

THEY CALL IT PEACE

THERE IS A 1939 cartoon of David Low's showing Hitler and Stalin with smoking revolvers, shaking hands over the prostrate body of Poland. Stalin is saying 'Bloody assassin of the workers I presume?' One is reminded of this by the get-together in Moscow of President Richard Nixon (ex-arch-enemy of Communism) and Leonid Brezhnev. The prostrate body is that of Vietnam—about which not one constructive word has been spoken in the innumerable communiques on space, on medical research, science and technology.

As for the personal touch, the trivia has been splashed around as usual to fill in the time until the messenger dashed in hot-foot from the SALT talks with the disarmament formula which would once more save the world. We had Mrs. Nixon shaking hands with a Russian circus bear—less politically rewarding than shaking hands with Brezhnev—Mrs. Nixon discussing her daughter's dancing lessons in the interval at the Bolshoi and the breaking of the champagne glass(es)—the *Sun* says a trawler. *The Times* says one—whatever happened to the old Russians who used to sling their champagne glasses away after they drank a toast? The *Sunday Telegraph* Moscow correspondent says, 'one possible concrete result of the Summit is that a Russian firm has decided to produce its own version of the All-American Pepsi-Cola.' And, after the agreement, Mr. Nixon

attending a Baptist church service no doubt to thank God for his co-operation. The BBC commentator was so carried away by the sentimentality of it all that he said a hymn was sung which reminded Mr. Nixon of the religious services of his boyhood. When one recalls that Mr. Nixon is a lapsed Quaker and hymns do not feature in Quaker meetings one feels that the sentiments overcame the facts.

The Russians sent out a communique. 'A universal peace and a reduction of the intolerable burdens imposed on all nations by the excessive armaments of today, is the ideal towards which every Government should strive. . . . [The time is] very favourable for seeking by international discussion the most effective means of assuring to all peoples the benefits of a real and durable peace; for the financial charges imposed by armaments were paralysing economic prosperity, and the accumulation of war material was transforming armed peace into a crushing burden.' This, alas, was in fact the Czar of Russia in 1898 inviting Governments to The Hague Conference. Since 1898 the Governments of the world have been going through the motions of what is laughingly called 'disarmament'. From The Hague Conference to Locarno, from Locarno to the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 to the present agreement such charades have gone

on, punctuated by bloodier wars and more devastating weapons.

The Times (27.5.72) in its leader on the agreements says, 'They were fashioned by hard, compelling interests. The two leaders met because it was to the advantage of their two powerful countries—only recently bitter rivals and even now confronting each other almost directly in the Vietnam war—to come to some agreements. Russia has her special reasons for relaxing tension in Europe.'

On the day after the agreement was signed Melvin Laird, US Defence Secretary, took steps to halt work on a defensive missile base in Montana but at the same time he said there would be 'no saving' on offensive weapons. 'He implied that the American aim would be to maintain a qualitative superiority over the Russians,' says the *Sunday Telegraph* (28.5.72). 'The programme,' continues the *Telegraph*, 'to build a strategic bomber and a submarine force to replace the present Polaris and Poseidon submarines by the end of the decade must continue.'

The whole issue of disarmament is made more complex than necessary by the smoke-screen of official verbiage and technical jargon. For example 'disarmament' is never contemplated by any state, they would in fact, cease to be 'states' if they did disarm. At the earth-shattering most states slow up their rate of increase of arms (for example

1936-39). The usual technique is an agreed formula not to disturb the balance of terror. Or, a method of armament or testing of arms is felt to be undesirable—or even technically dangerous by its indiscriminate range and effects so it is excluded from usage. For example the Test Ban Treaty of 1963 which limited nuclear tests to underground sites (no provisions were apparently made for the danger of leakages or contamination of underground water). The agreements about poison gas and germ warfare are obviously because of their danger to users as well as to the prospective victims. In any case, did a desperate situation develop, all states find excuses for their most reprehensible acts. The bombing plane was once outlawed—but reserved by Britain for 'policing' the North-West Frontier of India!

The present agreement comes under the classification of a new formula. The theoreticians of nuclear warfare have devised a policy of 'second strike capability' which means that after the great powers have launched their first atom-bombs or H-bombs, 'victory' will go to whichever side has the ability and capability of making a second strike either with nuclear submarines, strategic bombers or long range missiles. Living (if you can call it that) on the theory of the balance of terror, statesmen and military experts are grotesquely concerned when, by some chance, one

of the great powers gets ahead of the others in 'strike-capability' and has a capacity for 'over-kill', that is, to create unnecessary deaths. This may occur through technological developments. (The joker in the present agreement is that less missiles may mean more accurate targeting, hence more strike-capability.)

The great powers are under the illusion that they are completely rational and as long as the balance of terror is stable they are safe. Obviously the SALT talks were held because technological developments had disturbed this balance—also in *realpolitik* the rise of China had completely shifted the world balance of power as it existed in 1945. It is quite true, as *The Times* says, that the agreements 'were fashioned by hard, compelling interests'. *The Times* politely omits to refer to Nixon's forthcoming election campaign as one of the 'compelling interests' but nevertheless the election campaign explains the 'selling' of the Summit.

One may or may not share the statesmen's theory of the 'balance of terror' producing stability and feel that any nuclear kill (or for that matter non-nuclear) is 'over-kill'.

Even the coolly balanced production of death goes astray sometimes. For example this week-end a 40-gallon drum of potentially lethal gas leaked on its way to 'the Ministry of Defence chemical defence centre at Nancekuke' (so says the *Guardian*—how defensive can you get?). The concern of governments is not with peace but with the preservation of their own powers, with things as they are.

They are unscrupulous enough to do a deal and call it peace.

JACK ROBINSON.

Dockers' Rearguard Action

MASS MEETINGS of dockers in Hull, Manchester and London have again voted in favour of continuing to ban certain containers. Stewards in Liverpool will be recommending the same policy at meetings when dockers return from the holiday.

District officials of the Transport and General Workers' Union have been very busy addressing these mass meetings of dockers. In London's Royal docks, the rank and file subjected the official, Bill Mundy, to a barrage of heckling. He told them: 'We will carry out the law and the law says we should not black indiscriminately.'

There now seems little chance, despite the instructions of Jack Jones, the general secretary of the T&GWU, of the dockers lifting their ban before the June 2 deadline set by the National Industrial Relations Court. Sir John Donaldson, president of the court, has ruled that the union is responsible for the actions of the stewards and that if they continue to defy instructions, then their credentials should be withdrawn by the union. The union has repeatedly tried to get the dockers to lift their ban without any success and will on Friday, possibly have to pay a further fine or have all the assets of the union taken over by the court.

NATIONAL DOCK STRIKE

June 2 is also the day set for the start of a national dock strike in support of an average earnings fall-back payment, an extra week's annual holiday and the right to 'stuff' and 'strip' containers. By organising a national stoppage the union hope to regain control of the container issue.

Thursday's *Financial Times* quoted the following from an employer the writer had interviewed: 'Jack Jones isn't taking on the government or anything like

that. It's more like a man throwing a stone through a shop window to get a grievance heard. There's no hope of a negotiated settlement because Jack must have a national dock-strike to get his militant stewards under control and his union off the NIRC hook.'

