

WHO WINS IN VIETNAM?

AS WE GO to press the issue in Vietnam is not yet resolved, the NLF Army is said to be re-grouping for the offensive upon Hue. ARVN has replaced several unsuccessful generals and the world awaits tricky Dicky's new moves to stop the advance. Nixon has promised to do all short of atomic weapons—we fear the worst.

Seven Days re-surfaced for May Day with an issue devoted to Vietnam. It features an interview with Ly Van Sau, the official spokesman for the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam in (in Paris). Ly Van Sau said, 'You wonder why we are now using conventional armaments like tanks and

cannon instead of sticking to guerilla warfare. Well, we are now using all available forces, guerilla, regional and regular—and doing this is what constitutes a popular war.' (Surely, the translator meant 'a war of the people'.) He goes on, 'We consider it natural that the Vietnamese people should defend themselves with every available weapon against an enemy who has the most up-to-date arms and has unleashed the whole American arsenal in Vietnam.'

Ly Van Sau went on, 'The price we have to pay for this is very high. There is no easy way for us; we must suffer, we must overcome many difficulties, make many sacrifices and undergo many privations to fight such a very powerful enemy. But our struggle is developing—we've been fighting for more than a quarter of a century. As we have moved from the purely guerilla stage to the use of superior weapons, we are winning some very important victories, in spite of the fierce reaction of the Americans and their attempt to stop our offensive. There is talk of one front, two fronts, three fronts, four fronts in South Vietnam—but in fact there are hundreds of fronts. There's no place where people are not attacking the enemy.'

The logic of Ly Van Sau's remarks is that the North Vietnamese could use atomic weapons. The *Sunday Times* correspondent, William Shawcross, claims that the NLF are using a Russian 'Strella' missile which, like several Western missiles, works on the principle of 'homing' on the heat of an aircraft engine. It is fired from the shoulder and is the ideal missile for the NLF. As their weapons become more technically complex, the NLF will be more dependent upon the Russians and the Chinese for supplies. Obviously one of the sacrifices of the NLF will be the sacrifice of national independence.

It is true that the North Vietnamese are suffering from bombardments by the American Air Force.

as they suffered from the oppressions of the French and the Japanese—but this is the logic of total war. As a tactic it has failed up to now to break the spirit of the North Vietnamese—in fact such bombing (as it did in Britain and Germany) merely stiffens the will to resist. The need for complex supply lines tactics of guerilla warfare eliminated and therefore bombing was a failure as strategy. We do not know if the new form of warfare has made the NLF supply lines more vulnerable.

War has a dynamic of its own which goes forward despite any human hopes or fears. It is possible, if Ly Van Sau is a reliable spokesman, that the North Vietnamese have become conditioned to a war economy and a war psychology. Twenty-five years of fighting must have produced a new type of citizen. The North Vietnamese Government must be (internally) the safest government on earth. No one will question their actions, nobody examine their motives—and for twenty-five years!

Much tribute has been paid (in *Seven Days*, too) to General Vo

Nguyen Giap whose 'military genius' has defeated ARVN but *Seven Days* is indiscreet enough to mention that in 1945 when Giap was in the first Vietnam Government he was Minister of the Interior (and we quote Jean Lacouture), 'a position which enabled him to effectively suppress nationalist and Trotskyite opposition'. It is unlikely that General Giap has changed his stripes. In fact his taste of military success may have hardened his anti-nationalist and anti-Trotskyite attitudes.

This makes nonsense of Trotskyite support of the NLF, it is impossible to assess what is meant by 'nationalist' opposition. Surely, the whole NLF outlook is based on an appeal to Vietnamese nationalism? Such political programmes as they have advanced are far removed from communism, the support of the middle-class farmer landowner and small businessman has long been cultivated by the NLF.

We do not know at this point who will win in Vietnam. The odds are at the moment that the NLF will win but given the fortunes of war and the ability of masses of war material to decide issues it is still

uncertain. The one thing that is certain is that the people of Vietnam, both North and South, will lose and for twenty-five years have been on the losing side whilst French, Japanese, Americans and assorted native political leaders battled over their homes and bodies as to who should rule them. In the process homes and bodies were shattered but from the fragments life was reconstructed and incredibly went on to raise more food for soldiers, more children for war.

The Vietnamese (North and South) are a peasant people and as such, have an inborn distrust of government which to them means the landlord, the tax-gatherer and the soldier. It is probable that whatever shoddy compromise is arrived at in Vietnam—or in Paris or Moscow—and whatever new form of political set-up is made for the Vietnamese, they will still have to harness the oxen, plough the paddy-field and tend the rice crop. They will still have to pay the landlord, the tax-gatherer and render military service in preparedness for the next war which will correct the injustices of the present one. Unless the Vietnamese realise the great confidence trick worked on them by governments who continually ask them to 'suffer, overcome many difficulties, make many sacrifices and undergo many privations', whether under the flag of North or South Vietnam.

JACK ROBINSON.

More on UKAPE

FOLLOWING THE NEWS that the 'United Kingdom Association of Professional Engineers' has links with the right-wing Monday Club, *Public Service*, the official paper of NALGO, reports that UKAPE—the professional engineers' trade union—is, in fact, a very dubious contender for such a title.

UKAPE, like the Post Office Telecommunications Staff Association and the National Union of Seamen, has of course registered with the Government's Industrial Relations Court. Furthermore, some of its members have made wild claims, particularly in such journals as *The Surveyor*, of a membership of between 6,000 and 10,000. But its actual membership on December 31, 1971, was 3,617 men—and one woman. UKAPE was actually formed by a limited company, the Engineers Guild Ltd., with a loan of £3,290, and another loan 'from an unspecified source' (the Monday Club?) of £1,000. It has one permanent official, its general secretary, who by coincidence is also the secretary of the limited company. And of its 36-member executive, five are not even employees at all: they are company directors!

So much for UKAPE, a trade union for engineers. Another Tory 'front' organisation?

P.N.

ALL GAS & GHOSTIES

WHAT CAN ONE SAY about the poor old Church of England? It has been called, with some justice, 'The Tory Party at Prayers', but it is perhaps one of the least intolerant of the Christian churches. A few years ago vicars attempted to attract worshippers by playing guitars, holding special services for motor cyclists and running discussion groups. It is an amiable picture, if a trifle pathetic. Running around trying to be 'with it' seems so hopeless. A friend pointed out to me that when a comic clergyman appears on TV, or the cinema, the radio, the stage, he is always C of E. Never an RC. Let anyone make a joke about the Roman Catholics and a yell of protest goes up from them.

But guitar-playing vicars are infinitely to be preferred to inquisitors and witch-finders generally. Yet this is what we may be getting back to. According to the *Guardian* (20.4.72), 'Bishops of the Church of England are officially recommended today each to appoint his own trained exorcist to be ready when needed to expel evil forces from people and places. This comes at a time when there is growing concern in the Church at the increasing interest in the country in witchcraft, magic and the occult.'

This is an attempt to keep up with the hippy-Joneses, who are turning to occult-

ism, much as their grandparents or great-grandparents did at the turn of the century. Guitars are exchanged for the paraphernalia of the magician, and so the Church of England must hurry to catch up with the new craze. So highly educated, intelligent, modern men, in a society that can send astronauts to the moon, dabble in magic and exorcism. (And then people talk about African tribes, with their witch-doctors, as 'backward'!)

