

## MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS!

WITH THE APPROACH of April 26 there is some controversy arising on the census. The lower depths were reached by Sue Rogers, a Young Liberal in Plymouth, who stripped off five sweaters in front of holidaymakers revealing a flesh-coloured bra stencilled with her census number, she said, 'I would take it all off if it would stop the census.' It didn't and she didn't. Jeremy Thorpe, the Liberal leader, revealed a less-enticing midriff by saying that some of the questions in the census went 'far beyond what is reasonable'. He particularly took exception to the questions asking for the names of every member of his household, where they lived five years ago, who their parents were, and where their parents came from; such answers, said Mr. Thorpe, could provide a 'Powellite' government with everything it needed for a round-up of immigrants.

Mr. Des Wilson, the blue-eyed boy of 'Shelter', saw nothing objectionable in the census, differing from his co-panelists on BBC 'Any Questions'. Anthony Hopkins was vigorously opposed to it, aided by the extremely right-wing Lord (Ted) Leather and the deplorable Lady Barnett. Even the reactionary 'Peter Simple' of the *Daily Telegraph* came out against it before leaving for his holiday, but

don't worry a stopped clock is right twice a day. Even *The Economist* has doubts on the census.

The Young Liberals, in political groupings, are so far alone in making the running. They propose a mass burning of census forms and have set up the organization 'People against the Census' (see last week's FREEDOM).

### WHAT DO THEY WANT TO KNOW?

It is only to be expected that with the growth of interest in sociology as the new cure-all for our social ills (whatever happened to psychoanalysis?), the sociological virtues of the census should be extolled. The *Guardian* (12.4.71) argues: 'The sociologists, the economic planners, the housing authorities, the traffic engineers, the authorities responsible for the planning of education all need to know more than they do about the way people live, about their families, about their incomes, about the way in which they move about the country, and about their special problems. The British authorities often know less than those in other advanced countries about the movements of wealth and population. They know less about the likely future needs for housing, jobs, education and about where the

needs will arise.' The *Guardian* goes on to accuse those opposing the census information as obstructing the possibility of improving social conditions.

### WHAT DON'T THEY KNOW?

It can be pointed out that there is in the possession of the authorities, local and national, a great deal of this information already. Almost everyone has a birth certificate, a school record, a school health record, a school leavers advisory file, an employment card and Labour Exchange file, a passport or a visa, a health and social security card and record, a housing list record, a building society mortgage record, Social Security case-work files, a doctor and/or hospital medical record dossier, a bank statement, hire-purchase records, job references, work records, time sheets, driving licences, tax records, trade union records, Youth Hostel, AA and other voluntary organization records, hotel registers, marriage certificates, registry office records, election voting returns, income tax returns, Post Office savings bank and Giro, dog and television licences, life, fire and car insurance, rates and water rates, telephone call record (even if unimportant, it is a record)—which you can't take with you. This list of traces which are all neatly docketed, filed away and from time to time amplified, are already ample to supply any information needed

If you should, by any chance, be what this State calls 'criminal' or even worse, 'subversive', your dossier will be even more extensive, supplemented by private information and phone tapping. If you are a recent immigrant your record is already filed. If you have been interviewed by market-researchers the recesses of your heart and appetite have been laid bare already.

Perhaps the authorities find it beyond them to correlate and co-ordinate this mass of statistics. Perhaps the population is on the whole so anarchic (or so law abiding) that they have left insufficient traces to build up the information required.

### WHAT WILL THEY DO WITH IT?

The point that census information is duplicated may be irrelevant but the staggering assumption (of the *Guardian* among others) is that the information is necessary in order that our social welfare may be planned. The excuse for not building houses, schools, roads and hospitals by the last unlamented government was that the financial position of the country was too grave, not that they hadn't got the statistics to know. The plight of the homeless, the overcrowded classrooms, the traffic tangles and the hospital waiting lists showed more obviously than any sociologist what was needed. The present lamentable government is not crying out for statistics or in-

formation, it merely points out that houses, schools, roads and hospitals can only be built if the profit system is seen to first. They do not entirely follow (except to the extent of a million unemployed achieved) the awful logic of their profit-making criteria.

If this mass of statistics is fed into the computer it will not produce one more house, school, road or hospital unless the will is there—and social welfare is not produced in the cell-brain of a computer but in the minds and hands of concerned citizens.

All that the cell-brain of the census will give us is a mass of information available to whoever wishes to make use of it, and knowing big business and Big Brother government we can guess what use they'll make of it. The *Guardian* quotes the Registrar-General's office as saying, 'If any of the information given in a census ever was misapplied then that would be the end of the census—no one would answer another.' So why not start now? Why not answer: 'Mind Your Own Business' across all or some of the questions? You can always dodge, and if you want to confront them the fine is only £50. Perhaps it might be best to have fun and make the computer blow a fuse or two such as replying to the first question for example: 'Sex — occasionally!' and so on.

JACK ROBINSON.

## POLICE FLOUT JUDGES' RULES

'Every person at any stage of an investigation should be able to communicate and to consult privately with a solicitor . . . provided that . . . no unreasonable delay or hindrance is caused to the processes of investigation or the administration of justice'—'A person in custody should be allowed to speak on the telephone to his solicitor or to his friends provided . . .' (From Judges' Rules.)

COUNSEL for Mr. J. Prescott, the first of two men charged with causing an explosion at Mr. Robert Carr's home, asked the court to declare that there was nothing to prevent a defendant from speaking with his Counsel. Commenting on a police officer's failure to permit him access to his clients, he said: 'Words fail me to describe the outrageous use of police power.' Detective-Chief Superintendent Roy Habershon denied flouting Judges' Rules or persuading the defendant to change his lawyer. Yet when Counsel asked: 'You deprived Mr. Prescott of legal assistance for nearly 48 hours, is that correct?', the solicitor for the police objected.

The NCCL has asked the Home Secretary for a high-level enquiry into allegations made by a number of people questioned during the same investigation. Mr. Prescott and a Mr. Jan Oudenaarden were taken to Barnet police station on Thursday, February 11. Mr. Prescott's solicitors were refused access to their client until after he had been charged at midday on Saturday, February 13. On Monday, February 15, when he was due to appear in court, it is alleged that Mr. Prescott's Counsel was prevented from seeing him until Mr. Habershon arrived seconds before the case was due to start. Mr. Oudenaarden was released at 4 p.m. on the Saturday without any charges being made.

A second person charged in this case is Mr. Ian Purdie. He was detained and taken to Barnet police station at midday on Saturday, March 6. He was not

allowed to see his solicitor until 5 p.m. the next day, some 30 hours later. His solicitor had been notified by the police on Saturday evening that his client was in custody but, in spite of his persistent requests, he was refused access to Mr. Purdie.

These experiences were not isolated. Three witnesses for the Women's Liberation 'Miss World' hearing were seized on the Thursday afternoon and detained at the same station. Their solicitor called to see them that afternoon but was denied access and told that the officer in charge was not concerned with 'legal niceties'. They were finally released at 11.30 p.m. Three weeks previously Mr. Ross Flett and Mr. Philip Carver were taken from their homes early in the morning and not released until late afternoon. Again a solicitor's clerk was refused access. Details of three other cases have been recorded by the NCCL and it seems likely that a number of other people received the same treatment.