If, with a national dock stoppage, Jack Jones can get some concessions on containers, then he might be able to avoid a direct clash with the court. Employers have already hinted that they might build more container depots in existing

WE ARE ANGRY!

THE EIGHT TRIAL is coming up very soon (maybe even before press day) despite the fact that only one of the eight has got a QC and then after 15 attempts. There are only 300 QCs in the country, so proper representation in court seems unlikely for at least several of the accused. As the trial may drag on like the Mangrove Trial, or last three weeks like the Ian-Jake trial, now is the time to mobilise to help the eight. A demonstration is planned for 12.30 p.m. on JUNE 6 outside the Old Bailey. Also on SATURDAY, JUNE 3, at LSE Old Theatre (Houghton Street) a 'teach-in' on the case will be held. This is an important meeting as one of its intentions is to break down the sectarianism of the Bolshevik groups who rallied on Jake and Ian and to introduce a greater feeling of solidarity and ANGER against the government and its state. Any help with the campaign will gladly be received by Compendium Books, 240 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1.

dock areas providing more jobs for dockers. But this would hardly alleviate the dockers' fear of losing their jobs.

In the mid-sixties there were 60,000 dockers. When the docks were decasualised in 1967 there were 57,000. Now there are 42,000 and by 1980 it is estimated that only 25,000 will remain. Dockers see containerisation as a threat to their livelihoods but the loading and unloading they are claiming represents only about 3% of all container traffic. This work would only provide about 500 extra jobs. The containers that have really caused the loss of jobs are the big regular consignments from the manufacturing companies. Dockers are not claiming this work, but they have, over the years, made claims for the work at the new inland depots each time these were built. The union has taken these claims to the industrial tribunals and each time they have lost. Bernie Steer, secretary of the National Ports Shop Stewards' Committee, has said this about the union's attitude to these claims:

'In the past the wishes of the men have been ignored. Four years ago we were advocating that dockers got all the work of stuffing and unstuffing containers. We wanted blacking then, but the official union line was that we should deal with it through the courts. And look where that has got us.'

Dockers are really fighting a rearguard action trying to protect jobs which have, mostly, already been lost. It is not surprising that many dockers are disillusioned with the T&GWU leadership. Essentially this is a struggle that has come too late. The union, with the help of severance pay, has quietly gone along with the employer and the Dock Harbour Board and co-operated in the slaughter of jobs. The T&GWU is now faced

Continued on page 4

ON THE WAY TO JAIL

PHILIP SANSOM was fined £15 plus £4.30 costs for refusing to make a Census Return, on November 30, 1971, at Sudbury Magistrates' Court. (See 'Suffolk Free Press', 3.12.71.)

Statement 27.5.72, after being sentenced to 28 days' imprisonment (with seven days more in which to pay) at the same Court, 23.5.72, for refusal to pay the fine, on his way to prison, Wednesday, 31.5.72:

What started off as a personal dislike and distrust of Government snooping has now been justified by independent computer experts. The London 'Times' now tells us (27.5.72) that the privacy and public welfare committee of the British Computer Society has produced a highly critical analysis of the methods used in the 1971 Census, CLAIMING THAT INFORMATION MEANT TO BE CONFIDENTIAL AND ANONYMOUS COULD BE USED TO IDENTIFY PARTICULAR PEOPLE IN PARTICULAR CIRCUMSTANCES.

It could harm immigrants, people on Social Security, or indeed any group which at any time the State wished to investigate or discriminate against.

Personally, I have nothing to hide and nothing to fear from answering the Census. Indeed, it seems I have much more to fear from NOT answering it, since I am now on my way to jail!

I refused to answer because I resent the idea of us all—repeat ALL—being forced to become computer fodder for the central authority and for those commercial interests which buy Census information. In a democracy such demands for information should be voluntary, not compulsory. All of those with concern for personal privacy and integrity should stand up against the steady erosion of our freedom which is corrupting our democracy—and of which the Census of 1971 is just one symptom.

One last point. In sentencing me to prison, the Chairman of the Sudbury Magistrates referred to 'martyrdom'. I would like to assure him that, far from wishing to be a martyr, I do in fact bitterly resent being chosen to be one of the small minority prosecuted for failure to complete the Census Form.

There have been about 350 prosecutions. There are an (unofficial) estimated 300,000 failures to return the form—and many thousands more who returned incomplete or spoilt forms. Some quite well-known people have announced their own failure to return the Census and have almost invited prosecution, but to no avail. Why was I chosen?

I am refusing to pay the fine because I refuse to pay for my own prosecution in an unjust case. The initiative for my 'martyrdom' came not from me but from the Census Officer for Boxford, the Sudbury Magistrates and the Westminster Government which tried to force its totalitarian and nose-parker demands on the British public. If this country is not to end up like Communist Russia or Nazi Germany we must resist every attempt to undermine our own privacy and freedom of choice!

PHILIP SANSOM.

Tribal Drum

THE HANDBOOK OF REASON, by Dagobert D. Runes (The Philosophical Library Inc., \$6).

THIS BOOK CONSISTS of a series of short essays and aphorisms, arranged in alphabetical order. The author's theme is religious bigotry and political persecution, mainly from the point of view of the Jewish people, who may indeed be said to have had a fair amount of experience of the subject. The title is a misnomer however. It suggests Voltaire, but Mr. Runes' preferred weapon is the bludgeon, not the rapier, and probably in a book of this kind the rapier is the better weapon. The constant thuds of the cudgel become monotonous.

He is absolutely right about the persecution the Jews have suffered, as well as the gypsies and other people. Unfortunately the Israelis have recently shown us that Jews also are capable of atrocities, that they have learnt nothing from their persecutions, or perhaps they have learnt the wrong lesson, that to survive one must be as cruel as those against

whom one fights. In the long run this means that both sides become more and more destructive till the structure of civilisation itself begins to break up. Exhaustion may save the day before this stage is reached, but it would be unwise to count on this.

I do not think that a person can claim to be a man of Reason, as the title of this book suggests, and write the following:

'ZIONISM. Zionism, or the feeling of togetherness with the people of Israel, is the essence of Judaism. The Hebrew faith again and again declares its indomitable determination to return to the land of divine promise and to overcome all efforts of hostile subjugation. . . .'

It may well be, I think it is, a good thing that a persecuted people should have a country of their own, but to be guided to the whereabouts of this country by ancient religious writings is a disastrous superstition. Palestine already had its inhabitants. Of course by the beginning of the present century most of the habitable world was occupied by some-

body, and it may well be that the present Palestine-Israel mess would have happened anywhere, in Africa or South America instead of the Levant.

The trouble about Judaism is that it does still have links with the Old Testament, and its massacres and intolerance, and it gave birth first to Christianity and its horrors, and then to Islam and its atrocities. And of course other peoples, who until recently had no contact with the three religions, were also equally capable of committing barbarities.