'A commission', says the *Guardian*, 'set up by the Bishop of Exeter, Dr. Robert C. Mortimer, which has inquired into the history and practice of exorcism as part of the Christian ministry, also proposes that centres should be set up to train exorcists. This should be done, if possible, in collaboration with the Roman Catholic Church.'

The old enemies are going to unite against the demons!

However, the report goes on to tell us that to begin with at least the assumption must be that the person thought to be possessed by evil spirits is physically or mentally ill. Resort must first be made to the doctor or the psychiatrist, and only when all else fails must the exorcist be called in. Animals and children must be removed from the house when a service

Continued on page 4

STILL DEFYING THE LAW

SHOP STEWARDS representing dockers from all the major ports have decided to defy their union's instructions to lift the blacking of selected companies' containers. The decision was taken at a meeting of the unofficial National Port Shop Stewards' Committee, as part of their continuing campaign over who should load and unload containers.

This decision is also in defiance of the National Industrial Relations Court who have instructed the Transport and General Workers' Union leaders to get their members to lift the blacking. But the importance of this open disregard for the law is that it shows that the rank and file members are, at the moment, in control.

Ironically, if the Industrial Relations Act had not been passed, this dispute probably would have been smoothed out round the negotiating table. As it is, the union has had to pay £55,000 in fines for contempt and has given the NIRC assurances that it is trying to get its members to end the blacking.

With the TUC heaving a hasty retreat from a confrontation with the State, Mr. Jack Jones, the general secretary of the T&GWU, sent his legal advisers along to the court to put the union's case. The union, now following the TUC's new line of obeying the law, said this: 'It will be my case that it has always been union policy that the court orders, however distasteful they may be, should be obeyed, and through its full time officials the union has sought to have that carried into effect.' Mr. Pain, for the union, went on to say that the union 'can't control everybody in the docks', but would try and prevent the dispute from spreading.

The union argued that the withdrawal of stewards' credentials would make the situation worse, although it had been considered. If they were withdrawn, Mr. Pain argued, the dockers would either refuse to have replacements or would elect 'men of like mind or possibly more radical'.

SEEKING A WAY OUT

The leadership of the T&GWU have really been put on the spot. It has now been given until Tuesday, May 9, to prepare a full answer to the court's decision

that the union must discipline its stewards.

Mr. Jack Jones has been searching for a way out. Directly the court proceedings were over he met Mr. Macmillan, Secretary for Employment, to discuss the container dispute. The outcome was a suggested meeting with the employers and the National Dock Labour Board.

In contrast to his members, Mr. Jack Jones is seeking a lawful way out to avoid further fines being imposed. At this stage I don't think he can discipline his stewards because his whole reputation as a 'lefty' would be in ruins. He is now the victim of his own speeches and policy statements in which he has emphasised his support for grass root decision making and union democracy. Mr. Jones now faces the dilemma of disciplining his members or paying further fines.

His case will be that the union cannot be held responsible by the NIRC for the action of his stewards. If the court rules that the union is accountable for the action of its stewards, then the T&GWU could have its assets sequestered until the contempt is 'purged'. Or the court could fine the stewards in contempt.

NATIONAL STOPPAGE

A national delegate conference of dockers has given the employers 28 days' notice of a national dock strike over claims for the right to 'stuff and strip' containers, for average earnings when on full back pay and a fourth week's annual holiday. This conference decision was taken before the meeting of the National Shop Stewards' Committee. This recall of the docks delegate conference and their decision could be used to siphon off support from the blacking campaign and the initiative will be wrested away from the rank and file.

The contrast between the rank and file's continual defiance of the law and the retreat by union leaders should not surprise anyone. The history of the trade union movement is marked out with such retreats and surrenders by the leadership when faced with a head-on clash with the state. Leaders are more concerned about the assets of their unions than they are in making a prin-

ciple stand. Rather than mobilise the membership against the law and the state they bargain away hard won gains. They are the compromisers, the go-betweens, the agencies for keeping workers in line. It is these leaders who make the productivity deals, sign the no-strike agreements, agree to speed-up and compulsory overtime, which increases the employers' exploitation of the working class.

CONTAINER LEVY

The T&GWU is no exception. Instead of making a fight to keep jobs both in the docks and at the terminals at the union rate, they are talking of a settlement like that negotiated by longshoremen in America. This agreement levies money on containers which are packed and unpacked outside specified areas. The money raised is then used to pay higher severance payment. Such schemes do not prevent the loss of jobs, they only cushion effects of redundancy.

It is natural that leaders should act in this manner. We do not believe in 'saviours', either of the 'left' or the 'right'. Leaders will always try to keep control. They hold positions of power which would be threatened if control was won by the membership. The present retreat by the trade union leaders is not a defeat for the working class. It was something that just had to happen.

The Industrial Relations Act was made law to combat unofficial disputes. The leadership of the trade unions have on numerous occasions shown how valuable they are to the employers and the government by preventing these stoppages. They maintain discipline and channel off discontent along the safe paths of procedure. It is in the interests of these leaders to maintain the illusion that they represent the working class. But when workers realise that they can do without leaders then they will kick them out of power.

Workers by their very position in society have the power and strength to defeat any anti-strike laws. If the law hits one section of workers then it can be defeated by others giving their active support. Solidarity and direct action can beat any employer, any law, and any government.

P.T.

Kropotkin brought up to date

MESSAGE OF A WISE KAROETER, by Roel van Duyn (Duckworth, cloth £2.95, paperback 75p).

ROEL VAN DUYN was in the old Provo movement of some years ago, and has now moved on to the Kabouters (Gnomes), the Dutch radical movement which has taken its place. He believes that the Provo philosophy was not sufficiently constructive, as it aimed to provoke authority to show its real brutal face behind the liberal mask. That aim has now been achieved beyond the wildest dreams of all, not only in Holland but in every country in the world, including dear, peaceful England. Now is the time, van Duyn believes, to be more constructive, to create an Alternative Society, and this is what the Kabouters aim to do.

Roel van Duyn has found his inspiration in Kropotkin's books, particularly in his *Mutual Aid*. I do not think that he would claim to be a 100% anarchist. He comes close to it, but from time to time he expresses views with which an anarchist would not altogether agree. He also, and here I must say I am very much with him, criticises Kropotkin's over-optimism, and his tendency to dismiss the institution of government as something brought about by 'sorcerers, rainmakers, miracle-workers, priests, people with special knowledge of ancient customs and the leaders of warlike hordes'. If this was all it was, why, van Duyn asks, were they so often successful? 'One of man's characteristics', van Duyn goes on, 'is his almost universal fear of finding himself in the dark. This irrational fear, with which we are all familiar, sets up a need for some fixed authority, for laws that will "protect" us. The fear within us, and the need for hierarchy which it reinforces, are the father and mother, so to speak, of the credulity which the

mass of people show towards authority. How are we to come to terms with this "father and mother" without becoming their victims? Only by being rational enough to gratify the equally irrational and powerful need within us for freedom; by creating an anti-authoritarian society, in which fear will not be further stimulated by what are at present the very real dangers of war and famine, and in which the need for hierarchy will be satisfied. . . .