The NCCL pointed out to the Home Secretary that the police had consistently refused to say who they were holding at the station at any one time. This meant that an innocent person could be seized at his home, or off the street, and detained in a police station for hours or days without anyone knowing or being able to help in any way.

The right of access to legal advice should be applied without exception whether those detained in custody are subsequently charged or not. In practical terms, a person facing charges is more in need of legal advice than someone who is merely alleged to be 'helping the police with their enquiries'. Furthermore, the practice of holding people for questioning without their consent, while it is accepted without criticism by the news-media, is legally questionable and a misuse of police power.

From NCCL Bulletin, March/April.

## LEADERS & LED

THE RETURN TO WORK at Fords has brought to light the deep resentments and antagonism between shop stewards and the leadership of the Transport and General and the Engineers' Union. A strike which started spontaneously with workers voting with their feet ended with a secret ballot which had been hurriedly organised by the unions with the help of the Ford Motor Company. It has even been admitted by Moss Evans, Chief Negotiator for the T&G, that such a ballot could not have been organised without the help of the Company in supplying addresses and posting letters.

Shop stewards were angry not only over the terms, such as no strikes, but also because they had not reached parity earnings with car workers in the Midlands. The hurried ballot confirmed many of their suspicions and added to this, the deal had been worked out over the heads of the negotiating team by Hugh Scanlon and Jack Jones.

To many this was reminiscent of the 'right wing' leadership which has dominated these unions in the past. Peter Jenkins, writing in the *Guardian* praised Scanlon and Jones for the 'reasserted authority and leadership over the heads of the discredited, elusive and—literally—irresponsible negotiating committee'.

### FEARED THEIR RANK AND FILE

The actions of Scanlon and Jones shows that they were worried men. No leadership likes its men committed to battle for too long. Although they are of the 'left', they thought that the claim for parity was unrealistic and like any leadership or authority, they feared the rank and file as much, if not more, than the management. As it is the clauses in the settlement give Fords a no-strike breather which could set a pattern for Vauxhall workers. This is what all employers hope and pray

for. All leaderships, by their very nature, must fear any action from below that threatens their authority. This is true of the Government, the State and all the authoritarian institutions which serve and safeguard the profit motive system.

It is consistent with all who favour a society of leaders and led that the Communist Party should have given its support to the election of Hugh Scanlon, an ex-party member of some fifteen years, rather than the more recent member, Reg Birch who had gone Maoist. Reg Birch is rightly angry at Scanlon's interference, but it is a good bet that he would have done the same thing if he had been elected President of the AUEU.

### INCOMES POLICY

While union leaders are paying the way for the resumption of work at Fords, national leaders of the TUC are begging the Government for a chance to run a voluntary wages policy. Mr. Feather said that they were 'willing and able' to do this. While Mr. Heath, the Prime Minister, did not take up the offer, there are signs that the Government are changing their minds and moving towards an incomes policy. If it comes off it might not be formally named as such, but recent wage increases in the private sector are making the Government re-think their policies.

The TUC have also mentioned that such measures must also affect prices and profits. Such an incomes policy would not suit the employers. They feel that they have to increase profits in order to catch up with lagging investments. Obviously the TUC would have to have some window dressing of price and profit restraint in order to sell it to the trade union movement. But as we have seen in the past, such agreements only work one way. The working class has been sold this before.

The trade union leadership at national level is basically a form of authority like any other. It is true that trade unionists can and do exercise some control over the leadership and like any other authority it has degrees of power. These men in authority have lost touch with the everyday reality of working for a living. They have forgotten what it is like to hear the starting hooter on a cold dark morning for their world is not one of toil, but of lounge suits and negotiating tables. As workers we have nothing in common with these statesmen of the labour movement. Workers should not look to these bureaucrats, but to themselves if they are going to solve their problems and create a world with dignity and sufficient for human needs.

### BASIC DISCONTENT

A revolt for such aims is feared by all in authority. They now rule by dividing worker against worker and blaming 'militants', 'wreckers', 'trouble-makers', 'wildcaters', 'communists', 'maoists', 'trotskyists' and 'anarchists' for fomenting stoppages. Yet the basic discontent exists in the relationship of employer and employed, leader and led, ruler and ruled. Until the latter take over and run production by voluntary co-operation, workers will remain on the receiving end. They should not assist the employers and the TUC in the continuation of their own exploitation, but organise to seize the very work places in which they now work.

Employers need workers, but workers do not need employers and could continue to produce under a system of workers' control. Such a change will not be negotiated by trade union leaders, but will be made by workers themselves, when they decide they can live without the power and authority which creeps into so much of our lives.

P.T.



# The Years of Boredom

Dear Comrades,

The attitude of some of the older anarchists to Colin Wilson always puzzles me. I am aware he was at one time an attendee of meetings of the London Anarchist Group, then drifted away from anarchism and 'did his own thing', but I cannot understand why it is necessary to continually indulge in calculated bitchiness as for example Arthur Uloth's article in *Freedom* for February 27, and the often expressed antipathy of the Black Flag Group.

Like Colin Wilson I too am a 'child of the fifties', in an intellectual sense that is. I became a conscious anarchist about 1958 (despite the fatuous suggestion by Albert Meltzer that I was a 'child of the Peace Movement'—in fact I did not enter this until 1964), though I had had unconscious anarchist leanings for some three or more years before.

What attracted me to anarchist ideas was Colin Wilson's *The Outsider*, an extremely erudite examination of literary outsiders and their relationships to society at large, pressures to conformity, and the need to express the sacredness of the individual will as against the demands for legitimacy of collective action of authority: be it State, Firm, Institution or Collective. It was not merely that Wilson said 'Come and join anarchism' for he did not. In fact I found out about anarchism because someone gave me some copies of *FREEDOM* much later. What Wilson did, and for that I am grateful, was to give an annotated book-list of works that helped me to clarify and codify my anarchist ideas.

The fact that I became an anarchist and others did not is perhaps also because, like Wilson, I was working class, hailed from a provincial town, and suffered the period of military conscription and contact with large bureaucratic organisations which acted as both laboratory and testing ground for political development.

In other words, unlike the anarchists of the sixties I became involved in anarchism and crystallised my intellectual ideas prior to going into political action.

rather than as a result of it. This is also probably why I am still an anarchist while those who drifted into the movement from, say, the Committee of 100, have drifted out again.

Wilson's work, or at least his early work, before he allowed himself to be distracted (my opinion) firstly into religion and then into criminology, enabled many people, like myself, to have an introduction to ideas, for Wilson was writing as a free-thinking idealist, or realist perhaps, not as a literary hack nor an academic writing his yearly book or PhD Thesis. One could understand him and what is more his ample notes enabled one to look deeper into the sources from which his ideas were drawn. He departs from anarchists on many points, I suppose the most important of these is his refusal to accept as doctrine any one set of ideas. And I suppose this is what was so galling to members of the London Anarchist Group, the need for the true intellectual to continue to explore ideas and experiment without being bound by doctrinaire assumptions, and on one level anarchism can be just as doctrinaire as other political philosophies, religions or modes of thinking.

