

Workers' Control at Briant Colour Printing Knocks'em in the Old Kent Road

THERE WAS A TIME, not so long ago, when employers could close down factories and shove men and women on to the scrap-heap like so many old boots—and the pity of it was that the workers accepted it. But not any more. Times have changed, and a bloody good job too. It is ridiculous that working men and their families should be reduced to poverty because some rich man can no longer make a profit out of their labours. If an employer goes into 'liquidation' he has abandoned his so-called right of ownership and the workers have every natural right in the world to take over and carry on production under their own control producing things that people need.

Workers haven't yet gone this far, but already at UCS on Clydebank, at Plesseys, at Fisher-Bendix, and at the women's leather factory in Fakenham, they have refused to be tossed on to the dole. 'Work-ins' and occupation of factories have now become an accepted part of the industrial struggle. And now it has happened in the printing industry.

On Wednesday, June 21, the managing director of Briant Colour Printing in Old Kent Road, South London, sent for the FOCs (shop stewards) and calmly informed them that as of that moment the firm was

going into voluntary liquidation and all the 150 workers (except a dozen or so who were required to finish off some outstanding orders) were out, finished, sacked, on the dole, without a livelihood.

Ten years ago they might have got away with it, but times have changed. The FOCs called meetings of the workers and then told the director that the dismissal notices were not accepted. From now on the factory would be run by the workers themselves, and, within a few hours it was done. Work was continued without an employer and under Workers' Control.

Posters appeared at the doors and in the windows stating that 'This Factory Is Not For Sale' and is 'Now Under Workers' Control'. A workers' management committee was elected and got down to arranging the business of work rosters, looking after safety, canteen facilities, etc. A day and night guard was posted on the factory gate and nobody got in or out without their permission.

The Works Director holed himself up in his office and had his food sent up in a bucket on a rope from the main road—but the shop managers and supervision carried on working under the direction of the

Joint Chapel Committee. Existing orders are being completed and customers are being asked to pay in cash if they want delivery. All monies so received are placed in a special fund. New orders are being sought and are now starting to come in. The liquidator has come down to the factory but couldn't get in.

The posters don't lie. Briant Colour Printing is now operating under Workers' Control.

There is complete unity among the members of all the unions involved—NATSOPA, SLADE, NGA and SOGAT—and a leaflet was immediately issued informing the rest of the printing trade what was happening, asking for support, and calling a meeting outside the factory last Friday.

I myself went to the meeting (as a representative from my own Chapel in Fleet Street) and I was able to talk to a lot of the Briant Colour lads. They are rightly sceptical about the firm being skint. After all, they made a handsome profit of £665,000 last year and there is plenty of work in the plant.

The workers know that Briant Colour came under new ownership last year and they also know that the new owners have interests in other printing firms as well as a financial interest in one of the main

creditors. So they think the whole thing stinks of financial manipulation and speculative deals in which the owners will come out with plenty while the workers will take their places in the dole queues.

But these workers are not prepared to go tamely like lambs to the slaughter; they are determined to fight for their livelihoods and the welfare of their wives and kids. That's why they wouldn't take the dismissal notices, and that's why they are now in complete control of this beautifully built and equipped modern printing factory in Old Kent Road.

I wouldn't say that they are all raving revolutionaries. They are not fighting to uphold some political philosophy or some great ideology. They are much better than that. They are men and women who have had the guts to stand up to an employer and refused to be kicked in the teeth. They just don't think that anyone has some god-given right to toss them out of a job and they are determined to resist it with all their strength.

It is possible that the employer will change his tune and keep the factory running, or perhaps some other employer will step in and buy it. But, on the other hand, it is equally possible that none of this will happen and instead the workers will have to make the attempt to take the firm into their own ownership (as the women did in the Fakenham leather factory) and run it as a co-operative without anyone making a profit out of their labours. Time will tell, but I have the feeling that these men and women will do just that, if they have to, in defence of their livelihoods.

