sixteen—it's early days yet! There has been some 'tut-tutting' at the terrible indignity of checking in at a police station and how it would worsen the relations between immigrants and the police—what relations? It's just as degrading to go to a Labour Exchange to prove

what is your right to life, liberty and the pursuit of a job as it is to go to a police station. In fact, like the 'patrial' myth, it disguises the real repressive function of the law if it takes place in a 'respectable' institution.

It seems to be the aim of the Tory Government—like every other government—to make things appear to be being done rather than doing them. The Industrial Relations Bill will not cut down the number of strikes—this Bill will not appreciably lessen the number of immigrants—the Labour Government's legislation and a measure of unemployment are seeing to that.

As for Mr. Powell's desire for voluntary repatriation, this is in the Bill too—thus forcing Mr. Powell into a further slide into racism in advocating forcible repatriation. Not that with the present provisions in the Bill such a thing is not possible for misconduct—even for the misconduct of a member of one's family. The sins of the fathers will be visited upon the children and the virtues of the fathers in being born the right colour, in the right place, at the right time, will be visited upon them with the honour of being allowed to stay and work here.

J.R.

Trying to Control the Rank and File

THE END OF the postal strike has brought a victory for the Government but a defeat not only for the postal workers but also all workers and especially those who are at present involved in negotiations. The Government can claim that wages 'have been stabilised and there is some sign of them coming down'.

In view of this situation, coupled with the result of the postal strike, Mr. Heath, the Prime Minister, was willing to meet Mr. Feather, General Secretary of the TUC.

To have refused would have meant driving the TUC into a more militant attitude towards the Industrial Relations Bill. Unlike some of his backwoodsmen supporters, he is too astute a politician to want to smash the unions, for in highly industrialised societies, the unions play an important part in ensuring smooth operation. Employers and Government Ministers would not relish getting round the table with the overalled callous-handed workers from the shop floor. Such people would be directly affected by what was being negotiated and would therefore drive a hard bargain. However the gentlemen from the TUC are just as much concerned with inflation, declining investments and unofficial strikes as are the employers in the Confederation of British Industry.

Mr. Heath's talks with the CBI and Mr. Campbell Adamson, the Director General, have urged measures which will reflate the economy. He said that the economy was 'not going along as fast as its productive potential'. Reflation was needed 'to get unused, or most of the unused, productive capacity of the country to work again. We need investment to take place and industry must see a return on investment. Liquidity in our view is vital.' Mr. Feather said much the same thing to Mr. Heath. They are not just going to talk about wages, but also prices, productivity, investment and profits.

HIGH CLAIMS AT FORDS

Clearly all see eye to eye on the basics. The differences lie in the amount of wages that employers are prepared to pay. The TUC is obviously anxious to get some agreement on how to run the economy, but it is also embarrassed by high wage claims such as that being made at Fords.

A tripartite agreement is, in modern-day capitalist terms, the best way to ensure a smooth-running economy. The Industrial Relations Bill is really an anachronism introduced because it was thought that the TUC was unwilling or, as is more likely, unable to co-operate. Unable because of the continual pres-

sure from the rank-and-file trade union movement who see their unions as organisations for improving wages and conditions and not as a third party to ensure a smooth running and strikeless economy.

The trend on the part of the trade unions has been a continuous one. It was only the Government's and the employers' natural suspiciousness and their disinclination to share industrial power which has delayed the process of integration. This process will continue and will mean that the workers' struggle will be increasingly against the trade union leaders as well as employers and the Government.

NEED ONE ANOTHER

Mr. Heath is aware that in a 'democracy' the Government needs the TUC as much as the TUC needs the Government. Meetings between the two have been absent of late, but Thursday's get-together could be the 'beginning of a dialogue'.

Differences were mainly over the timing of reflation. The Government wants wage increases to be kept down to reduce inflation, while the TUC wants immediate economic growth to cut unemployment. This growth would encourage investment and stimulate further

Continued on page 4

Anarchy on the Old Plantation

MR. SIMON LEGREE, the well-known slave owner, has threatened to take his plantations away from England because the labour situation is not producing the right kind of slaves. He threatens to open up new fields in German, Japan or India, anywhere where the labourers have been conditioned to obedience by previous training or by starvation.

He claims that the ability of British slaves to stop working for a while, and to choose their masters makes it uneconomic for him to carry on in Britain. His most bitter complaint is about the apparatus set up by British slaves to negotiate the length of their fetters (any fetter under eight links is barred by British slave unions). He also points out that the union's ability to govern the size of whip and the number of

strokes which must be administered makes it difficult for him to carry on.

The British Prime Minister is anxious to accommodate Mr. Legree and has pointed out that he has on the Statute Book a Bill to stop slaves running away without giving due notice. It also includes provisions for negotiating deals in slavery and for provisions to stop people like Wilberforce, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Garrison and other agitators pointing out that slaves are slaves.

The Prime Minister is anxious to meet Mr. Legree and talk over the situation with him. It would be a pity if the slave trade upon which so much of our exports and balance of payments depend were allowed to pass into other hands because of these agitators and anarchists.

JACK SPRATT,

1871, 1921, 1971

THIS MONTH, the hundredth anniversary of the Paris Commune is being commemorated by the revolutionary left, and the fiftieth anniversary of the Kronstadt Commune is being commemorated by the libertarian left.

The Paris Commune is in fact being remembered not only by all those who would have supported it a century ago or would support it if it happened again today, but also by many of those who would have opposed it then and would oppose it now, especially if it happened here. Articles are appearing not just in the papers of the left-wing groups which are descended from those actually involved in the unsuccessful rising but also in the liberal papers which are descended from—and in some cases are the same as—those which shrank in hatred and horror from the spectre of revolution in 1871. And several commercial publishers are publishing new books or republishing old books to cash in on the casual interest

in people who would have rejected such interest with utter contempt.