For Kropotkin the irrational, the morbid and the cruel hardly existed, except as something that was part of authoritarian society, to be swept away eventually. He seems to make everything a bit too easy. Van Duyn is aware of this, and, after giving an exposition of Kropotkin's teachings, he goes on to suggest that the impulse toward mutual aid has as its opposite an impulse towards aggression. The tension between the two has a creative effect, so long as the aggression does not swamp the mutual aid. If it does society disintegrates. If, on the other hand, the mutual aid impulse dominates, a pleasant, if static, society is the result. The Bushmen and the Pygmies live in such societies. They do not progress but life is quite satisfactory. He believes that modern society is deliberately (so far as one can talk anthropomorphically of a society) stimulating aggression more and more, that the pace is quickening and becoming ever more feverish, and that in the end there will be a catastrophe, unless some way of slowing it down is found in time. I am sure that he is right, and that the explosion is less than a decade away now, though exactly how it will come, or what form it will take when it does, it is still not possible to say. (This last sentence represents my view not the author's.)

Our author relates Kropotkin to the

modern ethologists (students of animal behaviour), like Konrad Lorenz and the author of *The Naked Ape*. I am not sure that I always quite follow him in some of this. I am afraid that I am coming to believe that the book of Nature is like *The Bible*, 'a nose of wax, which you can bend into any shape you please'. There are so many facts about animal behaviour available that you can use them to prove almost any theory from anarchism to fascism. You see what you want to see. If the thought of conflict and violence pleases you, you can see plenty of evidence for 'nature red in tooth and claw'. If on the other hand you want mutual aid, there is plenty of evidence for that too.

Kropotkin observed mutual aid. Others have observed it too, while yet others have observed conflict, though I think that on balance Kropotkin's views may be said to win the day. It's not just a question of observable facts, but also of interpretation. 'Lorenz actually believes that all personal ties arise out of aggressiveness. He illustrates this with another example from the animal kingdom. A female has young, and so is aggressive towards everything that moves in the vicinity of the nest. However, in order to look after her young she needs the help of a male; so that towards him she must not be aggressive. How does nature solve this problem? The female of the pair learns to distinguish the male in question from his performance of a particular ceremonial. This engenders a positive "affection".

Lorenz's thesis that all love is a product of aggressiveness goes too far. It suffers from the same one-sidedness as the thesis that everything is the result of co-operation (an error Kropotkin did not commit). Lorenz's thesis resembles all too closely the Fascist notion that war is the mother of all things. Understandably enough, therefore, Lorenz is on the Right, politically speaking. His attempt to show that aggression is often constructive may be regarded as highly successful; but his conclusion is unconvincing and illogical. Co-operation and cohesion, as Kropotkin and other like-minded people have pointed out, are indispensable to the emergence of life. I cannot see why spontaneous affection should have to emerge in a roundabout way via aggression, as Lorenz insists, rather than from the power of attraction which positive and negative particles, unicellular creatures, plants, insects, animals and men all exercise on one another. You can interpret the same set of facts in two diametrically opposed ways.

I am inclined to side with Kropotkin, and with van Duyn's theory of mutual aid and aggression as two almost equal forces, pulling against each other. It fits in with my observations of life. It also appeals to my anarchist prejudices. One cannot really be more definite than that.

This is a good little book. It is only 98 pages. The ideas are clearly expressed, in the main, and it is a good introduction to Kropotkin, a good criticism of his rather over-optimistic attitude to life, and a good introduction also to the ethologists, and their theories. There are one or

two irritating minor slips scattered about, 'West Iran' for 'West Irian' for example. Get the paperback. Nearly £3, even by modern inflationary standards, is too much for a book this size. A.W.U.

PRESS FUND

Contributions

April 27-May 3 inc.

Hull: A.P. 50p; New York, USA: G.T. £7; British Columbia, Canada: R.P. 10p; Newcastle: M.B. 50p; Bridgewater, USA: R.P.II. £1; Wolverhampton: J.L. 80p; J.K.W. 20p; In Shop: Anon. 31p; P.G. 26p.

Total: £18.67
Sales (Vollme): £4.00

£14.67

(1) INCOME FROM POSTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND SALES
(Target for 1972-£4,500)

Amount received to May 3 £1411.15

(2) PRESS FUND CONTRIBUTIONS
(Target for 1972-£1,500)

Amount received April 27-May 3 inc. £14.67

Previously acknowledged £518.41

TOTAL TO DATE £533.08

Granada Produces a Ford

THE FORD STRIKE by John Mathews (Published by Panther Books, 40p).

ONCE UPON A TIME Ford brought out a new car called the Granada which is the name of the company that controls Panther Books. Granada decided to sue Ford for taking their name but simultaneously felt that John Mathews' book about the Ford Strike would only complicate matters so they held up publication. Hence what was to be an exercise in instant journalism has now become an example of retarded journalism which in no way alters the quality of the book but tends to strip away some of Panther's more breathless assertions about it. The blurb says: 'the 1971 Ford Strike . . . was the last major strike by British workers before unemployment started to sap their industrial militancy'. Such dull-wittedness does no justice to the author who happens to have written a very stimulating in-depth study of the weeks between January 29 and April 5 when the Ford Company, a supra-national octopus if ever there was one, was the stage of what Mathews calls 'an overtly political strike'. The most valuable sections in the book, and especially relevant now since Union leadership has been forced to reveal itself as opportunistic, are those which deal with various secret meetings between Jones, Scanlon and the Ford management.

'The Times' of March 25th had hinted at the possibility of an intervention by union leaders. The Liverpool delegation to the NINC (national joint negotiating committee) ran into

Jack Jones that same morning on Euston Station. They quizzed him on the speculation in *The Times* but he dismissed it as being totally unfounded.

"I'm not involved", he said, "it's up to you lads—you're running the strike".

The very next day Jones agreed to meet Gillen (chairman of Ford Europe) for the top secret summit meeting. By Tuesday he and Scanlon had negotiated a settlement that was to end the strike.

The workers have only one lesson to learn from this: they must represent themselves.

Mathews has also laid that old ghost concerning Ford workers which depicts them as mini-capitalists earning hundreds of pounds a week goaded into insane acts of self-destruction by a few Communists. What he has not done is give us any idea of the social situation inside and outside the factories that Ford workers have to put up with. He concerns himself only with the 'politics' of the situation and here only in the narrowest sense. After all, what does Ford produce? Motor cars! Nasty, smelly little status symbols that knock unfortunate pedestrians about whilst simultaneously gassing them. Still, it will take another book to go into the consequences to the motor car workers should the desire to terminate these, in every way reactionary machines, be realised. Meanwhile *Ford Strike* is one of those incontestably good reads which will have an actual impact in the industrial struggle. T. G. THOMAS.

ORA

Dear Comrades,

One hesitates to interrupt with the sad note of reality a fine polemic by Jack Robinson. However, in his recent article 'Between the Worlds' Jack attacks ORA for a 'probably unfortunate and hastily-phrased' statement about women's lib that was part of a leaflet read to a conference called by FREEDOM. As the writer of this leaflet I would fully confirm that it was hastily put together and in fact much of it was printed in note form. But Jack appears to have been rather hasty in quoting it. In its original form the phrase read, 'One large field that FREEDOM seldom reports is the women's liberation fight. This is a situation that all the political groups are cashing in on. As anarchists have always argued for the need for women to liberate themselves this is a struggle we should be supporting and putting our view on.'

I would agree that this is possibly not very well expressed and could have been expanded for more clarity. I would have thought though that it did convey the qualitative difference between the opportunism of the authoritarian left with their cashing-in on 'Issues' to lead and use them and an anarchist position which through consistent theories of mutual aid and self-reliance supports a struggle and offers help if needed. Furthermore there was the intention in that phrase to contrast the fact that the liberation of women has been a theme in anarchist writings for many years whereas it has only suddenly been 'discovered' by the fake left due to the upsurge in women's activity for freedom.