If we learn anything from Arthur Uloth's review of Bogdanor and Skidelsky's *The Age of Affluence 1951-64* it was that he himself passed through it unaffected by the literature of the time, witness his dismissal of Osborne's *Look Back in Anger*. To say it is a bad play is one thing, but to miss the point of its relevance at the time it appeared in provincial theatres is to completely misunderstand what it was to be a provincial intellectual in this period. Arthur Uloth is writing as a metropolitan. I am replying as a provincial. The impact of any drop of usable culture in any provincial wasteland is important to the provincial. Works like that of Osborne and Wilson's *The Outsider* act as a signpost to a better reality. They do not have to seem brilliant to the metropolitan, but to the provincial they are a social reality.

Fraternally,  
PETER NEVILLE.

# A Special Paper for Workers

Dear Freedom,

I fail to understand why Janet Lawrence is hostile to the appearance of the new rank-and-file paper *Outlook*. I don't know how Janet works out that 'the hard facts are that... the two papers cannot but compete'. This is rubbish, but an attitude I suspect many people will hold. If she had read *Outlook*, Janet would see that the two papers provide different functions. The purpose (surely) of *FREEDOM* is to provide a paper for anarchists, libertarians, from individualists to communist, radicals, intellectuals (but I don't think militants), for them to communicate their ideas, feelings, interests, etc., to other anarchists. *FREEDOM* owes no allegiance to any class or section of the community, whether workers, students or homeless—but only to anarchists. If various anarchists complained of 'not enough for the workers' (as recently at Freedom Hall) a scream would go up against them and I suspect Janet Lawrence would be screaming.

So a need does exist for an anarchist paper aimed at, and for the workers in industry. (As does one for dropouts, students, typists, etc.) *Outlook* is a monthly publication and provides material for anarchists to sell to workers at or in the place of work. Whether workers will accept it or take to it has to be seen. The paper will not be 'a special paper for workers because they are not up to understanding the finer points of anarchist doctrine'. One of the complaints against *FREEDOM* is that it is not intelligent enough!

Let's hope *Outlook* is intelligent enough, which I feel may well have to do with Janet's fear that it could harm *FREEDOM* and may push *FREEDOM* out (I feel, too, that this is rubbish), but this is a problem for *FREEDOM*, not for *Outlook*. She seems to suggest that anarchists would buy *Outlook* rather than *FREEDOM* if given the chance. Should we banish *Outlook* to protect *FREEDOM*'s 'honourable record'? Indeed Janet's reference to *Outlook* as being an 'irresponsible action' had me rubbing my eyes to see if her letter was signed

'Jerry Healy'!

Janet also implied that the viewpoint behind *Outlook* is naive and even futile. Of course the workers are not 'thirsting' to lock out the bosses and administer production on behalf of the community—if you're talking about the 'mass' of 'British workers'. By making reference to the 'Working Mass', 'Working Class', etc., one can prove or disprove anything. But I, and many others, believe that there's more than a chance in the coming '70s that a few workers may sit in their factory, may lock out the bosses and administer production themselves if even for only a week. That situation is worth a dozen 'General Strikes' and other such rubbish that we are told are necessary for change. That is a potential situation that makes it worth while bringing out such papers as *Outlook*.

This situation, the 'revolutionary ferment' exists now, or never, for any conscious anarchist or worker. These workers exist now. Any change that is coming potentially exists now. If people are not ready for anarchism now, then they never will be. A need for an anarchist paper specifically aimed at workers is needed now, not when 'times get grimmer' or when 'revolutionary ferment is apparent'.

So I, for one, look forward to both *Outlook* and *FREEDOM*.

Yours sincerely,  
PAUL ROUTE.



<b>PRESS FUND</b>	
April 6 to 12 Inc.	
Saffron Walden: A.R. £5.50; By Bankers	
Order: A.C.J. £1; S.G. 50p; T.P. 50p;	
Liverpool: J.G. 50p; Newcastle: G.M. 25p;	
Nottingham: H.T. 50p; Miami	
Group: £20; Greenford: B.W. 20p.	
<b>Total:</b>	<b>£28.95</b>
<b>Income Sales and Subs.:</b>	<b>£101.41</b>
	<b>£130.36</b>
<b>Expenditure:</b>	<b>£150.00</b>
<b>Deficit b/f.:</b>	<b>£270.45</b>
	<b>£420.45</b>
<b>Less Income:</b>	<b>£130.36</b>
	<b>DEFICIT: £290.09</b>

\*Corrects last week's error

# Letters

## A Simple Disagreement

Dear Sir,

I read with great interest the article by 'Justin' on the case of the Birmingham doctor, Dr. Robert Browne. If one clears away the emotive content of the article, and the red herrings about war and disease (i.e. 95%), all that is left is a simple disagreement between two people over what is right in the circumstances. Surely this is what freedom is all about—being able to express what one thinks is right, even if other people disagree.

I get the impression that 'Justin' considers belief in God and Christian beliefs in particular, to be irrelevant if not positively harmful, to the living of a normal well-balanced, enjoyable life. If this is erroneous I apologise, but if 'Justin' seriously believes, as he seems to, that Christianity has a repressive, joyless, sexually negative attitude to life, I can understand why he rejects it and the God that it stands for. But then, as a committed Christian, I do not believe in that kind of God any more than 'Justin' does.

Yours,

Birmingham SUE BOWSKILL.

Justin replies:

Miss Bowskill's interpretation of my attitude to God and Christianity is correct, and I am sorry she is a committed Christian.

What is left in the Dr. Browne case is not a 'simple disagreement', but yet another instance of a religious person forcing his views upon another in a particularly pernicious way. And breaking his Hippocratic Oath to boot.

## Lewisham Squat

Dear Sirs,

I can well understand that Bill Dwyer should still be smarting from the verbal drubbing Jim Radford gave him the last time he attacked the family squatting movement. As I recall it, Jim's anger was provoked not because Bill disagreed with him but because he grossly misrepresented the facts. Any *FREEDOM* reader familiar with what has been happening in Lewisham will know that Bill has just done it again ('This World', 20.3.71).

To suggest that Jim and Ron Bailey took the decision to apply sanctions against those who deliberately refused to pay their dues, is a blatant distortion of the truth. For a start Ron is now working full time for the FSAS and had nothing at all to do with it, while everyone in Lewisham knows full well that it was only Jim's influence that prevented this decision being taken seven months ago.

The truth is that the majority of families in Lewisham took this decision. At the last meeting they confirmed it overwhelmingly, while accepting Jim's amendment that any action should be postponed to give the few people concerned every opportunity to present a case to the group.

Unpalatable though it may be, to remote theorists like Dwyer, people's power does not immediately produce anarchistic sentiments and though the few squatters in Burrell House may be content and able to live rent free while begging for furniture and bedding in *FREEDOM*, the much larger number of working-class families in Lewisham have an equal right to their old-fashioned desire to pay their own way without the burden of free-loading parasites.