Some anarchists took part in the Paris Commune, many Communards later became anarchists, and the anarchist movement used to take its part in the anniversary celebrations of the Commune when these were held every year. We still honour the brave men and women (and children) who attempted to carry out the last French revolution against impossible odds a hundred years ago and died in thousands when their attempt was smashed by the overwhelming force of the reaction. But we cannot accept that, as Bakunin argued at the time, the Commune became a libertarian socialist movement despite itself (just as we cannot accept that, as Marx argued at the time, the Commune became a proletarian socialist movement). We are more inclined, after studying the facts rather than the myths, to accept the argument of Kropotkin and many other anarchists that the Parisians concentrated

too much first on the elections to the Commune council and then on its petty proceedings and on the squalid struggles between the various parties and personalities, rather than on the fundamental work of the social revolution itself. But this whole subject will be dealt with in a special issue of *Anarchy* to commemorate the fall of the Commune on May 28 rather than the rise of the Commune on March 18, and including the first English translation of some of the writings on the Commune by Bakunin and by Louise Michel, as well as a review of the available books on the subject.

Paris rose on March 18, 1871: Kron-

stadt fell on March 17, 1921. But compared with the hundredth anniversary of the Paris Commune the fiftieth anniversary of the Kronstadt Commune has been greeted with a deafening silence, not just by the Marxists from whom it would have been expected, but also by those to the left and right of them from whom it is rather surprising. The destruction of a socialist revolution by a liberal regime a century ago is news; the destruction of a socialist revolution by a socialist regime half a century ago is not news. Why?—because it is too obscure or confusing, or because there are too few pretty pictures?

Only a few anarchists took part in the Kronstadt Commune, but anarchists have always had a special interest in it, and the whole subject is dealt with in a special issue of *Anarchy* coming out this month, including reprints of some of the writings on Kronstadt by Alexander Berkman and Anton Ciliga, as well as a review of the recent book

by Paul Avrich on the subject.

Last month, the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Peter Kropotkin was hardly commemorated at all, except by a lecture at the South Place Ethical Society and an article in *New Society* reviewing two recent editions of American collections of his writings. The difference in the treatment of the hundredth anniversary of Lenin's birth last year is instructive—a successful dictator is remembered; an unsuccessful anti-dictator is ignored. Quite a lot of new or forgotten material by and about Kropotkin has been printed recently in both *Erratum* and *Anarchy*, and more will follow in due course—not to establish a cult of personality, but to make available some of the obscure but valuable work of a writer whose most important ideas are often the least known. Perhaps the best way of commemorating him would be to help the paper he founded 85 years ago.

J.V.

Times of Pollution

MR. BERNARD LEVIN after his quarrel with Viscount Rothermere of the *Daily Mail* (when Levin declared last June that he would vote Labour) has taken up a bi-weekly column in *The Times*. Judging by the prospects of the *Daily Mail* it may have been a wise thing to do. Even for *The Times* it may have been a wise thing to hire Levin, for their circulation position is not too happy, they sacked Steadman their cartoonist recently, probably for his too iconoclastic views so they are not being honoured by Mr. Levin for their tolerance. Even the cracked *Mirror* has taken on Bill Tidy (of *Private Eye*) for a cartoon series.

It is not unknown for newspapers to carry the views of someone opposed to their usual editorial viewpoint (e.g. the careers of Vicky and Low) in order to rope in a little extra circulation (I only buy it for Vicky) but Bernard Levin seems to take a perverse delight in standing issues upon their head. An article printed upside down in a newspaper would doubtless get more readers than any other. Levin seems deliberately to go out of his way to publicize the opposite views to those of the journal for which he works. He started his series with a pro-postman article on the strike—being a columnist he has not yet had to refer to the same subject again.

On Thursday, February 25, Mr. Levin in an article 'Pollution May Be Good For You' reached an all-time low. Admittedly there is something odious about everybody climbing on the anti-pollution bandwagon, especially those adverts sponsored by pollutant manufacturers, but Levin turns journalism into entertainment.

Levin examines the case of a cement works at Houghton Regis which was the subject of an anti-pollution order. It closed eventually, Levin implies that this was because of the court order, but it was stated by the company that this was not the case. He goes on to say that one hundred and seventy men will be unemployed because of the closing of the cement works so there would be no occasion to rejoice in Houghton Regis at the disappearance

of a pollutant.

He goes on to quote the report of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, 'Without adequate planning the overall effect could be a grave deterioration in the quality of the environment, which would outweigh the benefits of efficient anti-pollution measures'. Levin points out that we are not faced with the choice between a society with pollution or with anti-pollution safeguards but with pollution and the 'benefits it brings' (Levin's phrase) and a society without those benefits. He goes on to itemize some further 'benefits'—detergents, the motor car, the indestructible plastic container, the heavy lorry and pesticides; the usefulness of which outweigh their capability to pollute the earth, the water, the silence and the food-chain.

Rightly, but in the wrong way, he sneers at those who would take the benefits of the detergents, etcetera, but preach against their use. There are always those who will say 'I must have my motor car even though it contributes to the deterioration of the environment because it is necessary to my existence'.

Levin's position is like that of many, because he cannot live in a society without compromise he accepts the compromise, indeed he maximises it, and often, as in this example, he elevates his necessity to a virtue.

True, as things are workers must accept jobs, more or less, where they find them and they cannot always be too particular about the nature and social consequences of their work. But every man, even Bernard Levin, draws the line somewhere, he would not sell his grandmother to a white-slaver for example or accept cannibalism whilst rejecting vegetarianism.

Indeed it is a measure of man's ethical stature that he has an ability to discriminate between that which is socially useful and desirable and that which is financially profitable.

It is not even arguable that contributions to pollution of the atmosphere such as a cement works are financially rewarding. Industrial diseases, such as asbestosis and silicosis are still with us and a cement-lined lung is not a profitable investment.

Levin's chief deficit in his argument is that the manufacturers of motor cars, of detergents, of plastic containers, of pesticides, indeed of the majority of things manufactured in the world today, are interested in the public good or even in providing work in depressed areas. The main interest of manufacturers is the profit motive and if a thing made more nastily, more dangerously, more often makes more profit, more profit is made.