This 'discovery' is obviously political opportunism of the worst kind, the latest example of which is IS warning off other left groups from the occupation at Sextons in Norfolk as it was 'theirs' and then doing fuck-all for the women actually occupying. And in fact it was a member of the Libertarian Women's Network who, finding this out, duplicated for them a price list of the garments they are now making, which IS apparently never thought of doing. This, I would suggest, illustrates the difference between 'cashing-in' and 'supporting'.

ORA is organisation-minded—mostly in order to ensure it remains anarchist and revolutionary and coherent enough to last beyond one 'Issue'. How far it is politically-obsessed I am unsure as I'm not quite clear to which of the varying meanings of this phrase reference is being made. All anarchists are inevitably concerned with politics but in order to create a social revolution. There is not space enough to fully detail the great differences between ORA and the left political parties, but I would have thought it obvious that anarchists (FREEDOM as well as ORA) could be concerned with varying issues in society and act and comment upon them without 'blundering' into the sort of 'issue-politics' indulged in by the IS, IMG, Young Liberals, etc., games-players.

As a final point may I add that ORA is at present working on the fifth issue of its *Newsletter*, but is going forward with its plans to produce its own monthly newspaper (which is presumably what Jack meant).

Yours fraternally,
STEVE KIBBLE
(W. London & Middx. ORA)

LETTER

The Tobin Case

THE AUTHORITIES have now shifted Michael Tobin, the Kingsnorth Power Station worker jailed for 'seditious' pamphlets (see FREEDOM, May 6), from Canterbury Prison to Chelmsford, a maximum-security jail. Michael is inside for two years, which was the maximum Judge Thesiger, who is well known on the Kent Circuit for his vindictive sentences, could have given him under the charges. He has now asked for leave to appeal.

A Michael Tobin Defence Committee has now been founded in the Medway Towns to get support for him and to

publicise his case—especially the harshness of the sentence and the political implications for other libertarians. The whole affair was ignored by the Press, but it fits into a pattern of political sentences up and down the country. The Anti-Internment League has also become interested in Tobin's case.

The Defence Committee appeals for financial donations from Comrades to help Michael's wife, Molly, who has been left on her own with five young children to support. The Committee can be contacted at: 265 Dale Street, Chatham, Kent. P.I.

The New Banner: Flag or Rag?

THE NEW BANNER is a journal of libertarianism published in the USA. The editorial policy is anti-state, free-marketing, laissez faire economics leading to an eventual harmonious existence. Murray Rothbard of 'Libertarian Forum' fame looms large on a 4-page interview in which many memorable quotes not merely spill but gush (or is it vomit?) forth. He claims: 'True anarchism will be capitalism, true capitalism will be anarchism.' But more ominous still are the glib references to parliamentary action: 'Maybe eventually we will have a libertarian party. So if you have a really dedicated group in Congress or the Senate you can start voting measures down or whatever, and again. I've only met the Senator (Mark Hatfield) once. At that time he was very friendly towards libertarianism.' Finally Rothbard admits, 'You certainly don't have to convince the majority of the public, because the majority of the public will follow anything that happens.'

This interview could almost be with a

British Communist, with all the edition of 'the public will follow us', the subversion of Senators and the tactical but non-political manoeuvring around the house when their delegates are elected. The Rothbard interview apart, there are 8 more pages to contend with. About a page is filled with expensive display ads from Libertarian Enterprises and about a certain book which 'puts the revolution within reach'. Another side of the story is expensive advertising rates at 8p a word but then no press statement, so probably a profit-making journal. Finally you can buy very small 'laissez faire' posters for 85p a time—'anarcho-capitalism in action'.

A final word from Murray Rothbard: 'You know if the Commune runs everything and decides for anything . . . somebody's got to make the communal decision. . . . In other words it's going to be a coercive decision. You can't tell me that you'll have a participatory democracy.' Oh yes we can!

DAVID BROWN.

Ready this month!

LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION by Vernon Richards

This is not a reprint of the work with the same title published by FREEDOM PRESS in 1953. It is a new and considerably expanded version which the author prepared for an Italian edition published in 1957, and recently published in Paris in a Spanish translation.

Additional chapters deal with such important topics as the Militarization of the Militias, the Cult of the Organisation and of Personalities, the Rank and File's Responsibility.

As well as a Select Bibliography, the author has contributed a 20-page Bibliographical Postscript in which he discusses the most important works that have appeared on the subject in the past twelve years.

240 pages 8½ x 5½

cloth edition £1.50 [p.p. 15p]
paperboards £0.75 [p.p. 15p]

Order your copy now from Freedom Press



Secretary:
Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road,
Rotton Park, Birmingham 16

ANARCHIST FEDERATION of BRITAIN

AFBIB—To all Groups.

The next AFBIB will be produced in Sheffield at 4 Havelock Square, Sheffield, 10. Send material to Secretary, Peter Le Mare. Also needs offers of help from Groups to bring out further issues.

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:

N.E. England: Mick Renwick, 34 Durham Road, Gateshead, Co. Durham.
East & E. Midlands: P. Howell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester, CO1, Essex.
Surrey: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.
Yorkshire: Trevor Savage, Flat 3, 35 Richmond Road, Leeds, 6.
Manchester: Mat Cunningham, 9 Briar Hill Avenue, Little Hulton, Worsley, Lancs.
Scotland: Secretary, Mike Milot, 1 Lynwood Place, Maryfield, Dundee.
Wales: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).
N. Ireland: c/o Freedom Press.
The American Federation of Anarchists: P.O. Box 9885, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440, USA.
S. Ireland: 20 College Lane, Dublin, 2.
University and Student Groups: c/o P. L. Mare.

Injustice the World Over

IF INJUSTICE OCCURS in America, Rhodesia or South West Africa we can be sure the liberal conscience will stir, refreshed from the rest it experienced when the Mangrove Nine, the 'Angry Brigade' and those who fight racism in Britain were bullied and mistreated recently.

The *Guardian* passed all records for liberal hypocrisy when in an editorial (8.3.72), 'Justice again on trial', it looked at the trial of Angela Davis in America. 'Miss Davis does not have to worry about justice,' they say, 'the whole world is watching the trial of this American revolutionary.' Many of her (Angela's) revolutionary friends believe she does not stand a chance of receiving a fair trial in what they regard as a Fascist political system.

The *Guardian* should know that many of Stuart Christie's revolutionary friends don't believe he has a chance of getting a fair trial in Britain—under the

Guardian's nose—whose eyes (long-sighted for injustice but short-sighted for D notices) are averted anywhere but here in Britain! Those terrible Turks imprisoning Timothy Davey (while a 14-year-old girl is in Holloway prison awaiting trial—maybe you hadn't heard). One wonders just how honest these liberals are, how much sense of justice they really have, how much they feel the pain of the empathy that knows the sufferings of those who are mistreated so cruelly in our world today.

Of course, our world is a village today. To some of us it always was and suffering and injustice always move us wherever they may occur, the struggles of the oppressed and the courage of those who resist oppression with defiance always gain our support—even when they are on our doorstep!