Everything that Bill Dwyer writes about Lewisham displays his total ignorance of the subject—for instance there are no officials only paid employees who do exactly what they are told to do by the committee and the general meeting. The elected committee contains 10 squatters and neither Jim nor Ron are on it.

Dwyer accuses Jim of a cowardly attack on George Foulser, because he mildly suggested that this somewhat narrow source of information was 'unreliable'. It seems to me much more cowardly to write and print absurd lies and insinuations about a man that he wouldn't have the guts or ability to face in debate.

DEREK HATTON,  
c/o Southwark Squatters,  
UGS Settlement,  
Staffordshire Street, S.E.15

# Role of the Provos

Comrades,

We have just received the latest issue of *FREEDOM* which contains a lot of stuff on the current situation in Ireland. Firstly, it should be said that Justin's article is, as usual, a relief from the tiresome tirade of inaccuracies which generally emanate from England once the situation in Ireland is mentioned. There are two points however. Firstly, the Provisionals. It is misleading the situation to state as Justin does that their 'long term work is to further the interests of the Eire government'. This is not so. To the Lynch-mob in control in Dublin, the actions of the provos are a severe embarrassment, since Eire has not in any sense achieved economic independence from England and with the advent of the EEC for the past 10 years under both Lemass and Lynch Eire has capered like a syncretistic spaniel at Albion's heel. They are only committed on paper to 'a united Ireland' and have for long appreciated that the changing needs of capitalism necessitate an end to violence here. Since they have disavowed the provos the latter are now in the position of an anachronism. They cannot win for even if they're successful and they eventually do get some sort of a federal solution, they will be among the first to be liquidated by the new state. This they appreciate as their publications show—of late they have been denouncing Fianna Fail. Their hope had been for a Blaney-Boland takeover but now that they have been completely discredited the provisionals are left baying to the moon. It is much more likely that the ever-pragmatic Stalinist wing, the 'officials', will be able to do some deal with any federal solution. This is official CP line today. Hence the 'National Liberation Movement'.

It was a pity, however, that Justin failed to understand the article in the *Free Citizen* which referred to the PD 'radicalising' the civil rights movement by its demands for 'One man, one job' (not 'vote' as Justin wrote) and 'one family, one house'. The point is not that these demands are in any way revolutionary, but that the posing of them was enough to split the CR movement and remove the gomme men from it—a useful development at the time, although it is true to say that the CRA is irrelevant today.

As to A.W.U.'s article. Firstly, as the writer of the article he refers to in the ASA paper, I take grave exception to his allegation that 'I favour the provisionals'—from the very quotes he himself gives it should be quite obvious that this is not so—if I did I would join them—and be disciplined or shot for being an agnostic, whereas the 'officials' would expel me for being anti-authoritarian. Moreover, it is hardly sensible for A.W.U. to object to the provisionals being called 'provos' just because a Dutch group exists using that name. Despite the emotional appeal of William of Orange the working-class

people of Belfast know nothing of Kabouters. 'Provos' is the street argot here; if it offends London pacifists, I'm afraid there is not much we can do about it.

As to H's interminable articles, perhaps you could proof read them better—or could H manage to get people's names right. If A.W.U. objects to 'reformist' demands, he too should join with me in deploring that this kind of article still appears.

Finally, as to the latest news from the front. The election of the slimy Faulkner, who has coveted the job for so long and stabbed the two previous occupants in the back so frequently, is hardly reassuring. The man is a notorious bigot and 'hard-liner' and his appointment of well-known crypto West as Minister of Agriculture (a post from which he was sacked for speculation under O'Neill) is blatant appeasement of the right wing, who now stand revealed as being responsible for the murder of the three soldiers, whose deaths occasioned so much carefully organised and hypocritical slobber—even *FREEDOM* is guilty of this when it refers to the death of hired killers as 'terrible murder in cold blood'. As anarchists we felt that the murder was an act of right wing agent provocateurs and as such counter revolutionary, but we should shed no tears for dead soldiers, rather pity their victims.

Internment seems to be postponed, at least for the present as the 'security forces' have managed to convince Westminster that it would occasion more trouble than it's worth, but with the sectarian marching season almost upon us the prospects of direct rule from Westminster seem very real.

JOHN BELFAST.

Justin replies:

I take the point re the quote from *Free Citizen*—although John Belfast's interpretation is more sophisticated than the article implied!

Re the Provos: John is right. They cannot win. If they force a 'federal' solution, the 'official' leadership takes over; if they are simply smashed in the field, the Dublin government takes the credit for not supporting them. I should have written 'the long term effect of their work'!

A.W.U. replies:

I am glad John Belfast does not in fact favour the 'provisionals', and I am sorry that I have misunderstood him. It is a pity that 'provo' has come to mean violence and bloodshed, instead of white bicycles. Probably there is little we can do about it. But with regard to H's articles, these are the only ones we receive regularly from Ireland now, and although at times the writer wobbles a bit, H. does stick fairly consistently to the position of opposing both sides, since both are authoritarian. This is the point of view the anarchist movement exists to express.

# 'Solidarity' and Anarchism

Dear Comrades,

In the reviews of *Solidarity* publications (*FREEDOM*, January 23 and February 27), L.O. predictably enough takes exception to *Solidarity* attacks on anarchism. He considers that such attacks mar and flout what is otherwise good material.

There may be some truth in the allegation that we in *Solidarity* spend too much time, and too many words, on defining our own position as distinct from other groups. Perhaps we have been over-preoccupied with our own evolution, coming as individuals from the anarchist movement or the traditional left. But, to paraphrase one of L.O.'s own sentences, we have felt we would be losing part of our case to refrain from frequent demarcation, even if it meant quibbling a little.

L.O. seriously damages his case by mixing up the substance of his argument with some completely inaccurate, inconsistent and contradictory label-labelling. For example, we are accused of 'demonstrating neo-Leninist orthodoxy' in the very booklet he hails as a magnificent weapon for debate against all shades of Leninists. Then he proceeds to discern a Solidarist view of *Solidarity* as forming an anarcho-Marxist tendency. In the second review, we are 'proving Marxist orthodoxy'.

This sort of dual vision, simultaneously acknowledging and ignoring the work *Solidarity* is doing, gives weight to the accusation of 'anarchist muddle-headedness'. In fact, there is a considerable corpus of *Solidarity* writings to demonstrate precisely the limitations of Marxism, its inherent links with Leninism, and the reasons why such an orthodoxy is not tenable by revolutionaries today. The object is not to revise or up-date, but to

clear the ground for a libertarian analysis and programme.

We don't want to create a new orthodoxy. There is constant debate in *Solidarity*, though not in terms of the 'tendencies' and factions L.O. implies.