It is no concern of the manufacturers of cigarettes or armaments that their products deal out death and destruction; it is their concern if they fail to bring a dividend.

We have the right (and almost the necessity) to protest, both as consumers and producers, at the flagrant examples of exploitation and pollution of the environment.

It is just possible, as Bernard Levin seems to hint, that we cannot have this technological society without pollution. Bernard Levin and *The Times* being the apex of this society, no doubt we shall probably have to do without.

JACK ROBINSON.

PORTUGAL - the Forgotten Fascism

IN PORTUGAL, the death penalty was abolished over 100 years ago. Therefore, no one can OFFICIALLY be executed as in Spain where capital punishment is 'legal'. This is a piece of luck for the Portuguese Fascist régime for this permits them to kill opponents quietly and discreetly without the fuss of court cases, appeals and international opinion. Portuguese fascism cannot admit its crimes for they are in violation of its own constitution. Thus, all those executed in Portugal for political or social reasons are deemed to have died from illness (theoretically true in certain cases given the conditions of detention), accident or attempted escape. This should bring one to the conclusion that there are no political crimes in 'holy' Portugal or in its colonies in Africa. However, the reality is quite different.

cruel and tragic. Something that nobody mentions for it is embarrassing. A total of 78 people have been executed in recent years by the Salazar and Caetano régimes.

Killed in cold blood. Why? They demanded a just and free régime for Portugal. These men believed, perhaps as you do, in justice and democracy. The international press has said nothing about these heroes. The press has not even accused the régime that committed these crimes. The press ignores the fact that this régime continues to assassinate with impunity all those who dare to oppose it. However, justice will be done and will be seen to be done. THE PORTUGUESE RESISTANCE WILL AVENGE THESE CRIMES!!!

In Spain, the execution of a freedom fighter does not go unnoticed. They are equally cruel, but less hypocritical. The

recent trial of the Basques is an example. The inquisition continues in Spain and Portugal. This concerns not only these countries, but the whole world. If you allow them to kill and imprison without a protest, if you do nothing, then it will be you that may be killed or imprisoned. For if you were in Portugal, you would suffer this fate.

For our part, we can do little other than to make known our indignation, our anger and call for international solidarity. However, the day will come when Fascism will be smashed in Iberia; Basques, Catalans, Spaniards and Portuguese united in the reconquest of their peninsula from the forces of reaction. For to be free is more than a right, it is a duty that must be accomplished by political and by armed struggle. Here lies the moral foundation of the violence of the Iberian peoples.

PORTUGUESE LIBERATION FRONT.
Translated by T.L.

Thinking with her Heart

Dear Brethren and Sisters,

These comments have been unavoidably delayed but are still relevant.

The comrade whose book review appeared on January 16 obviously has deep feelings about Irish history. I regret to point out that this led her to make assertions which cannot stand up to rational examination.

The only people who always forget and never learn are the British, who, to this very day, think they can turn the Irish into nice little Englishmen by mailed fists and brute force and imprisonments and killings.

The first part of this seems unlikely.

The capacity for learning from experience appears to be pretty evenly distributed throughout the human species. If we assume 'H' meant, not 'the British race', but 'successive London Governments', I still cannot agree with her. While recognising, as all anarchists do, that the state is based on brute force, I don't believe the British state is using this force for the purpose of turning Irishmen into Englishmen.

'H' probably has little love for the Protestants of Ulster. But if we must talk about race, she should recognise that these people are predominantly 'Celtic', not 'Anglo-Saxon'. They have more pipe bands per head of population than Auld Caledonia itself, and there are few things less 'English' than the great Highland war pipe.

'H' says that Ireland is still not free. From an anarchist point of view, this is also true of England. Therefore I must assume she is talking in Republican terms. 'Ireland divided never can be free.' Trouble is, an All-Ireland Republic would simply mean a million resentful Protestants instead of half a million resentful Catholics. Both groups sometimes mutter about 'final solutions', but I presume none of us regard these as either practical or desirable.

If there is any possibility of uniting Ireland, it certainly won't be on a 'wrap the green flag round me boys' basis.

Yours fraternally,

DAVE COULL.

Police Strike

CRIME FIGURES SLUMP

TWENTY THOUSAND New York police go on strike—and the crime rate goes down. About the only people to have suffered are schoolchildren who are in greater danger from traffic. This seems to put the pig in place.

Governor Rockefeller was ready to send in troops when the police struck for more pay, but there have even been fewer robberies than usual. A bewildered sergeant explained that the underworld must have 'its own peculiar code of honour'.

In fact, the main contribution of the strike to so-called 'crime' is likely to be the possible imprisonment of its leaders for contempt of court. They are disobeying not only a court order to go back to work, but also their unions.

INT JACKSON.

(Source: *Evening Standard*)

STEPHEN MCCARTHY PROTEST

Saturday, 20 March

12—2pm Picket outside Upper St. Police Station, Islington

2.30pm Public Meeting in Chapel Market, NI probably followed by a March

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



PRESS FUND

January 19 to March 15

Whithy: P.R. 50p; London, N.7: J.H.J. £3.01; Texas: M.B. 40p; London, E.2: W.J.G. 50p; London: T.H. £1.00; Enfield: R.M.B. 50p; London: Collected in Bookshop £11.50; London: D.R. £1.91; London, N.W.2: D.S. £5.00; By Banker's Order: T.P. 50p; S.M. £1.00; S.G. 50p; Brighton: F.J. 35p; Manchester: W.S.W. £3.40; Bangor: J.T. £5.00; Wolverhampton: J.K.W. 50p; J.L. £1.00; New York: L.M. £2.20; Milan: T.O. £1.50; Oxford: Anon 35p; Cambridge: J.C.J. 50p; New York: L.M. £4.20; Winborne: D.M. £1.50; Frankfurt: H.B. 50p; Berkeley: E.A.B. £6.25; New Orleans: J.S. 70p.