Meanwhile there can be nothing but praise for this gallant little band of printworkers who have refused to be pushed around by a profit-hungry bunch of employers. They are an example to all of us, and we must make sure that they don't fail for want of our support. They may well be faced with practical difficulties—especially in the matter of supplies of ink, paper, etc.

We make all the things they need in the printing and allied trades and we must use all our industrial strength to see that they get the supplies they need.

SLADE (a printing craft union) has made the 'work-in' official and are now paying dispute benefit to their members. It is to be hoped that the other three Unions soon do the same. They are going to need money and it is up to all of us to see that they get it. There are wives and families to be fed while all this is going on. They are asking for orders and we can surely all use our influence to see that they get them. This factory is functioning under Workers' Control and all Trade Unions should place their print orders with it right away.

Speaking to the meeting last Friday, Bill Freeman, the popular FOC of the NATSOPA members at Briant Colour, had this to say: 'A long time ago all the land we are standing on was owned by ourselves and we lived off it. Then some rich men came along and took it off us and made us go to work for them. What we have done today is to take it back!' The statement got a big cheer—especially from us older workers who have been longing for this sort of thing for donkey's years. But what Bill Freeman said is a simple truth we all know in our hearts is right. A group of very courageous workers have taken back what rightfully belongs to them—the land, the factory and the tools by which they earn their living. A section of the employing class who for centuries have lived on the backs of working people have been well and truly knocked in the Old Kent Road. If we all make the effort and use our strength outside to support the lads and lasses inside we may yet manage to keep it that way.

Send your messages of support and your money and your print orders to: **Tony Austin, Treasurer, Joint Chapels Fund, Briant Colour Printing, 651 Old Kent Road, London, S.E.15.**

JOHN LAWRENCE,
NATSOPA FOC,
Press Association.

More Law—Less Order

THE GREAT MAJORITY of wrongdoers cannot be deterred because their actions are motivated by spontaneity, weakness, stupidity or other characteristics rather than by deliberate and planned wrongdoing. The English judicial system... is, in reality effective only for dealing with the compliant—the weak, the stupid, the illiterate and the spontaneous wrongdoers who comprise the vast majority of cases.' Who said this? It sounds on the face of it, a continuation of the anarchist anthology of self-justification on law and order which, some may reasonably think, too often infuses the pages of FREEDOM with a heady self-righteousness.

However, our excuse for returning so swiftly to this topic, besides the grim continuance of the Old Bailey trial, is that these words were not uttered by some latter-day Kropotkin or (up-to-now) mute inglorious Bakunin but by the new Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, Mr. Robert Mark. It has often been observed in politics as in public life, that new brooms have a tendency to spread just as much muck about as the old ones. That a crusading, reforming blue-eyed boy is all-too-often responsible for as much injustice, brutality and moral corruption as 'the old gang' which he has cleaned out, often the new boy adds a sickening hypocrisy which at least was absent from the old gang. Truly it was said, 'Lilies that fester smell worse than weeds.'

Mr. Robert Mark is no exception. These sentences are culled from an address delivered to the Royal Society of Medicine, on June 20, entitled, 'The disease of crime—punishment or treatment?'

Having thrown his bouquets to progressiveness Mr. Mark went on, in short, to toss back the ball so frequently thrown at the police. It is now, of

course, an accepted cliché that punishment is, in the majority of cases, no deterrent (even Mr. Mark can accept this). It is usually stated that the certainty of punishment would lessen the crime-rate. This has been common currency for some time. Mr. Mark quotes the Home Office Criminal Statistics that 'a burglar stands only a one out of three chance of being caught in the provinces and a one out of five chance in London. For robbery the chances would be slightly better than one out of two in the provinces and one out of three in London.' These statistics would seem to cast some reflection on the efficiency of the police, and some would even carry it so far as to reflect on their corruptibility. This is not entirely the case for changes in social behaviour (for example a vast proportion of such cases involve motor-vehicles). Whatever has caused the change the Police Federation have been behind pressure to revise the law to make it unnecessary to issue cautions to those arrested and to make it obligatory for the accused to go into the witness-box.