Our author says, 'ZEALOTS. Zealots are responsible for more killings than sinners. Remember the Inquisition, the Crusades, Nazism, Communism.' Yes, and also the Zionist terrorists, and their Arab opposite numbers, the IRA and the British paras. I read something, I think by Gerald Heard, years ago. I quote from memory, 'Gibbon turned his attention to the civilisation of his own day, and concluded, with the glee of a rationalist, that, since there were no more barbarians, civilisation was safe. But he did not realise that civilisation and barbarism are not geographical locations, but states of mind.'

The trouble with this book is that, despite the author's intentions, it could be used to stimulate barbarism. Mystical concepts of holy countries and racial destinies are the sort of things which

create zealots and barbarians. When it comes to the point, the author falls back into the old 'them-us' trap. The enemy is not the Gentile or the Jew, the Protestant or the Catholic (or even the Capitalist and the Authoritarian) versus the Anarchist or the Rebel, the enemy is the spirit of cruelty, fear, hatred and lust for power, and the only way of combating this is through reason, enlightenment, understanding, humanitarianism.

I do not think the situation is entirely beyond hope. In most of Europe, even now, there is probably less actual violence than there has ever been in history. We are much more conscious of violence than our forefathers were. They took it for granted. Hence a great deal of anxiety about it. The reason I am unhappy about this book is that I feel that it will merely help to keep the pot boiling. The author claims that in Russia and Poland three million galleys are waiting for the remainder of Europe's

Jews. I think that these galleys, many more than three million, stand in every country, for all of us. But it is not true that man is a naturally violent animal, there are too many accounts of peaceable peoples, some of whom have survived to the present day despite (or perhaps because of) their lack of aggression. I believe that violence springs from a state of mind, which is artificially, and quite deliberately, encouraged from early childhood onwards. If it is artificially encouraged it could be artificially discouraged—why not?

To me *Handbook of Reason* seems like a tribal drum, beating out a war-like rhythm. Its repetitiveness stimulates feelings of indignation which turn gradually to militant, or even military fury. 'Ecrasez l'infame!' But Voltaire, in his campaign against religious bigotry, was saved by a certain dry humour which is not so much in evidence here.

A.W.U.

Murder in the Streets

WHO KILLED STEPHEN MCCARTHY? by members of his family (The McCarthy Committee, 50 Courtney Court, Holloway, London, N.7, 10p).

IT IS COMMONLY said nowadays, in the media, that ours is an age of increasing violence, and this is often coupled to 'permissiveness' and 'sex', which are blamed for this alleged violence. It is certainly an age of violence as far as governments are concerned, but in England at least there is less violence now than there has ever been in the whole of recorded history. In the eighteenth century men still carried swords and pistols, and in the nineteenth century there was far more violence in London than there is today. Indeed what is striking about the modern urban populations is their extreme docility. England and the Scandinavian countries are the most quiet, most peaceable and least violent places in the world, and all the evidence is that violence is still decreasing, despite all the sensational films, despite the firearms used to decorate the pages of the hippy papers, despite all the fuss that is made. This is of course not true of Ulster, but there the violence is a clash between governments, the British Government versus the IRA, which is a sort of potential government. Popular violence, in the form of footpads, highwaymen, brigands and outlaws is simply dying out everywhere. (Most of the words I have just written in the previous sentence are archaic, which illustrates the point.)

But there is one form of violence which is increasing by leaps and bounds, but Muggers, Longford and Whitehouse are not likely to object to it. This is the violence of the forces of the state, who, not content with fighting the forces of rival states, are engaged in a largely unpublished war against the docile, harmless and pretty helpless urban masses. Unarmed, defenceless, unprepared for any kind of effective resistance, either violent, non-violent, legal, extra-legal, collective or individual, modern people, unlike their medieval or even Victorian forefathers, are easy meat.

This pamphlet tells of the murder of Stephen McCarthy by the police and prison authorities. To someone who believes in liberal England, peaceful, democratic and law-abiding, it would come as a shock. To someone who has doubted the truth of this picture for some time it is merely a confirmation of his fears. Here we have described in great detail the attack upon an unresisting young man by two policemen, his subsequent neglect in prison and Borstal,

and his eventual death. And we are shown how the police, the doctors in the prison and the Borstal, the coroner and even the undertaker, not to mention the press of course, the Ombudsman and the lawyers engaged by the McCarthy family, all worked hand in glove to cover up the fact that this boy had been murdered. In short it was the classical Mafia-style situation, that one would expect to encounter in, say, Sicily, or some banana republic, but which we are taught to believe could never happen in England.

The committee would like to take this opportunity to say that scores of men and boys die each year in prisons and police stations and the only cause of death allowed are natural causes, or suicide. We would like to point out that it is impossible to hang yourself in a police cell and this is where most so-called suicides happen.

In fact it becomes evident as one reads this pamphlet that killings by the police and prison authorities are quite common in England, and have been going on for years, without any great attention being paid to them. Yet the Germans who said that they did not know what the Nazis were doing to the Jews are held up to execration. Perhaps they really did not know. I certainly did not realise that things were so bad. . . . the police already have power over life and death. This is what, to take only recent examples, the names McCarthy, Savva, Gaynor and Oluwale mean. In short there is a sort of quiet massacre going on, in a truly British manner, very orderly and all whitewashed and covered up. The victims are youths, blacks, Irish and anyone who is felt to be a threat to 'the system'.

'The wicked fleeth where no man pursueth.' These victims constitute no threat to 'the system', but it is just possible that if this policy of small-scale genocide (what else can you call it?) is pursued long enough, a real threat will emerge. 'The animal is vicious. When attacked it defends itself.' It usually takes the human animal rather a long time to begin to defend himself, partly no doubt this is due to the education which we all receive, which teaches us to distrust our own abilities and trust authorities, institutions, courts and lawyers. It is to be hoped that people will buy and read this pamphlet in large numbers. It may be your turn next time.

The McCarthy family hope to get an official enquiry held into the death of Stephen. Their chances at the moment seem slim, but they are very determined.

JOHN BRENT.

Male Chauvinist Anarchist

PENTHOUSE MAGAZINE, the UK emulators of *Playboy*, has recently done a deal with the 'Workers Republics' of Yugoslavia, to open a nightclub on the shores of the beautiful Adriatic. It won't be the lathe-turners of No. 5 shop, Belgrade, who'll be frequenting it, either. The customers will be imported, as the Yugoslavian film 'WR: Mysteries of the Organism' has been exported. The film opened at the Academy 2, London, back in mid-November of last year, and regrettably, it's still running, still packing them in, whilst in its country of origin it has yet to get a public screening.

Hailed as a masterpiece in this country, with only a handful of dissenting voices, the film purports to be an exposition of Reichian ideas. In fact it's not far short of being a *Mondo Cane* of one-dimensional sexuality. What is really depressing is the acclaim it has had in some sectors of the left-wing, anarchists included. Because Reich and Reichian ideas are theoretically the subject of the film, and Alexandra Kollontai is briefly, and glibly, mentioned, and the female hero is an exponent of women's Lib (as it is misunderstood by the permanently masturbating and repressed director of the film, Makaveyev), and because she wears the red and black anarchist badge on her cap, then, somehow, critical faculties fly out of the window, or should I say, get buried in the genitals?