The term 'anarchist' would be rejected by nearly all members of *Solidarity*, who accept the need for a degree of organisation (including membership, which orthodox anarchists would probably bar) while trying to avoid bureaucracy, hierarchy and centralism. They find grounds for criticising anarchists, both historically

# Letters

Owing to lack of space we are compelled to hold over some readers' letters till next week.

and in the present. At the same time, it is possible to move from the 'class-struggle' type of anarchism to *Solidarity* with no drastic change of principle; the process is one of definition and elaboration.

It may seem unreasonable to reject 'anarchism' and still profess socialism, which can be taken to mean such a variety of things and has been so debased. Perhaps the explanation is that the 'anarchist movement' is a meaningful idea while the 'socialist movement' is not. It's not that we can agree with nothing in the anarchist movement, just that it includes so much with which we cannot agree.

Fraternally,

London

L.W.

**ANARCHY 2**  
**Out Now!**

**On 'Kronstadt 1921'**

**20p (50c)**

**Obtainable from**  
**Freedom Press**



# THE MIDDLE CLASS

THE MIDDLE CLASS worry me. I mean who are they, these people who live in semi-detached houses, read the *Daily Express* and voted for Heath so that he could stop strikes. You all recognise the mental picture. They do exist even though we never see anything to prove it. They are the ever wonderful 'silent majority'.

You see the trouble is, whenever Heath says 'My mandate is to control the unions and strikes', no matter how odious I know that to be, he is right. He has a mandate, proved in the polls, but who are they. Not factory workers surely. But are there really that many people working in offices? The only thing to do I thought, was to have a gander at the '61 census and see if that shone any light on who these Conservatives are. Deep down in the library amidst dust and parliamentary papers it was. Now only to try and extract the information. Here 'tis.

	Total
Managers, employers and professional class	
Men	1,900,000
Women	250,000
	2,150,000
Non-manual and personal workers	
Men	2,700,000
Women	4,200,000
	6,900,000
Manual workers, skilled and non-skilled	
Men	9,200,000
Women	2,230,000
	11,430,000
Farmers, the army and others	
Men	1,800,000
Women	580,000
	2,380,000
Housewives	10,600,000

It would appear from this that the sides are remarkably evenly matched—11,430,000 manual workers who all voted Labour and 11,430,000 others to vote Conservative (though luck for the Liberals), leaving only the housewives with the

casting vote. Mind you, what with hubby's influence you would expect them to split 50:50.

Hey! That means some of our side voted for the Conservatives. Damn right it does. They voted for Heath because he would end strikes. They realise that strikes are 'breaking the country', and these car workers are 'totally irresponsible' wanting rises when they already get £40 a week. That's quite a lot of money really.

They understand, these 'Conservatives', like anarchists, that strikes for more money will never solve anything in the long run, but they don't then take the jump to understand that what is really the matter with car workers, is a lack of personal dignity which expresses itself as a demand for more money. It does so because their whole outlook is conditioned to regard he who has more money as better, of higher status and more satisfied with life. Like most of the

underprivileged, the big battle is not with the system, but with what the system has done to your mind. The car workers probably can't imagine that they might be happier with less money and better work. Just cannot imagine it.

I once had to teach a girl to do a new form of wiring which was really simpler than that which she was already doing, but which involved reading an elementary wiring diagram. She had been told for years that she was thick, and she believed faithfully that she was. Because I knew she could do what I was trying to teach her, I kept insisting that she try. In the end she nearly cried and we gave up. She imagined that she could not do it, and hence by no possible amount of will power could she do it.

And then a little while ago my mother, who is fairly conservative and middle class, saw a film which included some shots of a car production line. And she admitted long afterwards that she hadn't realised that production lines went that fast. I was outright shocked at the speed, but my mother didn't associate the rate they were working with any other facts, like how they felt about life. She can now, having realised a connection, just begin to understand them.

Before anyone can understand anything they must have the INFORMATION, and anarchist information services amount to practically zero.

That's the real daddy problem of the lot, INFORMATION: it's all very well writing articles shouting 'support the strikers', but strikes for pay increases are stupid, and the Conservatives realise it. If the workers realised it perhaps they would strike for better conditions or a 3-day week. So give them this INFORMATION. INFORMATION might start them imagining the things that might really make them happier.

It is because workers in small firms, where they are still quite happy, have not got the INFORMATION about car workers that they think of them as irresponsible, greedy and in need of taming.

Information costs a lot of money, and time, I know, but it is vital, absolutely vital. Leaflets, talks, adverts, anything and everything.

But lots of it. R.M.

## ON IRELAND

Your correspondent Dave Coull is quite wrong. I don't care a tinker's cuss whether a person is Catholic or Protestant, Jew, Turk or Infidel. I do care very much for my country and that people should behave with humanity. He states that the 'Orangers' (with whom my quarrel is) are Celts. They are not. Take their names: Chichester-Clark, Taylor, Bradford—all English. Craig, Paisley, Laird—all Lowland Calvinistic Scots. They may have Celtic bands but being born in a stable does not make one a horse, and these planters have never integrated but kept themselves and their culture apart from the Celt. Even the words Whig and Tory are evolved from the Irish words used by the Irish against their supplanters. Because divide and rule has always been a British policy we have the terrible sectarian hatred in the six counties, fostered deliberately to divide the working class. Certainly a green flag will not unite the people. I am afraid only a war is going to settle things, for we are inundated with Quislings in the pay of England down here in the Dail as in Stormont. It is money that talks not the colour of flags.

I have seen the British at work all over the world, and I stick to it that they want everyone to adopt their culture and way of living and it is this that has created so much division and strife. However, things are coming to a head now and time is running out. No Briton, planter of 300 years or MP, has ever yet understood the Irish, and oddly this is partly language because we apparently speak English but we do not think English and words have different meanings and connotations.

I do not think Dave Coull is Irish, but we shall never be at peace until we have a united country regardless of religion or anything else but the good of the country. H.

## SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE

'GENERAL STRIKE, TORIES OUT'—the slogan with the most currency outside the Fairfield Hall on March 18, and it is a call of which one hears a lot amongst active opponents of the Industrial Relations Bill. Since by definition a syndicalist is one who works to achieve a social general strike in order to change society (thereby getting rid of the Tories and all other governments) it caused some remark that the anarchists at the Fairfield Hall were not among those chanting.

To a syndicalist a social general strike is an act of social revolution, one that more than anything else he wishes to achieve, but one which can only be successfully achieved if it is waged by conscious workers desiring and ready to take control of their own lives, of industry and of society generally to run them for the good of all. Such conscious workers neither need nor desire leaders and would not wait on trade union bureaucrats to vote for a general strike, would not delegate to those bureaucrats the running of that strike and would not therefore be moved by chants designed to influence those bureaucrats.

When the workers are ready to strike on a world scale, or even on a national or local scale, they will also be ready to dispense with leadership. Where workers have—especially as in the General Strike of 1926, but as in every strike one can name—left the running of major strike actions to TU leaders they have left themselves open to betrayal.