Mr. Mark skilfully passes the buck on to the high rate of acquittal. He went on following the burglary and robbery statistics to say, 'It is even more disturbing that, if he is caught the likelihood of conviction if he is tried by jury is only one out of two.' Earlier, Mr. Mark said, 'Under our present system of law only a small proportion of those acquitted by juries are likely to be innocent in the true sense of the word.' This, to be quite fair, is not what Mr. Mark said but what Mr. Mark said a hypothetical policeman could say were it not improper for him to comment. Mr. Mark himself admits that the majority of cases are tried by magistrates (unless, in some cases, the

accused himself elects to go to trial by jury). If, the accused is prepared to risk the possibility of a longer sentence by pleading 'not guilty' in the first place and in the second place, asking to be tried by a jury he is obviously more convinced of his own innocence, than the police are, whatever the true sense of the word is!

The National Council for Civil Liberties, in a memorandum on *Civil Liberties and the Judges' Rules*, quotes Mr. Mark in 1965 as suggesting that accused persons should enter the witness box and the caution-rule should be abolished in order to entrust (quotes the NCCL from Mr. Mark) 'to the criminal lawyer part of the task of the police officer that seems to arouse most distrust and criticism of the police by lawyers generally, namely, the interrogation of the accused'. The caution (goes on the NCCL) Mr. Mark argued, has never been of the slightest use to the innocent. There should be no restrictions on questioning 'other than a reasonable limitation of time and absolute prohibition of duress'. The caution, goes on the NCCL paraphrasing Mr. Mark, prevents the establishment of the truth and creates an atmosphere of distrust.

The Judges' Rules are neither, now wholly the product of the Judges, nor have they ever been 'Rules'—they have no force of law. They were revised in 1964 by the Home Office—space and time forbids one to go into details (the NCCL address is 152 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1). To take but one example of a rule: A person in custody should be allowed to speak on the telephone to his solicitor or to his friends provided (Catch 22!) that no hindrance is reasonably likely to be caused to the processes of investigation, or the administration of justice by his doing so.

In practice the NCCL found out that of 134 suspects 15 did get in touch with their solicitor, 108 did not, and 11 had not been taken to a police station. The 108 were asked if they had asked the police to allow them to speak with a solicitor. 42 said they had asked but been refused. Refusal took odd forms, one was asked if he had a solicitor. He said "no" so the policeman said, "Well, you can't contact him can you?" Another was told he could use the phone—but the room he was locked in had no phone. A comment on this was made by an ex-suspect or police-victim. 'When one is in a police-station how many can recollect off-hand the name and telephone number of a solicitor to defend one?'

To return to Mr. Mark's thesis. The gist of it repeated by various journalists is that the really big criminals behind organized crime are, by their knowledge of and usage of the law, getting away with almost literally murder. In order that this minority be successfully prosecuted (catching them is no problem) the Judges' Rules and certain other aspects

Continued on page 3

MARCH & MEETING

in support of
**Briant Colour Printers
'Work-In'**

Assemble 2.45 p.m.
**Bricklayers Arms
(top of Old Kent Road)**

March down Old Kent Road to
the factory for a Mass Meeting

Bring your Banners
Organised by
BCP Joint Chapels
FRIDAY, JUNE 30th

Spanish Lessons

ANARCHISM & VIOLENCE

LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION by Vernon Richards (Freedom Press, 1972, £1.50).

THE SECOND MAIN issue discussed by Richards is anarchism and violence. He begins by pointing out that, contrary to popular belief, violence is not part of the anarchist philosophy. Anarchists have repeatedly insisted that an anarchist society can neither be established nor maintained by armed violence. Recourse to violence is an indication of weakness, not of strength. 'The use of violence,' he continues, 'has been justified both as a principle and as a means to an end; hardly ever, however, by anarchists. At the most, anarchists have justified its use as a revolutionary necessity, or tactic.' In his view, those who call themselves pacifist or non-violent anarchists are partly responsible for the popular misunderstanding. The fallacy of the non-violent anarchist is that of 'making non-violence a principle, when it is in fact no more than a tactic. Furthermore, the "non-violent" advocates fail to make a distinction between violence which is used as a means for imposing the will of a group or a class, and that violence which is purely defensive.'