Total: £54.27
Income Sales & Subs.: £390.58

£444.85

Deficit b/f.: £35.12

£409.73

Expenditure
(8 weeks at £150.00): £1,200.00

DEFICIT: £790.27

afib

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, Heslington, 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, Primrose, Lancaster.

Corwall: A. Jacobs, 13 Ladrak Road, St. Austell, (M. Mo. B.)

East & E. Herts.: P. Newell, 'Aspen', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (QM, FL.)

Surrey: O. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.

Yorkshire: Martin Watkins, Flat D, 90 Clarendon Road, Leeds, LS2 9L.

Scotland: Temporary Secretary, Neil Munro, 201 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—badges; Q—Quarterly; FL—free lunch.)

ANARCHISTS AND MAOISM

NOT LONG AGO Maoist groups were refusing to believe that there is a rapprochement going on between Albania and Yugoslavia, now it is between Yugoslavia and China, and the evidence is growing irrefutable so that in all probability they have heard it from Chinese sources—the only ones they will believe.

I expect they also refuse to believe that China is ordering bombers from the USA—just as two or three years ago they held it to be an American-spread slander that China had sold the American air force steel used for making bombs to drop on Hanoi. (What the Americans would have to gain from spreading that particular slander is hard to guess.)

At one time it was a slander to suggest that Mao's close friend Ayub Khan was a dictator and a reactionary one at that. Now it is a slander to suggest that Ayub Khan was ever an ally of Mao. People who hailed him as a sponsor of the Bertrand Russell Peace Fellowship and its show trial of American war crimes in Vietnam, now write with not one flicker of a smile that Ayub Khan was a puppet of the CIA.

The position of the aristocratic quasi-Maoist party leadership of the East Pakistan National Awami League must indeed have been difficult. Fortunately for the Maoists, Yahya Khan has never been hailed as an ally by Mao, and present events in Bengal are not therefore as embarrassing as they might be.

In India the fratricidal conflict between differing Naxalite bands, their anti-intellectualism, which takes book-burning and other such anti-cultural forms, and their neglect of all work in the towns and industry, makes those Naxalites look like the Red Guards divorced from the system in which those Red Guards acted; anti-literate, puritanical, peasant and anti-urban jacqueries.

In the Middle East the Maoist section of the Palestinian Liberation Movement which has sat on the fence between

advocating revolution first in the Arab states and a more vigorous pursuit of its war with Israel, has apparently lost its grip on the guerrilla movement just when Jordan and Egypt are suing for peace, and therefore there are going to be some disillusioned Arab nationalists ready to turn to Maoism.

In Britain Maoists are a little embarrassed by the fact that Peking news agencies are not over-particular about what they claim in the way of revolutionary struggle. So their agency in New Zealand some years back showed pictures of dockers marching for Powell and referred to them as anti-imperialist militants; and so events in Ulster have been portrayed in the official Chinese report over here as being workers, Protestant and Catholic, united against police and soldiers in anti-imperialist struggle.

(Incidentally on the use of the words 'anti-imperialist', a delightful snippet from Trotskyist sources, which condemned Peking for a non-class-based analysis in that it condemned Japan's militarism rather than its imperialism in a recent pronouncement. Why, despite Lenin's work on imperialism—it should be class-based analysis to categorize Japanese rulers and capitalists as imperialists and not as militarists is hard to understand. In the modern day, when so large a proportion of the national wealth goes on arms production, it might well be more accurate to reverse the argument.)

It is not easy to add all these into a coherent picture. It is obvious, both from the news from within China where the military appear to be very much in command, and from the rapprochement with Tito, the palling with Washington, that the period of the Cultural Revolution is over; but to assess what exactly this means is something else.

One cannot make a direct comparison between developments in China for the 22 years since 1949 and the comparable period in Russia between 1917 and 1929

Russia had in 1917 a continuing revolution, from the overthrow of the Tsar, through the regimes of Rodzianko, Prince Lvov, Milyukov, Kerenski, until the October Revolution. That last saw two things. It saw the soviets, the organizations directly founded by the workers themselves and directly controlled by them through delegates elected on the shop floor and subject to recall, abolish the power of much of the old order. This was revolution. It saw those same soviets become incorporated in the classical machinery of the state and eventually become subordinated thereto, opening the door to the emergence of NEPist, managerialist and state capitalist power that carried through the Stalinist counter-revolution.

In China there was never a workers' revolution. There were never soviets, the workers only played a peripheral part in Mao's coming to power—there were strikes, it is true, on the line of march (just as Havana saw a general strike that toppled Batista, and allowed Castro to take power), but there is no record of strike leaders joining the Communist governments thereafter. The Red Army was predominantly a peasant one, led by land-owning, professional class and capitalist (or at least petit bourgeois) elements. There was therefore never a period equivalent to Lenin's imposition of one-man management, never a NEP (since the 'Block of Four Classes' was never disturbed in its power), never a Kronstadt and there did not need to be a Stalin.

So to make a direct comparison between the Cultural Revolution and the Third Period of Stalinism, and the Moscow Trials, is to oversimplify, though I think not to oversimplify unjustifiably, as the resemblance springs up through the differences and persists.

At the time of the Third Period, Stalinism vied with fascism as new forces on the political field, both opposed

to classical bourgeois democracy; both treading underfoot the social democratic collaborators with the bourgeoisie; both equally anxious to shoot and destroy the revolutionary left.

When the Third Period ended, Stalinism joined in popular fronts against fascism going further than the social democrats had ever done in collaboration with the capitalist parties. Not long later, Stalinism reversed itself and aligned with the fascists against the bourgeois capitalist parties, and then soon again reversed itself a second time.

Nowadays there is no appreciable equivalent of fascist force. There are fascist groups no doubt, but these no longer propagate a policy at basic variance with classical capitalism—or perhaps classical capitalism has so modified itself that there is no need for fascism so to do—and, as during the Third Period, the Stalinists (and others, who should know better) are always ready to sling the word 'fascist' round as an inexact term of abuse instead of an exact description of corporativist capitalism. Stalinism (despite the fact that it has frequently acted in a fascist way and the fact that it has in many ways evolved a corporativist system) is not, in the sense that pre-war fascism was, a new force on the political scene, and anyway Mao could hardly engage in an attack on Stalinism per se.