The sexual politics of the piece are glib and superficial, and the symbolism and the cutting within the film are mundane and cheap. Yet according to John Du Cane, writing in *Time Out*, November 26, 1971, the film is not only 'beautiful' but 'it is also a sophisticated piece of guerilla warfare against perceptual and conceptual imperialism'—which is, I suppose, the reason why the *Financial Times*, *The Times* and the *Daily Telegraph*, amongst other national newspapers, voted it one of the ten best films of 1971.

Amongst the eulogies showered down on 'WR' a few dissenting voices have fallen by the wayside. John Coleman writing in the *New Statesman* wasn't

entirely sure of Makaveyev's motives; Richard Roud, writing when the film was first shown at Cannes, described it as 'vulgar' and 'opportunistic'; and Jenny James of the People Not Psychiatry group in a letter to *Time Out*, December 24, 1971, wrote: '... this film is a bloody tragedy. Because for unthinkable thousands of people, "WR" will remain all they have heard of Wilhelm Reich, and they'll never know that Makaveyev has done Reich's ideas a worse turn through his groovy box-office success than the FDA when they burnt his books. Burning books is an obvious monstrosity, depicting *Playboy* "sexuality" as anything to do with the organic potency Reich was describing is a far cleverer blow. . . .'

Maybe the critics and those libertarians who hailed the film did so because they could watch male masturbation (but no ejaculation), simulated sexual intercourse (but no orgasm), and could admire firm naked young bodies of attractive women (shot in sumptuous colour) without feeling furtive, because, after all, the film did have 'political' content, which is rather like defending the indefensible—*Playboy*—because it is 'liberal'. Sadly, the 'Sexual Revolution' is potentially one of the West's biggest consumer growth industries, and is aided and abetted by a strange assortment of bedfellows. To speak out against mindless sexual intercourse and the 'Sexual Revolution' is to run the risk of misinterpretation and of being accused of being moralistic, yet it doesn't take much to see, glancing around, that the result of the 'Sexual Revolution' is more likely to affirm that women are merely objects of sexual gratification and abuse. (Never mind *Playboy*, just glance at the sexual politics of *Oz*, *IT* and the rest.)

Meanwhile, personal vibrators, sprays for keeping a hard on and controlling ejaculation, underwear, genital deodorants and magazines are flooding the market. The extent to which people, who should know better, are seemingly unaware of this industry—for that is what it is—is shown by the inclusion of an advert for *Forum*, *Penthouse's* 'serious' sex magazine, in *Shrew*, Vol. 4

No. 1 put out by Haverstock Hill Women's Lib group. And some male anarchists, smug that their 'anarchism' covers Women's Lib, frequently display their male chauvinism. In fact, according to an anarchist sister, I am told that male anarchists, by and large, are no better in their attitudes towards women than other men. Ian Sutherland's patronising and cheap review of Susan Griffin's 'The Politics of Rape' in a recent edition of *FREEDOM* is a case in point, and confirms the smugness and complacency too often found in male anarchists. How many brothers, I wonder, sling their anarchism out of the window every time they feel the itch to unzip their fly?

Nicolas Walter, writing in *Anarchy* 100, states in his exposition of anarchism: 'Let every individual do exactly what he wants, within the limits of his natural capacity, provided he lets every other individual do exactly what he wants.' (Emphasis N.W.'s.) I'm sure N.W.'s persistent use of 'he' is unconscious, but it does demonstrate how deep-rooted is the male-defined view of the world. As males, and as anarchists, we should, at the least, be aware of this. The next stage is to apply our consciousness theoretically and practically.

P.G.

Kids, the 5th World

LOOK AT KIDS by Leila Berg (Penguin Books, 144 pp., 50p).

LEILA BERG has acquired a reputation in educational circles for her book on Rivinghill and her series of children's books called 'Nippers'. More recently she has advised *Children's Rights* magazine, where a short section of *Look at Kids* was published in Issue 4. The book is divided into 20 short sections dealing with her childhood and children she has observed. It is a pity that the plentiful photographs are not of the stories, but all the same they are very effective, particularly a couple on page 76. Here a young child is pictured with an older woman who has the same facial expression but has all the marks of a hard, uninteresting life. This really sums up the whole nature of the book; Leila Berg blames no one but is highly critical of the situations. She details examples of mothers telling young enthusiastic children to shut up and so deny them their greatest needs, knowledge and understanding.

A second fact is the rather strange treatment given to situations themselves. Leila Berg is very conscious throughout that her attention to children can be destructive despite an intention not to be so. This is best shown in section 5. A young child for no apparent reason attacks an older one who is busy loading bricks onto a trolley. Leila Berg sees this and immediately visualises the possibilities. The young child may have his head smashed by a brick, or the older child may leave annoyed and upset. Intervention is however unnecessary as the feud soon heals itself whereas an intervention would have cemented the two children together against the author. Throughout the libertarian moral of the story is drawn, children develop best with themselves or other children and we as adults cannot act in a way to prevent this. Adults hate fights in the street and often prevent their children from fighting

Continued on page 4



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. Herts: P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (QM, FL.)

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

Yorkshire: Trevor Savage, Flat 3, 35 Richmond Road, Leeds, 6.

Manchester: Met Cunningham, 9 Briar Hill Avenue, Little Hulton, Worsley, Lancs.

Scotland: Secretary, Mike Malet, 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.

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

Class Struggle and the Classroom

MANY ANARCHISTS are familiar with Ruskin College Oxford's fine series of history paperbacks written by worker-students about the organisation and experience of work and leisure in their own industry. This is history written from the guts as no academic can write it—self-conscious independent working-class history. Every year Ruskin holds an open two-day history workshop, designed to present work in progress by teachers and researchers. It's informal and enjoyable and costs only 50p.

WHOSE CONFERENCE?

This year's workshop was ambitiously called 'Children in history: children's liberation'. The second half of the title was what attracted many of the 80-odd radical teachers—out of a total of 1,000 or so attenders—to come. But so tight was the schedule that we were kept busy attending lectures in no particular order from morning till night with scarcely a break. Group discussion of present problems was left to the end almost as an afterthought. The researchers largely monopolised question time with their recherché points. Many people were inhibited by the vast lecture room atmosphere. (There were happy exceptions. A Maoist ex-Scout got up after a dry-as-dust lecture on the Boy Scouts to announce that he felt there were strong affinities between Scouting and Trotskyism. He illustrated this mindbending comparison by his own ideological odyssey and as follows: when he was on the LSE students revolt committee four years ago, he was struck by the last-ditch stand of three committee members, who nobly offered to give back their Queen's Scout badges. . . .) Some of the worker-students felt that the nature of the conference was spoiled by 'too many North Kensington trendies', and the workers were conspicuously absent from the group discussions at the end.