As Dr. Waldheim, the new Secretary General of the UN visits Namibia (South-West Africa) and Lord Pearce returns

from Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), we need to remember that the strike in Namibia against contract labour and the miners' strike are part of the same struggle. The trial of strikers in Namibia and the handcuffing of pickets after arrest in Scotland, the torture of detainees in Northern Ireland, Southern Africa, Russia, the holding without trial and the mockery of justice in the destruction of George Jackson and the mistrial of Jake Prescott are all part of the same,

indivisible fight which does not care whether Jake was an anarchist or George Jackson was a Communist or internees in Long Kesh are members of the IRA—what matters is that they are human beings being unjustly treated by the forces of repression; what happens to them, if we feel and know the suffering, happens to us. If the State tortures the least of us it defiles all humanity. We think it wrong that a former Prime Minister was put in solitary confinement in Rhodesia without charge or trial but we also think it is wrong that a gutless British press can stand with eyes closed as the State prepares to persecute those awaiting trial in Britain.

J.W.

Dear Comrade Social Worker...

THE RADICAL social workers' group, Case Con, held a conference over the weekend of April 29-30, at Oxford Hall, Bethnal Green, London, open to social workers and interested parties. As a claimant I was one of those interested parties. If one wanted to be unkind, one could describe Case Con—or at least those who attended the conference—as a group of public and local authority servants with bad consciences at doing the State's dirty work, plus an articulate and dominating faction of Trotskyists. Personally I didn't feel too much sympathy with those who had troubled consciences, but the Trotskyists who were also, don't forget, social workers and social work students, put my back up straight away by describing claimants and those who came to social service departments for help as 'marginal'—that is, marginal in terms of 'revolutionary' potential. So, brothers and sisters, when you go down to your local social services department, in dire need, don't expect too much from one of these self-styled 'revolutionary social workers', because you see, you're only marginal.

One Trotskyist even went so far as to say that within their own work situation (i.e. local social services department) they couldn't do much (such as rocking the boat and jeopardizing their well-paid job) and that agitation should and could only take place outside the work situation, that is, evenings and weekends. One angry libertarian comrade asked if the speaker was saying we should join our nearest 'revolutionary' workers' party. Yes, came the answer. With comrade social workers like these, who needs enemies? Claimants' Unions are pretty chary about 'revolutionary' social workers too. Happily the Claimants' Union—with its decentralised structure, the autonomy of each individual union, and, of course, its 'marginal' members—doesn't make it too appealing for those seeking the revolutionary vanguard.

Well us 'marginals' (with a potential membership of seven million) in the Claimants' Union have been tackling the

State's Poor Law agency, the SS, for a couple of years now. Whether we're unemployed or sick and disabled, whether we're unsupported mothers, pensioners or homeless, we've all been fighting the SS and the miserable pittance it grudgingly pays out. And in this fight we're learning all the time about our rights, and about how to fight our claims. And every time an SS manager calls the police in to evict us we learn a little more about the true nature of the SS and its master, the State. Yes, we're learning all right. And what we're learning is reflected in our publications and handbooks. If you are claiming from Social Security, and if any of the following handbooks applies to your situation, I strongly recommend you buy one. The titles are self-explanatory: *Unsupported Mothers Handbook*, 5p, Highbury CU, 26 Mildmay Park, London, N.1. *Strikers Handbook*, 10p, Newtown CU, 19 Rea Tower, Mossborough Crescent, Newtown, Birmingham 19. *Homeless Handbook*, 15p, North London CU, 577 Holloway Road, London, N.17. *Pensioners Handbook*, 10p, East London CU, Dame Colet House, Ben Jonson Road, London, E.1. The Claimants' Union Guidebook, at 10p, explains what a Claimants' Union is, how to start one up, CU's attitudes to other groups, i.e. Social Workers, Child Poverty Action, TUs, political groups and so on. The Guidebook ends with the minimum policy charter of the Claimants' Unions, and is available from East London CU, address above. Please, if you're not a claimant, add another bob onto the prices given.

When the Claimants' Union movement achieves the first two points of its policy charter—a guaranteed adequate income for all people, children included, and a free welfare state with its services controlled by the people who use it—then Case Con social workers will no longer have to search their consciences or strut out the revolutionary rhetoric—for they will find themselves liberated by the very people they have chosen to ignore, the 'marginals'. P.G.

TALKING IN LONDON

LIBERTARIAN MEETINGS have been improving recently. Thus the Solidarity Group has held several series of regular seminars in London over the past year or so, in which members and supporters of the group, together with personal and political sympathisers, have been able to discuss libertarian ideas informally in an atmosphere which is friendly without being too confined.

There was a particularly fruitful session on April 15, when the subject under consideration was the latest Solidarity Pamphlet—*Workers' Councils and the Economics of a Self-Managed Society* (25p). This is an account of the economic and political aspects of a future libertarian socialist society, based on a text first published by *Socialisme ou Barbarie* in France in 1957, in the light of the experience of the Hungarian rising of 1956. The society described is pretty much that envisaged by such thinkers as Kropotkin and William Morris eighty years ago—despite a fashionable emphasis on such modern developments as automation, computerisation, cybernation, etc.—and the pamphlet is at the same time the most 'utopian' and the most 'anarchist' publication of the Solidarity Group over the twelve years of its existence.

The discussion was especially impressive because of its lack of sectarian prejudice, despite a range of opinion all the way from collectivism to extreme individualism, from the view that work could be transformed by the exercise of workers' control and wealth could be equalised by total self-management to

the view that work must be abolished and the whole concept of wealth must be transcended. The result was a genuine exchange rather than a mere repetition of views, and all the thirty or so people present seemed to have got something out of an afternoon's hard thinking and talking.

It was noticeable that anarchism in its various aspects has become an essential part of such discussions on the left (though there is still very little direct knowledge of anarchist writings and not all that much of anarchist history) and that several anarchists took an integral part in the seminar (though some so-called anarchists present appeared to be closer to syndicalism than what most of us would think of as true anarchism, while several Solidarity people present appeared to have come so close to anarchism as makes no difference).

Anyone interested in taking part in future seminars should write to the Solidarity Group, 27 Sandringham Gardens, London, N.W.11. An obvious reflection is that it would be valuable if such seminars could in the future be organised around more specifically anarchist themes; in many ways, well prepared discussions are more useful than completely unstructured meetings of the usual kind. In the meantime, public meetings are being held on Sunday evenings at the Peace Centre, 36 Romilly Street, London, W.1; the Individualist Forum and the Organisation of Revolutionary Anarchists are holding the floor on alternate Sundays, so there should be something for everyone. J.N.

TO CONSERVE OR NOT TO CONSERVE

FOR THE LAST 100 years the political and social revolution has been the dream of the majority of those of Left Wing thought. Indeed, since the French Revolution burst upon an unsuspecting Europe in the late 18th century, the world has seen countless revolutions with Freedom, Equality and Fraternity the watchwords. Yet not one has been a success. The end results have always been the same; merely a shift of the power structure from one body politic to another and not the people where it belongs. Oppression, whether it exists under the flag of Capitalism or the red flag of Communism, is still oppression. There are no degrees of freedom, only freedom.