Russian Stalinism largely—in its better manifestations—fulfils the class collaborationist role of the pre-war social democrats; and for the most part, social democracy has become a form of liberal capitalism and, like the remnants of fascism, is now part and parcel of bourgeois democracy.

In these circumstances Maoism cannot emerge from the Third Period either into direct alliance with classical capitalism in a popular front or into alliance with fascism against classical capitalism, and so to this extent the lessons of the past are no longer relevant to an understanding of the present. The issue is important since Stalinism played a predominant part in the defeat of the inter-war revolutionary movement, and that there is a considerable danger that it will play the same role again. L.O.



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

5p

PAPERBACKS

Fear of Freedom	Frich Fromm	0.60
The Sane Society	Frich Fromm	0.80
The Art of Loving	Frich Fromm	0.35
Authority and Delinquency	Alex Comfort	0.35
The Anxiety Makers	Alex Comfort	0.42
Sex in Society	Alex Comfort	0.17
Autobiography of Big Bill Hayward		1.05
Political Philosophy of Bakunin	(ed.) Maximov	1.50
Case of Comrade Tulayev	Victor Serge	0.37
Birth of Our Power	Victor Serge	0.35

HARDBACKS

Anarchy and Order	Herbert Read	1.05
A Question of Living	R. F. McKenzie	0.90
Kronstadt 1921	Paul Avrich	4.00
Talking of Summerhill	A. S. Neill	1.25
Wilhelm Reich (Biography)	Ilse Ollendorff Reich	2.10
The Hawkspur Experiment	W. David Wills	1.20
Throw Away Thy Rod	W. David Wills	0.90

Freedom Press

publsh
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 5 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	

with a recruiting drive, only to find itself barred from the university in question, whilst the officially authorised union has shown not the slightest interest or, worse, has confined itself to bureaucratically obstructing other unions and failed to do any recruiting of its own. There have been cases where the workers firmly refuse to join the authorised union, often with good reason, and hammer on the gates of another union, which often would be pleased to admit them but daren't. There has even been a case where an authorised union has started to recruit members, and then cried off.

Continued on page 4

Unions and the University

MOST PROGRESSIVE trade unionists are aware of the reactionary role of that distinguished body of gentlemen, the TUC General Council. Examples of their activities are:—

(1) After a vendetta by the manual unions in steel, led by the right-wing BISAKTA leadership, to force the progressive CAWU and ASTMS out of the industry, the TUC ordered the latter unions to open their branch books to management, in gross violation of TU principles, as a condition of local recognition;

(2) When the last 'Labour' Government proposed its anti-union legislation, the TUC 'fought' it off by agreeing to take equivalent measures themselves;

(3) Consequently on (2), whenever union bosses have been unable to force their striking members back to work, V. Feather, TUC secretary, has gone scuttling to their rescue. In particular, he broke the two-month Pilkington strike by a promise of no victimisation, which was broken;

(4) The TUC not only obstructed and opposed the call for a one-day token stoppage on December 8 against the Tory anti-union Bill, but used the occasion for a red-baiting, McCarthyite witch-hunt.

So that there should be absolutely no mistake about whose side they were on, this august conclave of doughty knights and peers of the realm, at their 1970 Congress, elected as their chairman none other than the grand-daddy of all blacklegs—Lord Cooper of St. Helens!

A recent but less publicised achievement of this gang of assorted works policemen and left-talking windbags relates to university workers. On every campus in the country, apart from the dons (organised by the Association of University Teachers, which is outside the TUC), there are a host of other workers: clerks, porters, technicians, cleaners, canteen staff, etc. The technicians have long been organised by ASTMS in most universities, but apart from odd groups the manuals and office-workers are non-union. Sporadic attempts have been made, both by union officials and left-wing students, to organise these workers (which number some 45,000, inclusive of the technicians) but with scant success. The average union bureaucrat, of course, prefers to sit back in his office and count the takings from the 'check-off' in a management-enforced closed shop, rather than make the effort

to break into an unorganised field.

Early in 1970, however, ASTMS won for the university technicians on the 'Redbrick Agreement' (national pay scheme) a 21% pay rise, following a job-evaluation exercise to determine comparison with similar workers elsewhere. Naturally this aroused interest in unionism amongst other campus workers who in some places began clamouring to be admitted to ASTMS. This would have provided an excellent opportunity for a concerted drive by the clerical and manual unions to unionise the universities. Instead, however, the TUC hierarchs, doubtless fearing that ASTMS, the dominant union in the industry, might use its strength here for progressive ends, in contrast to BISAKTA in steel (see note above), decided to parcel out the universities amongst a small number of unions over the heads of the workers concerned. The workers were classified as manuals, clerks and technicians and in each university a union (or unions) was given sole rights for each group. Where several unions had been stipulated for one group of workers, they were enjoined to come to a local agreement to eliminate competition.

The unions involved were, in descending order of allocation for each group:—

Manuals:
NUPE, TGWU, NUGMW.

Clerks:
NALGO, NUPE, CAWU, TGWU.

Technicians:
ASTMS, AUEFW.

Thus no provision was made for craftsmen to have access to the more specialised unions (EPTU, ASB, ASWPD, etc.) catering for their trades; they were expected to join general manual unions. Disdaining this, many such workers tried to gain entry to ASTMS by passing themselves off as technicians, thus causing trouble between ASTMS and the manual unions and defeating the alleged object of the whole exercise, namely, to avoid inter-union disputes.