MAKE THE LINKS

That was a shame. Interchange of work experience can be fertile. Teachers have a lot to learn from their history, and historians of childhood whether working class or not ignore present-day classroom struggles at their peril. The links between past and present, between childhood and adulthood, between experience and liberation, were not always evident. One lecturer who is travelling the country recording old people's memories of childhood gave an entertaining account of children's truancy, pranks and gangs. He declared that these

testified to the eternal war of kids against adults, and that children are an oppressed class. No anarchist could separate the world of school so sharply from the world of work. What about our nationwide industrial absenteeism, informal work organisation and sabotage? (The Ruskin books are informative on these neglected aspects of working life.) To stress the uniqueness of kids in this respect, is to universalise and romanticise just as the Opies did in their collections of children's rhymes.

CHILDREN'S STRIKES IN 1911

The triviality of this approach was shown up by a Ruskin docker-student who described the children's strikes in nearly 60 port towns in 1911. These strikes were always in the poorest, roughest parts of town, and often truant and 'bad elements' took a leading role. Their demands are fascinating. These varied from place to place, but usually included: abolition of the attendance officer, one day's holiday a week excluding Saturday, one hour's schooling in the morning and one in the afternoon, a shilling a week to be paid to all school-goers. 1911 was a year of dock strikes. It was in the town where the troops were called in and shot two strikers, that the first school strike broke out. The school strikes had no visible effect on school discipline, but who knows what effect they had on the strikers? Some-one commented that in Dublin in 1913 when the T&GWU blacked Eason's, the local W. H. Smith's, the kids brought schools to a standstill by refusing to work on blacked books!

Raphael Samuel, organiser of the workshop, tried to stir thoughts of present-day action by asking why 1911 was the only instance of widespread school strikes, and asked why teachers do not organise kids' strikes now. A rank-and-file teacher answered too swiftly that it is up to the kids to organise their own strikes. If there were any schoolkids there, any SAU militants, they were neither seen nor heard. Schoolkids were what the workshop really lacked. But nor was there any account of kids now, in Belfast for example, where a teacher is reported as saying, '14-year-olds are coming out with things I'd expect from a 16-year-old.'

TWO CULTURES

Dave Douglass, a 24-year-old CP miner who edits *The Mineworker* and is leaving Ruskin soon to go back down the mines, gave a wonderfully vivid talk

about his childhood. As soon as it was over, he slipped into the international jargon of Marxism-Leninism to describe the 'real' problems of the working class. The next day we were treated to a brilliant demolition of the sociology of Bernstein, revered on both Right and Left. But although 'restricted and elaborated codes' are a load of bollox, we had just heard two different languages spring naturally and fluently from one person—the fresh expressive language of experience, and the cliché-ridden ideology of Communist orthodoxy. Not the sort of problem to raise in that heady smoky pall of dedicated left-wing militancy.

RUSKIN COLLEGE FOR AND AGAINST

In his Ruskin book *Pit Life in Co. Durham: rank and file movements and workers' control*, Dave Douglass attacks the Ruskin College idea of selecting self-improving workers, indoctrinating them with a middle-class education, then setting them adrift. Ruskin students are known often to find it hard to fulfil an academic reading list and essay as competently as raw middle-class 18-year-olds. But to accomplish the kind of work we see in the Ruskin books and heard at the weekend, is a thousand times more important in every way than carrying out the dreary demands of the bourgeois curriculum. What use is a degree or diploma compared with the expression of your own historical experience? This underlines the good work Raphael Samuel is doing at Ruskin.

POPULAR EDUCATION AS MORAL POLICE

Samuel himself read a paper on the introduction of compulsory schooling 1860-80, which put Forster's Education Act of 1870 in the background for a change. As the clergyman said, 'The proletariat may strangle us unless we teach it the virtues which have elevated other sections of society.' Some of us didn't realise how recent compulsory schooling is. It involves the extinction of a whole class of street arabs outside the industrial and moral disciplines of the age. This was the time when restric-

tions on factory and workshop employment of children began to bite, when trust schools were set up, when orphanage societies began to snatch the child and stir the conscience. Kids were seized by Dr. Barnardo's, by police, by truant officers, and dumped forcibly in schools and homes. (One of the familiar weapons in such schools was silence.) There were even raids on Punch and Judy shows! When they had been broken in, thousands were sent to Canada, as domestic servants, etc. In the 1870s and 80s, Canada becomes for children what Van Diemen's Land was earlier in the century for convicts. Goodbye to the streets, to parents and families. When the kids' incomes vanished, their families were often pauperised. What Samuel did not say was whether all this regimentation had any positive effects at all—for example, whether it contributed to the control and elimination of childhood diseases like rickets.

NO VOICES FOR LIBERTARIAN EDUCATION

The debate over free schools versus radicals working within the state school system never really got off the ground. Nobody from Liverpool free school was around, and the few libertarian teachers were swamped by socialists. The libertarians obligingly revealed some of their difficulties: where is the money for free schools to come from? From factory money, capitalist money. There's nowhere else for it to come from. Kirkdale School finds cash hard to come by. The contradictions between free schools and a factory future were not resolved, nor the differences between liberty for a kid at school and the demands of his authoritarian family. (But these problems are universal, and state school teachers didn't have much to say about them either.)

Nobody was actually against free schools—but deschooling was simply dismissed from the start as untimely utopianism. If a paper had been read by a worker explicitly on say, Learning From Experience, people would have been forced to discuss deschooling in practical terms. All too clearly, none of the researchers or Samuel had absorbed

Illich or Goodman, though some of their experiences cried out for a deschooling emphasis.

WORKING WITHIN THE SYSTEM?

The mass of teachers stood with Chris Searle. He was for working within the state school system—and putting fire in his belly now and then with the sheer existence of free schools. There were several dismal accounts of teachers being repeatedly sacked by state school after state school for the tiniest signs of radicalism. Stories of long-sought 'successes' like longer hairstyles were depressing. More encouraging were examples of work projects. One teacher sent kids out with one of them in a wheelchair to make phone calls, go shopping, go on a bus, go to the cinema, public lavatory, etc. Finding out at the town hall about provision and regulations for cripples was also part of the aim to arouse kids' awareness of how society does and doesn't provide for the disabled, and how society is run. The kids had to be insured for every day spent out of school! This tale raised shouts of 'liberal crap' from the ideologists. But it is arguable that any school free or unfree could do with countless experiments of this kind. And it's not just the kids who need to learn how our society is run.

JULIUS.

(Next year's Ruskin history workshop will be on Women in History: Women's Liberation.)

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)

Freedom Press

publish
FREEDOM weekly
and distribute
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
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)
Airmail		
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)
Airmail		
USA & Canada	12 issues	\$11.00
	6 issues	\$6.00
Australasia & Far East	12 issues	£4.50
	6 issues	£2.25

Stoke Newington Squatters

IN THEIR FIRST ATTEMPT to get eviction orders against these five families and 15 children occupying houses in the Borough, some of which have stood empty for as long as four years, Hackney BC assumed they would be met with the sort of resignation they expect from unsupported families. They were mistaken. After hearing the families' spokesman, Bill Dwyer, present evidence of the perjurious nature of the written evidence contained in the summonses, the High Court judge's only alternative to pursuing the allegation was to concede Dwyer's demand to adjourn the hearing, declaring himself not competent to preside. No date was fixed for resuming the hearing.