However, evidence exists to suggest that the revolution of tradition is slowly becoming a thing of the past. Gradually more people, particularly the young, are turning away from the repetitious solutions of the past which have so obviously failed. The rise of the 'Underground', 'Alternative Society', 'Counter Culture', call it what you will, or perhaps it is, after all, three separate entities become interdependent, reveal, on the whole, a distinct disregard for the outworn political theories and manoeuvrings of the past. They believe that freedom can only be achieved by practising it and not imposing it on an unwilling populace by force of revolutionary arms. The nearest political movement to this constantly shifting nether world is, perhaps, that of the anarchists, but the vast majority of the 'underground' would not claim to be anarchists, nor wish to be. Perhaps one of the strongest

points about the 'underground' is that it is in a constant state of flux. It never becomes permanent or static. It has no laws or rules; everyone's opinions are valid. It reveals a complete denial of the State System of any sort. It detests violence. It looks to a future peaceful society based on human dignity. How successful this 'movement' will be remains to be seen, but it is an obvious fact that it is drawing into its circle more and more people of different backgrounds and cultural upbringing which in itself is no bad thing and can only enrich the 'movement'.

Probably the greatest move for change nowadays is the Conservationists, loosely grouped round the Conservation Society itself, many of whose members are also from the 'underground'. Never before has so much interest on an international scale in change been revealed. And, let's face it, the necessity exists. The life support system of this planet is gradually failing, a fact recently emphasised by 30 'top' scientists in the magazine, *Ecology*. Even governments are having to face the hard fact that some radical alterations to the system will have to be effected. Whether they will be prepared to make these changes is another thing. But as more and more influential people begin to join the Conservationists, the better the chance. In view of the increasing danger from pollution, etc., it would appear that the constant bickering of the so-called Left Revolutionary Movements are now rendered that much more futile than previously. It matters very little which of the interminable Socialist (as opposed to Private Capitalist)

movement runs things if the planet is doomed anyway. What does matter is that the planet be saved before it is too late. And this requires a drastic change of the system. Many will claim that the political revolution is the only way the system can be changed, but as stated, no evidence exists that that is what happens. Political organisations are concerned with power as an end in itself. Conservationists may yet create what the political movements have failed to do, a mass movement which, because of its size, influence and the hard facts of its message, may bring about in itself the change of system that is required. A change that can be brought about in a peaceful way without authoritarian pressure and violent means which have never solved anything and which so many of us are thoroughly sickened with and are completely opposed to.

It is a sobering thought that the very changes aimed at by the obsolete political movements of the past could be brought about by the very system itself through necessity.

GEORGE CAIRNCROSS.

Sexism Rears its Ugly Head

Dear Editors, It was interesting to read A. Jenks' article on money (April 29) but sad to see that here too an unthinking sexism has crept in. Of deprived children with extravagant toys, he says: 'It would surely be better if the mothers were to stay at home.' Why? Why not the fathers?

(Why rear children in small nuclear families anyway?) And what evidence at all is there to suggest that children are more damaged psychologically by not having a mother at home all day while they're away at school than women are by being obliged to spend all day every day in the exclusive company of small children? The kind of revolution that free nuns from the necessity of earning a large portion of the family income and 'allows' them to return to their 'natural' place in the home is the kind of revolution we can do without.

Edinburgh SALLY MITCHELSON.

MIDDLE EAST

A SPLIT has occurred in the Israeli Socialist Organisation (ISO) which produces the paper *Matzpen*. Over the past few years there has been an increasing number of Trotskyites joining the organisation. Once in a majority the Trotskyites began to attempt to redirect the organisation towards their dictatorship of the proletariat ideas. This being contrary to the views of the Libertarians and the large group of Anarchists within ISO a split was inevitable. Unfortunately due to the previously federalist structure of ISO this left the major part of the movement's resources, including the newspaper *Matzpen* in the hands of the Anarchists. The IGM in Britain have just stated that they will only recognise the Trotskyites as the 'true community of Matzpen'.

LARRY.



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

- Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist**
Alexander Berkman £1.50 (21p)
- Men Against the State**
Jas. J. Martin £1.05 (14p)
- Message of a Wise Kibbutzer**
Roel van Duyn
on Peter Kropotkin £0.75 (5p)
- The State** Randolph Bourne £0.10 (24p)
- Little Red School Book**
Soren Hansen
and Jesper Jensen £0.30 (34p)
- An Illustrated Life of William Morris** Richard Tanes £0.40 (34p)
- No Treason**
Lysander Spooner £0.60 (41p)
- Social Anarchism**
Giovanni Baldelli £0.40 (34p)
- Bakunin on Anarchy**
(ed.) Sam Dolgoff £5.25 (25p)
- The Russian Anarchists**
Paul Avrich £4.50 (21p)
- General Idea of Revolution in the Nineteenth Century**
Pierre-Joseph Proudhon £6.00 (25p)
- The Utopian Vision of Charles Fourier**
(ed.) Beecher & Bienvenu £3.95 (21p)
- The Great French Revolution**
Peter Kropotkin £3.75 (21p)
- Character Analyses**
Wilhelm Reich £2.10 (21p)
- Anarchism Today**
(ed.) Apter & Joll £0.75 (5p)
- God and the State**
Michael Bakunin £0.75 (5p)

Please send foolscap (9" x 4") S.A.E. if you would like to receive regular booklists.

Freedom Press

publish
FREEDOM weekly
and distribute
ANARCHY monthly

84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 01-247 9240

Entrance Angel Alley,
Whitechapel Art Gallery exit,
Aldgate East Underground Stn.

SPECIMEN COPIES ON REQUEST

Bookshop

Open Afternoons
Tuesday to Friday
2 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Open Evenings
Thursday close at 8.30 p.m.
Saturday 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, 1972

FREEDOM	
Inland, and Surface Mail abroad	
for one year	£3.00 (\$7.50)
six months	£1.50 (\$3.75)
three months	£0.80 (\$2.00)
ANARCHY	
Europe & Middle East	1 year £4.00
The Americas	6 months £2.00
	1 year \$12.50
	6 months \$6.25
India, Africa, &c.	1 year £4.50
	6 months £2.25
Australasia & Far East	1 year £5.00
	6 months £2.50
ANARCHY	
Inland, and Surface Mail abroad	
12 issues	£2.25 (\$6.00)
6 issues	£1.13 (\$3.00)
ANARCHY	
USA & Canada	12 issues \$11.00
	6 issues \$6.00
Australasia & Far East	12 issues \$4.50
	6 issues \$2.25

LETTERS

Please Teacher-i.

Dear Comrades,

I find three points in Peter Neville's letter last week on which I should expand and disagree. Firstly, the control by a teacher of the learning process is perhaps the mirror image of interference in class by children or of 'pupils' power'. Learning is the monopoly of the learner, not of the source of information. Presence is not an indication of willingness to learn at all; presence is demanded by law or in the case of adults by agreements with sponsors or the economic necessity

to gain experience for a better job. But I do not believe that blame for coercive education can be divided up among those guilty of perpetuating the state coercion in education. I did not call for 'pupils' power' for the simple reason that a real school is for education not endless, and often mindless, administration. This is why I was contemptuous of two teaching union conferences which seemed only willing to perpetuate the state teacher's role as a policeman marking examinations, keeping 'order', instilling all those ideas which we anarchists realise are just fronts to keep us quiet. This view is amply supported in Rank and File 20

who drew the conclusion that conferences packed out with headmasters would inevitably be for the preservation of the status quo. I blame an administration-mad union conference, not a mass of teachers.