However, a far more serious objection is to the manner of allocation of recruiting franchises to the various unions. This was done solely on the basis of existing membership, without any consultation of the unorganised workers. Whilst this was acceptable for the mostly well-organised technicians, where in most universities an ASTMS membership of 70% or more, obtained without management pressure or against it, made

a ballot superfluous, it produced anomalous results amongst the largely unorganised manuals and clerks. For example, if amongst 200 otherwise non-union manuals in a university was one ex-gasworker who had kept up his GMW membership, this would be enough to give this union monopoly rights to these workers, even if he had made vigorous attempts to enrol his mates and had been firmly rebuffed owing to the reactionary, bureaucratic nature of the GMW. In such a case, of course, the union's 'recruiting rights' become in practice a franchise to act as dog-in-the-manger by doing no recruiting oneself, and squealing to the TUC whenever another union shows its face.

The proper way to fix 'spheres of influence' in a largely unorganised industry is of course to consult the workers themselves. In the universities, this should be done by:

(1) Each union wishing to recruit a particular occupational group on a given campus must hold a public meeting, or, better still, all the contesting unions hold a joint meeting in which all could publicly criticise each other's record of service to its members, and the university workers make their own judgement in the light of the discussion. The latter type of meeting should be chaired by an impartial trade-unionist, e.g. from the local Trades Council or a union with no axe to grind in universities;

(2) The workers being contested must be balloted. If one union gets over 50% of the vote, that union gets exclusive rights; otherwise all may recruit in fair competition until a further ballot produces a vote of over 50% for one union.

However, such an approach is complete anathema to any union apparatchnik, to whom the working class are not human beings with hands, eyes and minds of their own, but so many cards in a filing cabinet, to be locked away and hoarded until they can be pulled out, shuffled and dealt for his arrogant poker-games of power politics and empire-building.

Not content with this cynical carve-up, these grands seigneurs then proceeded, without waiting to see whether the university workers were sufficiently satisfied with their allotted unions to join them, to settle with the university managements, above the workers' heads, as to how they would be represented by the unions

in negotiations. The result was an abortion of an agreement providing for a Central Council on which there would be 15 employers' spokesmen, a chairman nominated by the employers, and 12 union representatives, two from each of ASTMS, AUEFW, TGWU, NUPE, NALGO and the GMW. The CAWU was arbitrarily left out in the cold with local recognition only, doubtless because of its fighting record in industry (shades of steel!). In addition, three joint sub-committees were set up, for manuals, clerks and technicians. Again, the progressive CAWU was frozen out of the clerks' committee, although the TGWU, with fewer recruiting franchises for clerks than CAWU, was given seats on it. In fact, the whole monstrous apparatus is not only fundamentally bureaucratic in concept, but is not consistent even with the TUC recruiting carve-up. If each union were able to achieve 100% membership in its allotted spheres, as per the latter document (with equal partition where several unions are permitted to share a group of workers), then the crude principle adopted in allotting union representation on the Central Council, namely, 'Each union takes two except the CAWU' would be grossly disproportionate to relative membership. Fair allocation of 12 union seats would be:

ASTMS and NUPE—3 seats each

NALGO—2 seats.

AUEFW, TGWU, CAWU and NUGMW—1 seat each.

Thus the giant unions with small university memberships have been over-represented, presumably because they dominate the TUC, the progressive ASTMS is under-represented and the even more progressive CAWU is cheated out of its just dues.

The whole thing was cooked up at a meeting of university vice-chancellors, union big chiefs, and DEP and CIR representatives. Marvellous. All the big cheeves were there. Where the hell were the people who REALLY matter: the college porters, cooks and stokers, the clerks and typists, the library workers and lab. technicians?? The ASTMS Journal reported the matter in a gushing article headed 'Caviar at Congress House to Celebrate a "Model" Union Pact...' and quotes V. Feather, who was present at the deal, as describing it as a model and flarepath for other industries, and a photo is printed showing V. Feather, J. S. Davison (ASTMS bureaucrat) and two vice-chancellors, all looking very pleased with themselves. It seems that caviar was not the only item imported from Russia in this bureaucratic carve-up.

The effect of this 'model' agreement on university unionisation has been disastrous. There have been cases when a union has been all set and rarin' to go

Meetings at Freedom

Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. Vacant dates are available to anyone who wishes to speak or arrange a function. Please advise.

Currently scheduled
 March 17 Social Evening
 March 24 Bill Dwyer—'A Case for LSD-25'
 March 31 Arthur Uloth—'The Urban Crusoe'
 April 7 Peter 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, Red Lion Square, has been booked at 7.30 p.m. for a seminar on 'Anarchy & the Acid Issue'
 May 5 Albert Meltzer, Stuart Christie, Gerry Bree—'Anarchist Black Cross'
 May 12 Bill Turner (ILP)—'The Futility of Anarchism'
 May 19 John O'Connor—'The Interior Decorators'
 May 26 Social Evening
 June 2 Philip Sansom—'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'

Stepney Words

A VOLUME OF VERSE selected from a group of seventy children, aged between eleven and fifteen years, living in the East End of London is being published under the above title in Brick Lane shortly.

The youthful poets are all attending secondary school and there has been strong opposition to the book by those who feel that children's poetry should exclusively deal with flowers and other innocuous topics. The themes actually developed by the kids reveal remarkable honesty and realism. One anonymous writer tells us that life has little future for him. He recognises that his talents are mediocre and remarks that opportunities are there only for the intelligent.

Which I not is the last line. Another poem investigates problems of communication and advises 'Let it flow'. One moving piece illustrates some of the anomalies of being reared in a tough, unattractive suburb. Love is lavished on babies but a belt on

THIS WORLD

the earhole is the normal reaction when older—as when the oldies want to watch their television and youthful exuberance needs be controlled.

One little girl reflects that coloured children (who abound in this area) have little chance of achieving the 'good life' which our civilisation offers as a standard. Not all the poetry is free of racial prejudice—no doubt a tribute to parental ignorance and Enoch Powell.

How come working class kids got around to writing poetry anyway? It seems a dedicated teacher and some friends supplied the means and the courage (to resist the flower purveyors). One of them told me that at first the general reaction of the children was that poetry was too 'posh' for them. Later they found that verse making requires thought and concentration and was also a good medium for conveying feelings (about love, for example) which ordinary words did little or no justice to. I shall be happy to introduce interested persons to the organisers (including postal contact).