Within hours of the hearing Dwyer's home was burgled and copies of the summonses and all his other legal notes were stolen, nothing else was touched. The morning after the burglary a Council official arrived at the squat and asked to be shown the families' copies of the summonses. They replied that Dwyer had the only copies, and the official admitted before six witnesses that the 'evidence' in the summonses had been prepared before it had been 'officially' collected by his investigator. Fortunately we had taken precautions beforehand and deposited photocopies of the documents in a safe place. Since that time most of Dwyer's mail to the families and their friends has arrived re-sealed and the houses have been under more or less permanent plain-clothes observation.

This same official appeared for the Council at the second hearing in the local County Court. This time his written evidence was truthful (though not his spoken evidence, see below).

The legal defence (which the judge was reluctant to hear, declaring that there could be none) was based on two points: firstly, that the earlier hearing was still adjourned. Bill began to outline his point, but the instant he uttered

the word 'perjury' the judge accused him of childishness, and refused to hear anything further about it. It had, he said, nothing to do with him what had happened on that occasion, not that he let anyone tell him. Hear no evil. . . . And secondly, the main argument, that by the principal of estoppel, according to which payment of rent following notice to quit invalidates such notice, the payment of rates by the families since the first notice (one family had just paid £80 rates) was invalidating in the same way, and indicated that the Council had by accepting rates, accepted a tenancy. The judge ruled that this principle could not be applied to rates, and that in accepting payment the Council had merely acknowledged occupancy. He made no attempt to clarify the distinction in principle between paying rent and rates to the same landlord, the Council. Nor was he able to offer any consolation to the family who paid £70 deposit to a bogus landlord, only to find themselves squatting on Council property.

Announcing that there was therefore no defence in law, this impartial judge of legal niceties proceeded to bombard those present with his own judicial analysis of the housing problem. It was caused, he asserted, by the unrestricted influx into Hackney of Irishmen and overseas immigrants. The only solution to this, he suggested, was to erect barbed-wire fences along the Borough boundaries, but this of course was unacceptable in a democratic system. Equally unacceptable to him was the action of homeless families moving into empty properties, this he said was jumping the queue, and that was anarchy—end of argument, though not the end of the speech, as he went on to equate 'housing-queue' jumping with the 'wage-queue' jumping of the 'greedy railway-men'.

He sympathised at great length, however, with the plight of homeless

Royal Parasites

ONE OF THE most unfortunate of all human inventions was the institution of the Divine King, the man who became by ritual a living god on earth, whose magical powers were identified with the growth of the crops, and who was put to death at the end of a number of years, or when his physical powers began to fail. The institution was not universal, some peoples never had it, others have got rid of it. In most of the countries of Western Europe kingship survived, but the sacrifice was given up, the king became a ruler and leader in war, later still a mere figurehead, a constitutional monarch.

Humanity seems to be deeply conservative. No one now believes that kings are gods. They do not make laws nor lead armies. They perform no useful function at all, except to open hospitals and launch ships, tasks which could well be performed by mayors or other local worthies. Yet they are kept on, at enormous expense, with troops of ceremonial guards, several palaces, cars, servants, steam-yachts and aircraft, in countries, like Britain, which are relatively poor and cannot afford this sort of luxurious display.

The dismissal of Edward VIII, on account of his marriage to a divorcee, shows how decrepit the institution had

become already in the 1930s. A divine king, or a feudal monarch with troops behind him, is not dismissed in this way. He may be murdered in some palace intrigue, but he will not be sent packing, like some employee who has failed to come up to expectations.

Now that he is dead his wife is welcomed into Buckingham Palace. A kindly gesture I suppose, though not much use to her husband when he is dead. If the royal family had wanted to make it up they had done better to have done so while he was alive. Not that the Windsors require our sympathy, they had plenty of money. Money cannot buy happiness, but it relieves its fortunate possessor from anxiety.

The Queen's statement, 'My people will always remember him with gratitude . . . makes one feel a trifle unwell. Firstly, we are not this good woman's property; secondly, it is not we who should remember him with gratitude, but he, in whatever Valhalla he has flown to, who should remember us with gratitude. It was the people of Britain who kept him and his lady wife in luxury all their days, and who still, through taxation, support these absurd royal parasites.

JOHN BRENT.

families, and was, he said, deeply upset at having to grant eviction orders, even declaring, as we waited for the first tear to roll down his well-fattened porcine features, that at times the frustration of working through official channels made him want to throw bombs too.

He hoped that by granting the orders he would speed up the process of getting the families re-housed, although this particularly sickening platitude did not emerge until the above-mentioned Council official's statement that Helen and her six kids had never applied for a place on the housing-list and had for the last few years simply moved (read been moved) from squat to squat was flatly denied by Helen, who had made several applications, without success. Winded by an attack of blushing and stammering his worship asked for assurances from the Council official that 'every possible' attempt be made to re-house the families

in Welfare (sic) accommodation, reminding him of the Council's frequent complaint that its allocation of homes in the 'New Towns' remained largely unexploited because of the lack of employment there, but that this problem did not apply to several of these families as they were maintained by Social Security allowances. Thus assured, he was able in turn to assure the defendants that they need not worry, they would be hearing from the Housing Department. In a moment of almost human compassion he offered to allow the families and officials use of his rooms for discussion. It was, of course, not within his jurisdiction to order the Council to re-house the families he had just ordered onto the streets. And off he went to his rooms without even telling us where they were.

He needn't have bothered anyway, as

Continued on page 4

Dear Comrades,

At the present bloody stage of the Irish Civil War, it would appear that despite the brutal atrocities in 'Tanner's Halls', the beatings, the indiscriminate bombings, and the murderous snipings, that most of the (Political) 'Left' in this Country give token support to, at any rate, the 'Official' wing of the Irish Republican Army. After all, this is perhaps the last struggle of an oppressed and divided colonial people against the 700-year-old yoke of British Imperialism, and no different from the struggle in Africa and Cyprus. The IRA is the only legitimate military force of the Irish people and the lineal descendant of the Fenians and the United Irishmen. Far worse atrocities were committed by the Partisans and the Maquis against the Germans and their alleged 'collaborators' in the last War. (Women were shaved and exhibited in cages in the Zoo at Brussels.) And by the side of Oliver Cromwell, the man-made 'Potato Famine', the genocidal evictions of the 1840's, and the 'Black and Tans', these excesses may appear to be minimal.

On the other side there is the Widgery whitewash Amritsar-type massacre in Londonderry, and the hooding, wall-standing and testicle-bashing methods of interrogation practised by the Occupying Forces under a Brigadier once in charge of the notorious Hola Camp in Kenya, while Craig's hooded thugs move into the Catholic 'no go' areas on snatch-raids.

Partition must go, but Nationalism is not enough, and mere bourgeois irreverence leads all too often by way of Garibaldi to Mussolini, Graziani, Abyssinia, Spain, the Axis, and Badoglio. Mere movements of 'National' (not personal) 'Liberation' can only lead to Pilsudski, Mannerheim, Mao, de Gaulle and De Valera.