Secondly, I dislike the opinion that a teacher should decide who is qualified for what, in fact the job as works manager. A. S. Neill explains this very well. He invited a party of teachers to the Summerhill workshop, and these men were horrified to see 5-year-old children working on lathes and blowlamps. Without A. S. Neill's explanation of the competence of these children I feel sure that the teachers would have caused work to stop. In Peter Neville's 'Anarchy and Academic Failure' in *Anarchy* 53 he says '... we must adjust ourselves to provide those educational institutions ... that will cater for our educational and social needs.' Teacher control of qualification is in no way compatible with this. Of course it is a simplistic dodge to throw up ideas of a community of scholars, but

it is fundamental to a libertarian society that there is no teaching class but only a learning class.

Thirdly, I find the presence of trade unions in education, such as headmasters' union, various higher education teachers' unions, school teachers' unions, students' unions and now two pupils' unions, is counter-educational as it reinforces the elite system built up by a continuous series of examinations and gradings. If the unions wish to fight for improving conditions in schools, why is there so much talk about a unified pay scale for teachers but so little for a unified amount of freedom for ALL in a school?

Fraternally,

DAVID BROWN.

Please Teacher-ii.

Dear Editors,

During the last three months many people have been trying to develop a Free School in Leeds. The need for projects such as this is clear to many libertarians, as they believe that schools and teachers within the present system induce in the children precisely the ideas and attitudes that assist the system to survive. From Peter Neville's letter in the last issue of *FREEDOM* (24.4.72) it is apparent that his attitude as a teacher is exactly what we are working against.

One of the most successful criticisms against egoist individualism (an ideology he frequently inarticulates) is that it is a corrupt version, on the small scale, of the ideas of our bourgeois rulers held so dear. The most successful individualist is the bourgeois. His individual desires rule many people. It is this critique of individualism that P.N.'s letter lends obvious substance to. His claim to the abilities of craftsmanship or artisanship are doubtful and are a statement of his ego, spewing onto the children under his control. A sickness no doubt which they have neither the freedom nor the power to remove.

Stirner was also a schoolteacher like P.N. and all his writings are marked by the neurotic ruthlessness and sarcasm that characterises, in the main, the attitude of most teachers. In his letter P.N. states the rights of the headmaster with such phrases as:

'I am in control of the learning situation—I prepare and develop the syllabus. I do not advocate pupil control—I adopt a simple rule—I assume pupils are there because they want to be there and are willing to participate.'

To all libertarians the vile idiocy of these statements are disgusting. They are made at a time when the educational controllers of this society are on the offensive against us—Maurice Brinton versus the NCC, and Children's Rights, the NAS, the NUT and Thatcher versus the progressives—and he chooses precisely the side of our rulers!

Many times ideological individualism has been suspect on account of its confusions, but here he is clearly not anarchistic by any means. He desires the control over the children that the State has empowered and trained him to control.

Pupil power is about one thing—the right to tell an adult to piss off if the adult is annoying, in the 'learning situation' or elsewhere. The children he teaches often try to enforce this right, and I support them by doing exactly that now.

TREVOR BAVAGE.

Oops, Sorry Comrade!

Dear Comrades,

I came across a copy of *FREEDOM*, for the week beginning March 18.

I was very surprised to see our leaflet 'What kind of man are you?' on your front page. You had attributed its source to Edinburgh *Roots*, which I presume is a local paper.

I felt I ought to put you right as to its real source. It was written, published and distributed by the Independent Labour Party, 197 Kings Cross Road, London, W.C.1.

I enclose a copy for you to peruse over, the other side also has interesting information.

I feel you ought to quote the original and correct source of information as I'm sure your readers would appreciate this.

Yours fraternally,

SANDRA FILBY
(Leeds ILP).

What is to be done in Theory?

ON THE WEEKEND of March 25/26

four comrades from various parts of the country congregated at Wolverhampton to discuss the state of theoretical discussion in the anarchist movement. It was generally felt that the level was low, since there was a tendency to cling to outworn theoretical products of anarchists writing in past epochs and generalising from conditions specific to other countries, and a failure to ask new questions about society in Britain in the seventies and likely future developments. It was felt that this was one of the several reasons for the failure of anarchists nationwide to get across, and to initiate the beginnings of a strong and successful anarchist movement.

Many comrades apart from ourselves we feel are individually engaged in asking new questions, testing new theories, in isolation from each other, and a number of groups are looking at one specific question in isolation from other questions (e.g. it seems that ORA arose out of a criticism of the anarchist movement and its lack of coherence, but these criticisms were only superficially related to a view of British society in the seventies).

Despite certain reservations concerning their specific ideology we feel that those who once centred around the first series *Anarchy* used to perform this function, and nothing has taken their place in this respect. We therefore felt that there was a need to bring about a revival of serious ideological dialogue in the anarchist movement, preferably of a totally non-sectarian structure, from which might emerge a coherent anarchist view of theory and practice related to the present

and future of anarchism in Britain.

During our discussions we defined a number of areas of investigation that we felt needed to be pursued, which we put forward here, not as an exhaustive list, but as our small contribution:

- (a) An investigation of the psychology of the belief in the necessity of leadership, in order to devise means to overcome it.
- (b) An investigation of the inequalities of wealth, power and prestige, from the viewpoint that they exist as clearly as ever but do not, perhaps, elicit the same response from the working class that was present a century ago (i.e. the desire to share these fruits of capitalist society).
- (c) An investigation of belief in and fetishisation of social and political institutions, particularly those created out of the struggles of the working class in the past (e.g. trade unions), in order to determine what should be the anarchist response both to the institutions and the fetishisation.
- (d) An investigation of the extent of one-dimensional consciousness as described from various standpoints by such writers as Marcuse and Paul Cardan, and the means to overcome it.
- (e) An investigation of those areas of everyday life important to people themselves which are amenable to meaningful change by the people, in achieving which they are brought closer to an overall libertarian consciousness.
- (f) A study of revolution from an anarchist viewpoint to learn from past mistakes and discover what is meaningful in the concept of revolution.

and what practical problems face anarchists in relation to revolution.

- (g) The development of a specifically anarchist economics which investigates particularly the role of economic structures, and changes in them, in the formation of consciousness (since we believe that marxism, for example, only asserts this connection without proving it and without discovering its nature, if it exists).
 - (h) The problems of foreign relations and meaningful international solidarity, bearing in mind the uneven development of nations and communities (since this raises, for example, the question of how an anarchist society would give aid to the working class of a country still under State control without strengthening the State).
- Our immediate limited intention is to engage in a more systematised research in these areas and to co-ordinate the results into something approaching a coherent anarchist theory, not as end to philosophy, but as a beginning. However, there are numerous problems. Firstly, we are not competent to study even all the questions we have ourselves raised. Secondly, there will be questions which simply have not occurred to us. Thirdly, if we are not damned careful we will end up as isolated as ever, an elite without a mass, when we don't even want to be an elite at all.

To help overcome these problems we wish to throw our idea open to the whole movement, and invite those interested who feel they can make a contribution to play up their part. The sooner the movement as a whole drowns our egos, the better we shall feel.

Would anyone interested please write to Bridget Pym at 62 School Green Lane, Sheffield, S10 4GR, so that we might arrange for a conference of some description to discuss the principle of what we hope to see done, and to develop (perhaps different) conclusions as to how we move forward, 'we' then meaning more than just us four. For the moment we propose that such a conference be held in mid-June at a suitable venue convenient in the light of the geographical distribution of those interested. M.B.

GAS & GHOSTIES

Continued from page 1 of exorcism is to be held, and 'the patient' should sit in a deep armchair, so that self-injury is less likely. Victims of evil spirits are supposed to thrash about when the devils are leaving them.