So, while anarchists are as eager as any to counter the threat of the Industrial Relations Bill, while we have been working ever since we existed to promote the concept of a general strike for political ends, while we were to be found numbered among those present outside the

## WHEN WILL THIS BANDITRY CEASE?

YET ANOTHER WAGE claim is in the pipeline. This time from a small closely knit group of foreign origin. Claims are made by this group of extensive public service but it is arguable that the whole industry (if we can call it that) could be closed down with little difference to the Gross National Product.

It is impossible to discover the nature of the product or service supplied, and the group seem by a process of shifty property deals to have acquired substantial slices of England, yet their spokesman, a Greek of German ancestry, whined in public that they were 'in the red'. Since this 'industry' is of such an intangible nature and is assuredly a nationalised affair no doubt Mr. Carr could teach them a lesson by standing up to their impudent and blasphemous motto 'God and my Right'. Do these people have any concept of duty?

Any industrial dispute in this field could doubtless be put a stop to by a blanket declaration by Mr. Carr and Mr. Heath of total redundancy which has ample precedent in many parts of the world. There is a long history of labour disputes in this avocation. It was closed down, for example, with the redundancy of Charles Stuart and Louis Capet. This kind of thing never happens in the United States.

Edward Windsor sought to bring in foreign labour which some thought would lead to dilution but he was ousted by the management. Readers may recall that

Margaret Windsor, a member of the group, once sought to bring in an unsuitable co-worker (for want of a better term) but this was vetoed.

The work done by this group could easily be simplified (or done away with) in these days of automation and computers. It consists of openings, layings, speech-making, touring, hand-shaking, signing, acknowledging, viewing, consenting, willing, decreeing, with the concomitant overseeing functions of serving, detaining during pleasure, servicing and by and large, reigning. Their nearest approach to industrial labour is the launching of ships and the laying of foundation stones but the physical effort involved in this is minimal and it is not as if the ships and buildings would be incomplete without the perfunctory motions made by the group.

Members of Parliament must be well aware of the insidious influence worked by this group in their proceedings. Nothing can go forward without their permission. A few words muttered in an ancient foreign tongue is the indication that they assent. Their representatives are everywhere and it is a well-known fact that Budget secrets are 'leaked' to them twenty-four hours before they are known to the taxpayer.

Mr. Heath should put his foot down firmly upon this group who have never in their history stood on their own two feet but always on the necks of the general public.

JACK SPRATT.

## Jobs for the Boys

WITH THIS SLOGAN the Conservative Party began to plan its carve-up of the nationalised industries, giving the profit-making sections to their friends and leaving the non-profit-making sections to demonstrate the fact that nationalisation doesn't work.

In a recent issue of *FREEDOM* I listed the impressive business qualifications of the Cabinet when it came to discussing the South African issue. Today we are looking at the ministries which govern two of the main requisites of the working man—Employment and Housing.

Following his usual pattern Edward Heath has chosen his best qualified men to run these ministries. Robert Carr, the minister, will no doubt have a toast raised in his honour from his fellow members on the Council of the Institute of Directors. They are probably as pleased as he is about the Industrial Relations Bill.

Those against the Bill will probably ask how Mr. Carr, as a company director, can possibly know what goes on inside the workshops and factories of Britain. Here too, Mr. Carr is admirably qualified. He is also director of Security Services Ltd. and Securicor. In 1963 Security Services Ltd. sent a circular letter to a number of firms in London advertising a unique service. They offered to provide 'undercover agents' to give a 'complete appraisal of all unauthorised happenings, to follow company vehicles and report any persons found causing dissension or inviting employees to defect'. After a protest from Waltham-

defect'. After a protest from Walthamstow Farm labourers will doubtless be looked after by the Minister of State for Employment, Paul Bryan, who has ample experience from studying his own labourers on his 200 acre farm at Sawdon, Yorkshire. Paul Bryan is chairman of J. B. Hoyle & Co. Ltd., the suppliers of those neatly cut uniforms worn by Securicor drivers.

We can hope for more picturesque council estates soon, built on the lines of those developed by New British Garden Estates. Peter Walker, the Minister for Environment, is a director of this company and it is hoped that his expertise will be reflected in government buildings. These buildings should be built with a keen eye to economy too, with experience gleaned from his directorship of the Rodwell Property Group.

Of course much property is privately owned and, we are told, that some landlords are not so well off as they could be. Then what better consultant could the National Federation of Property Owners have than their present one, Mr. Grahame Page, Minister of State for Housing? You can also see Mr. Page if you want to become a landlord; as deputy chairman of the Property Owners Building Society. Or for a little dabble in the property market, try Mr. Page again, this time as director of the United Real Property Trust Ltd.

It is rewarding to know that our ministries are in the hands of professionals.

LARRY.

## LEEDS CONFERENCE APRIL 23, 24 & 25

This conference was called for to discuss the topic of reorganisation at the annual conference in Liverpool. It is hoped that the conference will, after an 'all-in' session, split into small groups to discuss all aspects of the topic, such as effects on local groups, types of libertarian organisation, needs (or lack of needs) for organisation, etc.

The conference has been set for the dates and times below.

### FRIDAY, APRIL 23:

8 p.m. — Meet at the shop or 'The Fenton' (both in Woodhouse Lane).

### SATURDAY, APRIL 24:

11 a.m.-6 p.m. — Main debate at 'The Christian Centre', Leeds University. An evening social will be organised to follow.

### SUNDAY, APRIL 25:

11 a.m.-6 p.m. — Venue as yet undecided.

Any pre-conference literature for distribution (stamps/donations for postage welcome) should be sent to:—

TREVOR BAVAGE,  
FLAT 3,  
35 RICHMOND ROAD,  
LEEDS 6

or

MARTIN WATKINS,  
FLAT D,  
90 CLARENDON ROAD,  
LEEDS 2

If you get lost in Leeds or want further information, ring Leeds 59762.

Details for accommodation — write to the above addresses.

BOOKS



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

5p

### PAPERBACKS

American Radical Thought: The Libertarian Tradition (Anthology)	2.12
Patterns of Anarchy (Anthology)	1.25
Enquiry Concerning Political Justice (Abridged)	Godwin 1.60
Obsolete Communism	Cohn-Bendit 0.25
Strike at Pilkingtons	Lane & Roberts 0.50
Men Against The State	James J. Martin 1.05
Homage to Catalonia	George Orwell 0.30
Green Child	Herbert Read 0.25
Essays in Literary Criticism	Herbert Read 0.80
The Dissenting Academy (ed.) Theodore Roszak	0.40
Anarchism & Other Essays	Emma Goldman 1.25
Rebel in Paradise	Richard Drinnon 1.70
No Treason	Lysander Spooner 0.60
PAMPHLETS	
Radical America	
Radical Historiography issue	0.45
World Labour Needs A Union	I.W.W. 0.15
Anarchy Now!	Bill Dwyer 0.15
Anarchy and Organisation	Murry Bookchin 0.05
Kronstadt Commune	Ida Mett 0.20

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 Sta.

SPECIMEN COPIES ON REQUEST

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

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES, 1971

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

Fairfield Hall, those on the AUEW march of March 1, the TUC march and the December 8 one—where all our propaganda centred on the need to promote work towards a general strike—we insist that this must be a revolutionary action of the workers not a bureaucratic manoeuvre by TU bosses.