But, just how 'Left', 'Revolutionary' or 'Libertarian' is the IRA? Within the 'Organisation' there have always been two wings (now called 'Official' and 'Provisional') and the Army has been split on the questions of Marxism and Fascism. The Provos represent the traditionalist, clerical wing; the people who supported General O'Duffy's 'Blueshirts' and his attempted intervention on behalf of Franco; and later, collaboration with Nazi Germany. 'England's difficulty' was always 'Ireland's opportunity' and the Irish rebels have always used a long spoon in supping with the Devil (or the Pope) and gladly accepted help from the Spanish, French, and German enemies of British power. (Tyne and Philip II, Wolf Tone and Napoleon, Roger Cas-

LETTERS

ment and the Kaiser.)

The Right Wing also contains many of the austere Puritans of the Gaelic League, based on ultra-nationalism, xenophobia, and the revival of a language only found behind the bars of Mooney's pubs.

The 'Officials' believe in a free, united, and Socialist Ireland. During the Spanish Civil War, Frank Ryan of the CP led an Irish Brigade to fight for the Republic, but later, during the period of Hitler-Stalin detente, switched his allegiance to Germany and was sent with Sean Russell (the then IRA Leader) in a 'U' Boat (Casement fashion) to land in Ireland. But Russell died on the voyage and the submarine returned (with Ryan) to the Reich.

And does anybody stop to think what would happen if the North were placed under direct rule from Dublin, under the 'spiritual' heel of Archbishop McQuaid, Cardinal Conway, and the Pope?

There would be no contraception or abortion, no divorce, and the most repressive literary, cultural, and artistic censorship ever known. Still banned in Eire are works by Brendan Behan and James Joyce, all the works of Edna O'Brien, and most of O'Casey, Liam O'Flaherty, Shaw, Sartre, Hemingway, Huxley, Koestler and Orwell. In Clone (Co. Fermanagh) the village priest segregated males and females in the local cinema, and the Prelacy forbade a visiting Yugoslav soccer team from polluting the sacred Hibernian turf because they were 'atheists'!

Further, the bog-Irish romantics of the Gaelic Language Revival should revise their misty History. Pre-Conquest Ireland was no Arcadia, but divided into Seven major kingdoms, each sub-divided into sub-kingdoms or 'tuaths', all under a High King of Tara, and this feudal society was clearly stratified under constantly warring Chiefs, into Freeman (freeholders, craftsmen, and clerics), Unfree (serfs and tenants) and Slaves, some of whom were kidnapped while guests like St. Patrick, or obtained by raids on the coasts of England!

The Anglo-Normans were 'invited' by Dermot MacMurrough in a 'Trojan War' type of situation, when he appealed to Henry II of England (in 1166) to help

him against the alliance of O'Rourke, whose wife, Devorgilla, he was currently knocking off. A force of Norman and Welsh mercenaries was promptly despatched under Richard 'Strongbow' Earl of Pembroke. The 'Pale' around Dublin became the 'Plantation' and eventually complete occupation, followed by Partition, dictated to the defeated Irish rebels at gun-point.

Clearly then, Partition must go. A free, United and Socialist Ireland must arise, perhaps at first under a Federal system of autonomous republics on the pattern of the Swiss cantons. The priest-caste and their interference in secular affairs and private morals must go, together with the British Army, the Ulster Unionists and the Gaelic Revivalists. Religions based on superstition, ignorance, poverty, and the politics of rival Green and Orange political gangs are only used and exploited to divide and confuse the oppressed and exploited in their present misery.

Long Live the Libertarian Federation of All Ireland!

Yours fraternally,

CAVAN MCCARTHY.

Egoist Individualism

Dear Editors,

In his letter against Peter Neville, Trevor Bavage (13.5.72) states that 'one of the most successful criticisms against egoist individualism ... is that it is a

corrupt version ... of the ideas our bourgeois rulers hold so dear'. In what way is this a 'successful' criticism? It reads very much like a variant of the usual socialist line that individualism is 'petit-bourgeois'. Unfortunately for him and the socialists, however, the kind of society described as 'capitalist' has never been individualist (it is doubtful if any society can be). At no time have its rulers either preached or practised the view that the interests of the individual have precedence over the collective interests of the State.

Support for my contention comes from no less a fervent advocate of libertarian communism than Emma Goldman. In her essay 'Minorities versus Majorities' she writes:

'The oft repeated slogan of our time is ... that ours is an era of Individualism, of the minority. Only those who do not probe beneath the surface might be led to entertain this view. Have not the few accumulated the wealth of the world? Are they not the masters, the absolute kings of the situation? Their success, however, is due not to individualism, but to the inertia, the cravenness, the utter submission of the mass. The latter want but to be dominated, to be led, to be coerced. As to individualism, at no time in human history did it have less chance of expression ... It is absurd to claim that ours is the era of individualism.' (*Anarchism and Other Essays*.)

Bavage writes that 'the most successful individualist is the bourgeois. His individual desire rules many people'.

This attempt to make 'individual desire' the equivalent of individualism is nonsensical. One individual may desire nothing more than to become an anonymous particle of a mass. Another may desire to rule in the belief that he is the instrument of some transcendent Provi-

dence, e.g. Hitler. In both of these cases the individuals concerned are not individualists. They do not prize their uniqueness, nor wish to become self-owning. They are possessed persons: the first by the passion for mediocre self-renunciation, the second by the passion to exercise power in the service of a fixed idea, a metaphysical spook.

Stirner was certainly 'ruthless' and 'sarcastic' in his philosophical annihilation of the superstitions of authority. If this is 'neurotic' all praise to it! He never, however, threaded his writings with the kind of personal abuse and demagogic intimidation used by Trevor Bavage to cover what appears to be an astounding intellectual impoverishment. If Bavage has read all Stirner's writings (which I very much doubt) he has put no significant value on it, since no one could construe Stirner's essay on education, for example, as likely to be of comfort to 'the educational controllers of this society'. Insofar as Peter Neville takes his inspiration from Stirnerian ideas, Bavage's interpretation of his views is distorted, if not completely falsified.

As for Neville's 'vilely idiotic' statement, what anarchist could object to it, so long as he proposes no coercive sanction to maintain his 'learning situation'. From what Bavage proposes it seems he wants to abolish State control and replace it by mob control. That the mob he favours are children does not make it any more attractive—it is simply 'child-centredness' gone mad.

Yours sincerely,

S. E. PARKER.

London

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.

Flemish Action Committee for E. Europe. Vik Van Brantegem, 90 Canfield Gardens, N.W.6, wants contacts with British anarchist groups.

Roadrunner, monthly, non-violent alternative magazine. 8p. Issue 35 now out. Articles on anti-psychiatry, alternative society and Namibia, plus all the usual items—Tiny Mines, On the Road, etc. £1.25 for 12 issues, 65p for 6 from 28 Brundretts Road, Manchester 21.