Women's Liberation!

Mrs. Sonia McMahon, ex-model and wife of the new Prime Minister of Australia, has laid her chips on the table. 'I never enter into the political side of things. That's something I leave to Bill'. Her predecessor, Mrs. Gorton, was similarly interviewed when her husband took office two years ago. She, the holder of a university degree, replied when questioned about Vietnam: 'I do not speak in any sort of way either for or against Vietnam. My opinion is of no value.'

Squatters Organised?

My friends squatting in Burrell House for nearly a year now and living harmoniously together are thanking their lucky stars that they had nothing to do with the Bailey-Radford organisation. I pointed out in a previous issue that the Burrell House delegation walked out of a public meeting held by the 'organisation' just as the sponsors were on the point of electing officials. At that time I indicated that the payment of officials (as advocated) would entail a regular income which would have to be paid by the squatters themselves.

Now the squatters' friends and allies are showing their true colours. They have threatened a number of families in Lewisham with eviction for non-payment of 'rent'. Eight families have been given a deadline. Then, presumably, a goon squad from the officials will descend upon them. This paper had an indignant letter (published in full) from Radford when I had the temerity to point out the ruinous consequences of 'legal squatting'. That letter included a cowardly attack on George Foulser, now in prison for defending the Burrell House squat. Were he at liberty I would be interested to see his reaction to the leaders' new-fangled police force!

Parker in Defence

S. E. Parker, in a recent talk at Freedom, outlined what he considered to be erroneous arguments. In Defence of Anarchism (his topic).

Firstly he delivered a broadside at Tony Gibson and the paper he gave here on February 10. The identification of vague progressivism with anarchism, Parker argued, has nothing to do with it. The undermining of puritanism is fine but it is substituting the shadow for the substance in seeing gain for anarchism in this.

Secondly, he postulated that equating anarchism with egalitarianism is illogical and he cited the case of two farmers who start off with exactly the same amount of land and resources. One through industry accumulates wealth, the other is content to provide only for his immediate needs. What is wrong with that, Parker asked. Apparently the speaker is in touch with that strange manifestation of anarchy in the United States who call themselves anarcho-capitalists and this simplistic defence of capital must appeal dearly to them. The only thing seriously wrong with Parker's example is that it has no relevance to the facts of life. We don't all start with the same resources in material things and I think the mainstream of anarchists has rightly argued that equality in material things is a prerequisite for a just society. Inequality always puts some men at the disposal of others.

'Bakunin was no anarchist,' declared Parker waving a copy of Max Nomad

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.

in our faces. It seems Bakunin was not always wise in his choice of words—for example he duped the police forces of Europe into believing that his organisation numbered many hundreds of thousands when actually they were a mere handful. Nomad has unearthed some allegedly anarchic sentiments attributed to Bakunin but let the latter speak for himself: 'All exercise of authority perverts; all submission to authority humiliates.'

The next evil to be guarded against, the speaker asserted, was organisation. Robert Michel's famous theory on the iron law of oligarchy was trotted out and reinforced with 'Organisation needs the sanction of authority'. This argument, of course, if it is valid makes nonsense of anarchism other than as a delirium for a tiny elite (no doubt Parker sees himself amongst them). The substantiation for his argument lay in an example of what has happened in the past and the deduction that this is what is likely to occur in the future also. It would seem, if we were to accept this line, that social struggle and hope for a better world should be abandoned. After arriving in London I met a comrade who told me that his embracing of anarchism was delayed by three years after listening to a lecture by Parker. Even pessimism—a stock in trade of the elitists—is contagious!

Finally, Parker assailed moralism pointing both to Tolstoy's 'The Kingdom of God is Within You' and a pamphlet of Peter Lumsden, our Christian atheist. After that we all adjourned to the pub where, to give Parker his due, he shines.

BILL DWYER.

UNIONS

Continued from page 3

because it has not got sufficient franchises in other universities to make its expansion in the industry worthwhile. The whole future of university workers is being settled by petty intrigue and telephone diplomacy by tinpot bureaucrats in union regional offices.

As a result, the initial impulse for unionisation among campus workers is dying, and many such workers are sickened by their first experience of the movement. Worse, as a reaction to this, there is a move to extend the Association of Cambridge University Assistants, a seahouse union, into a National Association of University Assistants. Thus the union bureaucrats stand exposed once again as the enemies of the healthy organisation of the working class.

The only answer for university workers is not to form a seahouse union but to examine the record of each trade union as the representative of its members and to insist as a solid body that they will join the one which can serve them best, and no other. (In particular, the manuals at Bradford, Birmingham and UWIST, where the GMW has been given monopoly rights, should have no truck with this outfit, which placed the heads of 10,000 glassworkers on Lord Pilkington's chopping-block.) Further, to defeat this carve-up, and prevent it being copied in other industries, trade unionists must fight for democracy in their organisations.

★ UNIONS IN — BUREAUCRATS OUT!

★ DOWN WITH THE BRIDLE-TRON AGREEMENT AND HIGH-HAND CARVE-UPS!

★ LET WORKERS JOIN THE UNION OF THEIR CHOICE!

★ FOR DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED OFFICERS SUBJECT TO RECALL, WITH LAY REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT AT ALL NEGOTIATIONS!

JOHN CHAPPELL.

for the freedom of the working class. The slogan on the banners must be changed from 'Kill the Bill' to 'Social Revolution and Freedom'.

A movement with these aims will not come from the union executives or the TUC. It will only come from the factories, workshops, building sites and all places of production and distribution. We must not only defeat this Bill but also destroy the system that needs such totalitarian legislation.

P.T.

C

ontact

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

Girl Members wanted for a commune in South of France. Write before coming to Alain Roux, Rue du 14 Juillet, 66—Cannes, France.