L.O.



# Riff-Raff

APOLOGISTS FOR Russian methods of imprisonment and of the Russian system of government will find much to grind their teeth against in *Cancer Ward*, as will American publicists with the collection of letters written by a man in virtual solitary confinement for the past ten years—*Soledad Brother*. Books such as these reveal the similarity in style with which governments attempt to stifle their individual dissidents and opponents. More than this they reveal individual efforts to resist and fight in most subtle and dangerous ways.

Nothing Personal happens to be an LP recording of George Melly singing blues along with Mick Mulligan's band. He needs no publicity himself, but this record may be unknown since it was released back in 1958—lo and behold just thirteen years ago, but a world away in music and life-styles! If you like jazz and like Ma Rainey or Bessie Smith you may love or hate this record. What comes over is the sheer enjoyment of band and singer rollicking through old blues numbers, or songs like *Hound Dog* and *This Train*. You'll have to search hard for it however—I got mine 'reissued' in a recordshop in 1959! (Decca LK 4226.)

*C'mon Everybody* is a paperback poetry-of-the-dance. Issued by Corgi and one of a series of poems books. It is one of the few anthologies to be carried in every rucksack since it sings a little; makes you think a little; and leaves you happy or sad according to mood and place. Adrian Mitchell has the first word with his *Do in The Bourgeois*. Allen Ginsberg practically the final word: 'Maybe there's some sixteen-

year-old kid in a place like Wichita right now who's not just writing but singing and dancing his poetry. . . . That's what I'd like to see—the first poetry reading where a sixteen-year-old kid from Wichita comes on singing and dancing poetry.'

If you are locked up in a nightshift job or pissed off with the same tedious sexy novels and want to grip a bit of zen instead of 'a bit of glorious tit' as my local lady in the cafe says, you could enjoy *Zen Flesh Zen Bones*. Until this Pelican paperback it was only available in an American edition, now within reach at 30p.

Undramatic though it is, the most positive aid towards creating a more anarchic society is the regular sales of anarchist and other libertarian literature. You may wish to sell outside a bus or train station; inside an arcade; in a streetmarket; cosily in a shop or cafe; roughly treated outside factory or school; snugly inside university halls; but wherever, you can be assured that you give others the free choice of understanding anarchist thought and possibly reaching out towards libertarian—ever open—attitudes. So why not shake off your arsing-around and commit yourself just a very little. Freedom Press (who also publish *Anarchy*), and Housmans Peace News Bookshop, send out a fine selection of pamphlets and newspapers/magazines which supported by the drugcult papers—*Oz*; *IT*; *Friends*—give a pretty varied choice. Besides which you can add your very own and local magazines. *C'mon Everybody!*

DENNIS GOULD.

## THIS WORLD

Dear Editors,

Bill Dwyer's reports of my talks show a developing talent for dodging the issue. His most recent is a beaut.

Item: the two farmers. Of course they were a hypothetical case, but the case was neither impossible nor irrelevant. It was used to illustrate my question 'what is wrong with inequality of wealth?'. No one at the meeting answered this question and Dwyer's present profession of faith is no answer either. What Dwyer did not report, was that after the two farmers I went on to argue that it was the belief in, and practice of, authority that 'put some men at the disposal of others', not the fact that some had more wealth than others. Anarchism is opposition to authority, not commitment to egalitarianism.

Item: anarcho-capitalism. Here Dwyer writes from the invincible basis of sheer ignorance. I am an anarchist-individualist, not an 'anarcho-capitalist'—who tends to be almost as obsessed with social engineering as Dwyer is. At least, however, the 'anarcho-capitalist' can be said to have a far better grasp of economic realities than any anarcho-communist I have come across.

Item: Bakunin. I made no mention of his duping 'the police forces of Europe'. The 'allegedly unanarchic sentiments' were expressed by Bakunin in a letter

written on February 7, 1870, apropos the Jesuits and a letter written on April 1, 1870, to Albert Richard. Max Nomad gives his sources if Dwyer wants to check their authenticity. In both Bakunin expresses his belief in dictatorship—'invisible' and 'temporary', of course—and Max Nettlau, expert on Bakunin, has commented on this. More data can be provided if wanted.

It is significant that Bakunin-worshippers insinuate falsification when these revelatory letters are quoted. One in the USA suggested to me that they might be translated wrongly, but gave no reason for making such a supposition. Now Dwyer retires behind legal phasology in an effort to suggest they never existed!

Item: the unnamed 'comrade'. Poor man! Is he such a mental weakling that he can only get his ideas by a process of 'contagion'. If I am so 'infectious' he is lucky Dr. Dwyer is around to immunise him.

Yours sincerely,

London S. E. PARKER.  
29.3.71

P.S.—If my 'simplistic defence' of capital appeals 'dearly' to the 'strange' anarcho-capitalists of the USA, I will treat Dwyer to a pint from the proceeds!

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, May 2. 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, Harington, 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.  
Cornwall: A. Jacobs, 13 Ladrans Road, St. Austell, (M. 26, 2).  
East & E. Herts.: P. Newell, 'Agaia', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (RM, PL.)  
Sussex: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.  
Yorkshire: Martin Watkins, Flat D, 90 Clarendon Road, Leeds, LS2 9L.  
Scotland: Temporary Secretary, Neil Munro, 203 Cornhill Drive, Aberdeen.  
Wales: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).  
N. Ireland: c/o Freedom Press.  
S. Ireland: 20 College Lane, Dublin, 2.  
University and Student Groups: c/o P. L. Mare (Address above).  
Abbey Road: M. Gossling, M. Gossling, 15-16, Q. Quarterly, FL—Free London.

# THE NEW ANARCHY

ANARCHY, Volume 1, Number 2 (Second Series), Freedom Press, 20p.

THE SECOND ISSUE of the new *Anarchy* is devoted to the Kronstadt rising. This year is the fiftieth anniversary of the (by most of the world) forgotten struggle of the sailors of the naval base of Kronstadt against the Bolshevik regime, which they resisted because it was already becoming reactionary and crushing the revolution. The sailors had been referred to by the Bolsheviks as 'the pride and glory of the revolution', but as soon as it suited the government to suppress them it did so without compunction.

This issue of *Anarchy* is a beautifully

produced commemoration of this tragic event. It is illustrated by contemporary photographs, and contains articles by eyewitnesses, N. Petrov and Alexander Berkman, a review of Paul Avrich's book *Kronstadt 1921*, a piece by Anton Ciliga and other matters unconnected—directly—with Kronstadt, but linked with it indirectly I think. For liberty is indivisible. These include *Memoirs of an Ancient Activist* by Paul Goodman, which describes the difficulties of being a libertarian and a homosexual.

This is an excellent production, and in my opinion well up to the high standard of the old *Anarchy*.

A.W.U.

## A Christian's Defence

POLLUTION AND THE DEATH OF MAN. The Christian View of Ecology, by Francis A. Schaeffer (Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 30p).