'Peace News' for theory and practice of non-violent revolution. £4.95 p.a. (students less 10%). Trial sub. 7 weeks for 80p with free M. Duane 'Biological Basis of Anarchism', 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

Anarchist Posters—each one an original woodcut. Bakunin, Kropotkin, Malatesta. 30p from 153 Woodhouse Lane, Leeds 2.

Australian Red and Black 4 available from Jim Couch, Box 131, The Union, Sydney University 2006. Articles on Russia 1917-21, Bakunin, IWW, etc. 30p.

Oxford Anarchists meet every Friday, 8 p.m., Clarendon Press Institute, Walton Street.

East Kent Anarchist Federation. Inaugural Meeting: Saturday, June 17, 3 p.m., at 22 Royal Road, Ramsgate. Anarchist Meetings. 271 Commercial Road, First Floor, changed to Tuesdays 8 p.m.

Anarchist Summer Camp. Anyone interested contact P. H. Jacques, 4 Rue du College d'Anney, 84 Avignon, France.

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.

Hospitality in New Zealand for any visiting anarchists—A. A. Hishop, Puketa, Kaikouya, NZ.

Workers' Control. Anarcho-syndicalist group to be set up on LTE Railways. Contact P. J. Goody, 5 Grafton Close, Hounslow, TW4 5NQ.

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 8 Fund, c/o Compendium Books, 240 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1, a.s.a.p.

Free Valpreda Campaign. Send all material to 113 Cazenove Road, London, N.16.

Squatters

Continued from page 3

all these assurances were shattered seconds after his departure when the Council official revealed for the first time that he was not representing the Housing or Welfare Departments, and that he could 'take the judge's advice or leave it'. At this point Helen's patience broke and she told him she would be resuming perjury charges, whereupon his side-kick replied, 'Go ahead, we'll see who ends up inside'. The official, sensing danger, changed his tune and asked for three days' grace to 'arrange' something, adding that she was being manipulated by people whose motivations were political.

It is now three weeks since the hearing and the only communications the families have received from the Council have been possession orders. One of the

families took their order along to Shelter, and asked for help, only to be told sorry, we're Council-backed, we can't do anything.

The Hackney Gazette has remained silent throughout, although it normally carries at least two pages of sensational court reports, and never misses a chance of bashing the Labour Council.

Two of the families are determined to give the Council a run for its rates, not only during the evictions but before and after in the form of direct-action protest and written propaganda. So far they have received very little support from FREEDOM readers or anarchists in general, despite a lot of publicity in FREEDOM and elsewhere (the exceptions being the local ORA group, and much individual help from Bill Dwyer, George Foulser as ever, and Mary at FREEDOM). Help has also been promised by the East London Squatters' Association.

GET DOWN HERE AND HELP HARASS THE HARASSERS.

Help is needed as follows:—

1. Most important, four families to take one kid each during eviction, and one family to have two small kids, to prevent Welfare officials 'taking them into care'.
2. Use of car, van, any kind of transport, during the next fortnight, for campaigning (will pay, and take care).
3. Comrades with transport to be present at eviction. Purpose explained on contact.
4. People to actually move in during eviction attempts.
5. Lots of publicity.
6. Help distribute leaflets and fly-post.
7. Help from anyone with experience of similar actions.

STOKE NEWINGTON SQUATTERS, c/o Helen Vennard, 32 Grayling Road, London, N.16

Kids

Continued from page 2

even in a playful way. Instead they rope them off in a gym and call it boxing, add rules and instigate competition tactics and the rest. Adults dislike un-adult behaviour because this is an adult world with adult norms. If activity is inherently non-adult it is suppressed or subverted into mere 'useful' forms. In Britain for instance many people have fought a long time for adventure playgrounds but architects still plan play areas with concrete pipes and ladders so as to win an award because 'there is something for the children as well!' Only really free play and school can change this and maybe this is why so many free schools are closed down—they do not have enough of the 'adult' in them, no desks, no nice displays and no 'qualified' teachers.

Look at Kids is an enjoyable but saddening book. It is in the same style as John Walsley's *Neill and Summerhill* and both are very vital to anyone interested in the child's world.

DAVID BROWN.

THIS WEEK IN IRELAND

A VERY MOMENTOUS week both sides of the border. The IRA prisoners in Mountjoy rioted and smashed up the prison, demanding they be treated as political prisoners, and they raked in those to whom they referred as 'common criminals' to help. Later the expression used was denied by the political wings of Sinn Fein in very holier than thou language.

This event has led to a number—40 I think—of IRA prisoners being removed to the Curragh and put under military control and a bill rushed through the Dail to make this legal for 24 months—actually under the Special Powers Act it was legal anyhow. Many people, not only Sinn Fein, are very dubious about this bill which seems to be interment under another name but both Sinn Feins are so intensely disliked except by their own small coteries that there has not been as much protest as there would otherwise have been.

The Chaplain of Mountjoy has written to every member of the Dail imploring them to build an entirely new sort of prison and end the futility of the present system of punishment which does not rehabilitate.

Meanwhile an outbreak of arson has occurred in Dublin. Dunne's of North Earl Street was burnt to the ground at a cost of thousands and thousands of pounds. Another shop got the fire under control in time to lose £770 only, and owing to the diligence of vigilantes the devices have been discovered in at least 12 other stores and rendered harmless.

In one store a young man came in and tried on sports jackets but said none were quite what he wanted. As the assistant was hanging up the jackets after he had gone he felt something in the pocket of one. He took it out and it was so hot he dropped it and a small fire started instantly. In Woolworths, a girl found one of these objects amongst highly inflammable plastic.

Sinn Fein try to make out that it is Northern Protestant extremists but the store workers say the suspected planters

spoke with Southern accents. It is not the work of a pyromaniac as dozens are put in different places at the same time. It may be a break-away group. It may be the IRA desperate owing to their failure in Derry.

The Official IRA shot a nineteen-year-old Creggan soldier home on leave from Germany and he in mufti. This had rendered service as a vigilante in the dark days of 1969 and then it was enlist or starve as is so often the choice of those in Derry, and at that moment in time the army were being regarded as the saviours from the brutal RUC and B-Specials. This however was the last straw as far as the violence-sick women of the Bogside and Creggan were concerned and they started a very real peace movement. 2,000 attended a meeting which was disrupted by 250 screaming IRA supporters. Sinn Fein have given out that the women are not typical and that some of their leaders will be tarred and feathered. Nevertheless seven of them talked with Whitelaw yesterday, and they are demanding not only that the IRA stop but that the British army stop too. 'It must be both sides,' said Mrs. Mary Barr. They were pleased with their interview with Mr. Whitelaw though they will not report until they have talked with the 35,000 women they say are behind them. Perhaps this 'monstrous regiment of women' will accomplish that which has defeated all politicians?

Now they no longer dare talk of going into the no-go areas of Derry and taking them by force of arms, the Protestant extremists are yelling for services to be cut off, no electricity, water, post, children's allowances, etc. In fact murder slowly, especially the babies, the old and the invalids, instead of just shooting them. The extremists on both sides are drunk with blood-lust and the urge to destroy all who disagree with them.

Time and the hour ride through the roughest day. We must just wait and see,

H.