Black Flag, Now monthly, 6p (Bulletin of Anarchist Black Cross). Jan. & Feb. includes 'Anarchism in China', 'Angry Brigade' From Freedom Bookshop.

CND Festival for Nuclear-Free Europe, April 11 (Easter Sunday), 1 p.m.—6 p.m., Alexandra Park Racecourse. Edward Bond has written a play to be performed by Brighton Combination. Plus the Barrow Poets and groups.

March and Rally, Monday, April 12, Hyde Park 1 p.m., Trafalgar Square 3 p.m. Speakers: Frank Allaun, MP, Paul Oestreicher, French Trade Union and Student Speakers.

Kropotkin Lighthouse Publications, 'The Revolutionary Catechism', Necheyev, 5p + 21p post. 'Song to the Men of England', Shelley, 'Post Poem' with Walter Crane's 'Workers' Maypole', 10p + 21p post. 'Poems', Jim Huggon, 5p + 21p post.

Available soon: 'International Anarchist Summer Camp 1969 Cornwall—Report of Speeches and Discussions', 5p + 21p post.

'Peace, Freedom and Non Violence, For use in Schools', 5p + 21p post. Discount available on bulk orders. Jim Huggon, c/o Housmans Bookshop, 5 Caledonian Road, London, N.1.

Spanish lessons given in London. Rates on request. Write, in first instance, to Box 02/71, Freedom Press.

All Women's Library, 2325 Oak, Berkeley, Calif. 94708, USA. Send a stamped, self-addressed envelope or 2 International Reply Coupons for information.

Libertarian Forum on Kronstadt and Paris Communes, 50 and 100 years' anniversaries. Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1, Monday, March 22, 7.30 p.m. Anarchist, Solidarity and Socialist speakers.

Oxford Anarchists, J. Brent, 1a Woodstock Road, Oxford.

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 Freedom every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.

RANK & FILE

Continued from page 1

expansion.

The dilemma which faces Mr. Heath is that while he favours 'less government' in industrial affairs, the modern capitalist economy demands more. The political presence of the Government is there even if it is not constituted as a formal incomes policy. The policies of the present Government could lead to a very major recession. Certainly for those who find themselves unemployed the difference is academic, but the present course could lead to a million out of work by next winter.

Such a situation is by Government choice, one made to render the capitalist system more viable in the long term. What we are seeing now is a 'shake out', not just of labour but also of the 'lame duck' companies. Even the multi-national companies are feeling the pinch. They are cutting back on investment and making workers redundant.

Agreement between the TUC, the Government and the employers will only be possible and effective if there is more authority exercised by them. Such a liaison with more centralised power

for the TUC and the employers would mean controls over the rank-and-file trade unionists. The TUC has tried to do this in the past but on the whole they have not been successful.

It is unlikely that such a concordat will be reached for some time. The Government feels that it has the vast majority of workers supporting its Industrial Relations Bill and that the TUC is unable to exert the necessary discipline on some trade unions and a substantial number of the rank and file.

Last Thursday's meeting with the TUC was merely an exercise in public relations. They both had nothing to lose, while in fact the TUC achieved something in showing that it could again 'walk in the corridors of power'.

MARCH 18

The TUC has certain recommendations to be considered by the unions at the emergency conference to be held at Croydon on March 18. These are for opposing the Industrial Relations Bill when it is law and are centred around the Register of Trade Unions and the fact that unions should not sign legally binding agreements. Their document says that 'The government's aim to impose an alien concept of authority on the internal workings of trade unions

can be seen most clearly in the proposals for registration.'

While agreeing that the Register is State licence and an 'alien authority', the union executives wield too much authority over their own members and they are only too willing to use it when it suits them. If such non-co-operation is carried out by the unions the Bill would be worthless. It would mean that even the new courts envisaged to judge 'unfair practices' would be boycotted by trade unionists.

Mr. Heath might now see his chance for a compromise. At present the economy is in no state to sustain a long drawn-out wrangle over non-co-operation. If anything, the employers need the trade unions to deal with so that further rationalisation can take place. Non-co-operation during a period of reflation would not help the employers.

One gets the impression that the TUC is not so much against the aims of the Bill but the way in which the Tories want to carry these out. Mr. Carr, the Minister of Employment, said as much in an interview with *The Times* on June 22, 1970. He said, 'I shall be very surprised if the trade unions do not share my objectives—even if they do not care for my methods.'

ONLY METHODS CHANGE

If the Tories can get the help of the TUC in solving the present economic recession, then some compromise could be agreed to over the Bill or even agreement not to enact it. Such a situation does not help the working class. All such schemes have one thing in common—to control the rank-and-file trade unionists. They are aimed at crushing the movement that now exists in industry. The aims are the same, only the methods change. Every industrialised country, whether east or west, if the State feels the necessity, will introduce totalitarian means into a 'democracy'. However if the demand is made strongly enough, the totalitarian system will give way in order to leave the State intact, as was the case in Poland.

In all these areas of conflict a grass-roots movement exists. Its strength ebbs and flows and is made up of a minority of committed militants. This movement has to grow to embrace far more than the present few and with the strength and determination to struggle

of the Resisters Inside The Army movement. It is no big sweat if a college student, unwillingly dragged in is against [the war]; usually he is ineffective.

'The army is very glad to get rid of "ritas"; the really conscious one [soldier] stays in.'

'We are very glad to see that you begin to see logical conclusions—results of American Servicemen's Union aims.'

'There is at least one Rita/ASU paper in England operating around Mildenhall Air Base.'

The Good G.I. Schweik Goes On

'RITA ACT' of Heidelberg writes regarding FREEDOM article (16.1.71) that the number of GI war-resister papers is now about one hundred, some are (temporarily) defunct.

Circulation figures for these papers are estimated at several hundred thousand. Bond has a circulation of 60,000.

Contrary to what our writer guessed, most resisters are volunteers (as are 85% of the US Armed Forces). 'Rita Act' writes 'Their [the volunteers] political development usually took place after joining. This is the most positive aspect