THE TROUBLE with a book like this is that you have to accept God, Christ, the Fall of Man, etc., as literal facts, not as allegories, before you begin. If you do not believe all this then the arguments of the author are without any basis. Apparently the idea, which I first encountered in the works of Alan Watts (the writer on Zen) as far back as 1957, that Judaeo-Christian theories about the relationship between God, Man and Nature were responsible for pollution and the destruction of wild life have now become part of the conventional wisdom in America. The author seeks to refute this. In fairness to the Christians I think it should be pointed out that deforestation was as much a problem of the ancient world as it is of ours. Of course populations were smaller and technology simpler, so the amount of destruction was less, but it was pretty bad even so. Whole forests vanished for ever from Palestine and Greece and parts of China, without the help of any other theory, religious or secular, than simply this, 'Let's grab what we can get, when we can get it. Never mind about the future, the world is boundless. And anyway we shall be dead by then.' This philosophy dominates us still.

However, even if the Judaeo-Christians did not actively promote this policy, they did little to stop it, as our author readily admits. He believes that it is the duty of the Church to oppose it without cease. His church is the Protestant one, and he appears to be a kind of intellectual fundamentalist. I feel that to some degree he is on our side, but he does make the most astonishing statements. For instance, 'In Eastern countries there is no real base for the

dignity of man.' To which one can only reply, 'This is not true.' His ideas of Humanism are wild in the extreme. To him the humanist also has 'no real base for the dignity of man'. When opposing ideas are so out of touch with each other, argument is a waste of time.

The book includes an article by Lynn White, Jr., 'The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis', in which the writer suggests that the ruthless attitude to Nature began in Europe during the Dark Ages with the invention of the iron ploughshare, which cut deep furrows in the earth. Nowhere else was anything similar developed, the scratch-the-surface kind of plough being felt quite adequate. The author of this article favours the mysticism of St. Francis as the appropriate creed for our age. There is also a shorter piece by Richard L. Means which deals with Eric Hoffer's warnings that the trend now is to romanticise nature, which is reactionary, etc. Means believes that Hoffer is overlooking the fact that while one man, as an individual, finds himself fighting nature (which is far from always benevolent), men acting collectively are not in the same situation. If they wage war on nature they run the risk of destroying the natural world and ultimately themselves.

Both these articles are reprinted from magazines in order to give the reader an idea of what Dr. Schaeffer is opposing, although he in part agrees with them. In his view their failure to come to grips with the problem adequately lies in the humanism of their approach. And what I feel is the trouble with all this is that to believe in the Christian scheme involves a readiness to accept unprovable assumptions, which are not so very different from those of the Aetherius Society which teaches that people are coming from other worlds in flying saucers in order to help us.

A.W.U.

## NO LONGER SILENT

KENT STATE and Lieutenant Calley: The four words spell the death of the American 'Silent Majority'—which was a majority which wished to silence not so much the anti-war protesters as their own consciences—which Nixon

claimed to represent two-and-a-half years back. It is three ways split with sections turning to wanting peace on humanitarian grounds and super-patriots wanting whitewash brushes and the belief that everything goes to protect the country. They cannot coexist.

It was a similar wish to 'silence' not any hatred of war as such—that caused the clamorous support for Chamberlain's 'Peace in our Time' Munich policies. It was a similar wish for 'silence'—to silence strikers and opponents of apartheid in this case—that last year tipped the balance in favour of Heath.

We were treated then—we still are being—to long talks on the right-wing backlash, and fatuous but learned-sounding comparisons with the rise of fascism (all as reason of course for supporting the lesser evil in the elections). Those who so talked (and talk) were (and are) incapable of understanding the essentially transient nature of a silent majority phenomenon.

The common factor in Nixon's support, in the Men of Munich and in Heath's backing was that it was silent; it was the people who didn't want to know and resented being asked to think. This was not the fact of fascism. There the forces of order did know where it stood and was by no means silent.

Fascism, National Socialism and Falangism (and Peronism), followed a prolonged and bitter struggle between mass revolutionary socialist movements—which very nearly succeeded in abolishing the bourgeois states—and Monarchical and Militarist, traditional, aristocratic and authoritarian Conservative movements. The 'forces of order' of the centre were not just unwilling to make

## MAY DAY ISSUE

This month we have decided to publish a fourth issue of the paper. It will come out on the Thursday before May Day and will be a special issue aimed at the occasion.

It will include an article written by Kropotkin for May Day as well as one from our comrades in the IWW in America. Our main feature will, however, be on the meaning of May Day today. This will be an appraisal of how the writer sees the present-day attitude of workers to the day which has symbolised working-class aspirations for a better world. A number of photographs and illustrations are planned to make the issue an attractive one.

Although May Day falls on a Saturday this year, a demonstration is taking place in London on that day, as well as those organised by the Labour Party on the Sunday. These demonstrations will be a good opportunity to sell this special issue and to propagate anarchism.

Orders will be taken on the usual sale or return basis.

EDITORS.

## Contact

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

The Match — Anarchist monthly, \$3 p.a. For sample and other literature, write to P.O. Box 3684, Tucson, Arizona, USA.

Scottish Anarcho-Syndicalist Conference. May 8/9. Details: Contact Moira Young, 91 Burghhead Drive, Glasgow, S.W.1.

Wanted: A copy of Voline's 'Unknown Revolution' for comrade in Australia. Send to Box 002, Freedom Press.

Preston Libertarians. Please contact Dr. Charles Shaw (for Mad research work), 12 Elmley Street, Preston, PR1 7XD. Telephone: (0772) 52659.

'Hyde Park Socialist' now out! Includes 'Sectarianism on the Left' by John Downing and 'The British Left during World War 2' by F. A. Ridley. From J. Hughes, 48 Gilbey Road, London, S.W.17. 20p a year.

S. Ireland. English anarchist visiting S. Ireland for touring holiday in June would like to meet Irish comrades en route. Terry Phillips, 70 Blenheim Walk, Corby, Northants.

Proposed Group—Dundee. Mike Malet, 1 Lynnewood Place, Dundee.

'Tincan'. Midlands poetry, prose and artwork. Photo-litho anthology. Blue or grey cover. From G. Charlton, Arts Lab., Tower Street, Birmingham, B19 3UY. 20p, incl. post.

Anyone interested in forming a Cambridge Anarchist Group contact John Jenkins, 75 York Street, Cambridge.

Charlotte Wilson, 1854-1944. First Editor of FREEDOM. Information about her life and work sought by Philip Venning, Old Wyldes, North End, N.W.3.

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.

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.

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.

George Foulser, now squatting as 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.

up their minds or listen to the debate, they actively disliked both and were determined to be heard in opposition to both.

There was no such hope/fear of imminent revolution pervading the England of the Thirties or the Sixties—or even the USA of the Sixties. The Left appeared an irritant, and people might wish it would go away, or even think of swatting it in an absent-minded way as one would a buzzing fly; but there was no mass revolutionary movement breeding terror in the petit-bourgeoisie; and so the petit-bourgeoisie did not consider—as it had done in fascism—making sacrifices to submit itself to a disciplined mass party.