Dr. Mortimer does say that 'the general attitude in the Church of England seemed to be to regard exorcism as an exercise in white magic or a survival of medieval superstition'. But he believes it has a more positive value. For myself, I can only say that it does seem to me to be a survival of medieval superstition, and I am glad that despite all the pressures towards irrationalism 'the general attitude' is still a sceptical one.

Occultists tell me that I use scepticism 'as an excuse' for not committing myself, which has a familiar ring, and reminds me of the world of politics, where scepticism is the worst crime. But sceptics have never started a war or launched a persecution, only the 'true believers' do this. The trouble is that a sceptical position is a hard one to maintain in a society where science and technology are not far developed, and if, as seems more and more likely, our technological culture suffers a serious reverse, from over-population, pollution, the Bomb or internal chaos and civil war, the field will be left open to the magicians and their persecutors to torment one another, and any poor victim who happens to get in the way.

JOHN BRENT.

THIS WEEK IN IRELAND

IT IS HORRIBLE INDEED the two indisputable things that have come to light in the six counties. One is that the tortures at Hollywood Barracks, and such places, of arrested suspects goes on unabated, and they are untellable in their brutality; but a ray of hope. Whitelaw allowed John Hume to see a twenty-year-old and take a doctor, and is investigating and these things may come to an end, one can but pray so. How any man can deliberately inflict pain on another beats me. The other revolting thing which I have been researching for several weeks is that there is no shadow of a doubt the Special Branch are going round in multi-shooting people with the intent of raising sectarian battles. Then the Unionists will be able to say to Westminster, 'We told you so', and demand even more fiercely the 'liquidation' of the Bogside and the Creggan and the Catholic enclaves in Belfast and Newry. The Unionists WANT above all things to re-establish the old rule only more so. Paisley wants the Bogside, etc., liquidated, but he wants the six counties totally integrated into the UK, fancying himself as Minister for Ulster and then Prime Minister.

Meanwhile groups of youths, approximately 17 years old, called the Tartan Gangs, roam about creating mayhem. They loathe the RUC, Catholics (Teagues, Micks, Fenians and Papists), drugs, the tricolour, the Republic of Ireland, the IRA and Glasgow Celtic. They like British soldiers, 'Ulster', the Union Jack and Glasgow Rangers, and the areas in which they live. They have no political allegiances. If you want to find out about them just shout 'Up Celtic' and then run for your very life. As one

member of Vanguard reputedly said to another, 'The Tartan Gangs are getting Fascism a bad name.' John McKeague of the Shankill Defence admires them.

Down here it is all the EEC vote on next Wednesday, and we are worked to death. The Spring show is on and I am driven to impotent fury by over-dressed women who are all for it, as it means their husbands will get fat jobs in Brussels and to Hell with the small farmer. It is quite extraordinary how many who have perhaps as little as 15 or 20 acres believe that it means instant riches for them. They can't see only 2% of farms will be viable in the EEC, and mass unemployment and emigration will result. Ireland, all 32 counties of it, is a very exhausting place in which to live at the moment. If only there was some way of blowing away the greed of the few, the hatred of the many and the sectarianism of the six counties.

H.

Are you a university student?
Get your professor to recommend for the university library a set of

BOUND VOLUMES
ANARCHY Vols. 1-10
(Nos. 1-118)
1961-1970 complete
Price £40.00 per set
(p. & p. £1)

Printed by Express Printers, London, B.1

Published by Freedom Press, Leeds, B.1

Contact

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

Help! Fold and Despatch 'FREEDOM' Thursdays from 2 p.m., followed by discussion at 7.30 p.m.

Rudolf Rucker's 'Johann Most: das Leben eines Rebellen' need for translator. Please write, don't send, to John Hinsley, 61 Sandhurst Avenue, Ward End, Birmingham, B36 8EJ.

Anarchist Syndicalist Alliance National Conference to be convened in Manchester/Salford on May 13/14. Details and items for agenda, enquiries: A. Portus, 116 Gilda Brook Road, Eccles, Lancs.

Crescita Politica, a group aiming to constitute a network of anarchist publications in Italy is interested in sending Italian anarchist works, both its own and others, and in receiving English books and periodicals. For contacts write to: Crescita Politica Editrice C.P. 1418 Firenze. Catalogues available at *FREEDOM*.

Will Jake Jenkins, believed to be in South Shields, get in touch with Maurice, Alison and Kiki, 107 St. Pauls Road, Jarrow.

'Inside Story', monthly, 25p. 'This beautifully produced magazine is a sort of anarchist Private Eye... an excellent publication' (*Freedom*). 'A lot of research has gone into producing this paper... good hard information' (*Friend*). For sample copy of 'INSIDE STORY', send 25p (or £1.50 for six issues) to 3 Belmont Road, London, S.W.4.

Anarchists / Libertarians interested in forming a group in the Southend area, contact Andrew Putnam, 14 Chandos Parade, Hadleigh, Essex or phone David Carr, Southend-on-Sea 66794.

Leeds Free School and community trust. A free school project is being organised in Leeds. Money and materials are urgently needed. All donations and enquiries to: M. Silver, 7 Hestle Mount, Leeds 6.

Nihilistic Luddites interested in forming an agricultural commune contact M. Phillips, 26 Uckfield Grove, Mitcham, Surrey.

Agricultural Community. Would any NON-NIHILISTIC, NON-LUDDITE agricultural commune like a Honda F30 Rotovator with attachments? Cheap, easy terms if trust established (1). Write Box No. 003 *FREEDOM*.

Direct Action. We need practical help in the form of other human beings, who want and need to challenge the entrenched Establishment through anarchist intervention. Anyone interested please ring 852 8879.

'A Flight of Silver Birds', original poems by Tina Morris. Send 24p for 6 cards (3 different designs) to 18 Pemberton Street, Blackburn, BB1 9AB.

All Saints Collective, 53a Portland Road, Radford, Nottingham, need militant activists for full time community work or industrial action.

ORA. Meetings at Peace Centre Coffee Bar, 36 Romilly Street, W.I. Sundays 7 p.m. May 21: 'Women's Liberation'.

Corby. Public meeting on 'Anarchism and Workers' Control' planned for June 29. Green Room, Civic Centre at 7.30 p.m. Local help with publicity appreciated. Contact Terry Phillips, 70 Blenheim Walk.

Help! Stoke Newington 8 Fund. Comrades now on remand in Brixton and Holloway need financial aid urgently for meals, fruit, papers, books (which must be new) and cigarettes. Please send donations to the Stoke Newington 6 Fund, c/o Compendium Books, 240 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1, a.s.a.p.

Free Valpreda Campaign needs help, not just by way of support, but also involvement in planning and organising. Please contact c/o N. & E. London Group ORA.

Would Box 001 please send *Freedom* Press his address as we have mislaid it. We have a number of replies from your ad.

Cockpit Theatre, Marylebone. Evening of songs and poetry from Bill Fay, Maureen Benjamin, John Silver, Jeff Cloves. Sunday, May 14, 8 p.m. 20p.

Centro Iberico, 125 Kingsway, London, W.C.1. Sunday, May 14 at 7.30 p.m. Miguel Garcia. Garcia will speak on Spanish Political Prisoners and a collection will be held for them. A film, 'The Executioner' or 'Fury over Spain', will be shown.

Individualist Forum. Peace Centre Coffee Bar, 36 Romilly Street, W.I. May 14, 8 p.m., 'Individual Liberty and the Law', A. Macken.