Two points arise here. As a simple matter of fact, non-violent action has often and, indeed, most frequently been used as a tactic. But Richards begs the question when he flatly asserts that 'non-violence is no more than a tactic', for whether it is so or not is precisely the issue in dispute between non-violent and

other anarchists. In large part, I think, the difference between the two positions derives from a difference of meaning attached to the term 'non-violence'. The term itself is negative, suggesting simply the absence of violence. But to advocates of principled non-violence it usually means, in addition, something positive: the active state of love, in the sense of respect and concern for the dignity and individuality of others, including—and this is the hardest bit—those we may regard as our enemies. In this positive sense, it is at least arguable that non-violence merits the status of a principle rather than of a tactic. That it deserves to be considered as a central principle of anarchism is suggested by the fact that Gandhi arrived eventually at the conclusion that the ideal society was enlightened anarchy, not by theorising about the meaning of anarchy but by spelling out all the implications of accepting the principle of (positive) non-violence.

OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE

With respect to Richards' second point, the distinction between 'offensive' and 'defensive' violence, it is not my experience that most thoughtful exponents of non-violence have failed to recognize the distinction. What they have argued is that the distinction in practice is far from clear-cut. This lack of clarity is suggested by the popular aphorism: 'Attack is often the best line of defence'. When politicians authorize the unleashing of violence, they almost invariably seek to justify their action in terms of

defence. And this is not sheer hypocrisy: it is difficult to establish an objective definition of what is 'purely defensive'. Moreover, from the perspective of the revolutionary who recognizes that the ruling classes make constant use of various forms of institutionalized violence to maintain their dominance, it becomes possible to justify almost any act of violence by the oppressed classes as 'defensive'. In face of such difficulties, non-violent anarchists doubt the practical value of the distinction. But this does not imply that they equate the violence of the oppressor with that of the oppressed. Non-violent anarchists cannot be neutral in any struggle between oppressor and oppressed. And they will side with the oppressed, even when the latter use violent methods—adding, however, that recourse to violence will not achieve liberation and may well be counter-productive. And, of course, they will act on this belief by not resorting to violence themselves and by seeking alternative non-violent methods of resistance.

BART DE LIGT

In developing his argument in the context of the Spanish Revolution, Richards quotes extensively the opinions of the eminent non-violent anarchist, Bart de Ligt, expressed in *Conquest of Violence*, 1937. He does so partly to bring out the naivety of de Ligt's presentation of the non-violent case. But, on my reading of de Ligt, his advocacy of non-violent resistance by the Spanish workers and active non-violent intervention by the international working-class movement in their support was not to suggest that, in the actual circumstances of 1936, a non-violent solution was a practical possibility. De Ligt was aware that it is not possible to make a non-violent revolution in the absence of a movement which has committed itself to, and trained itself in the use of, non-violent methods. Indeed, in a passage which Richards quotes, de Ligt says explicitly: 'Considering the ideological traditions, and the social, political, and moral conditions under which this civil

war broke out in July 1936, the Spanish anti-militarists could do nothing else than to resort to arms before the military invaders.' But to admit this is not to concede or to weaken the non-violent case: it is to underline the imperative need for revolutionaries to re-think their strategy of revolution and to prepare and implement a non-violent alternative. Non-violent methods are never likely to be employed successfully if they are turned to only after armed conflict has broken out.

JIU-JITSU

Richards underlines de Ligt's conclusion that, if the international working-class movement had not neglected its duty, 'violence would have been kept down to a minimum and the possibility of a real revolution would have been so great as to change the face of the world'. He takes this as an admission on de Ligt's part that 'under certain conditions violence need not degenerate, a position which many advocates of non-violence dogmatically sweep aside as untenable'. But this, I feel, misunderstands de Ligt's point. Non-violent resistance can never hope to do more than minimize violence. Any non-violent resister who thinks he can avoid the violence of the opponent is destined for a rude awakening. Indeed, the theory of non-violent action assumes that the opponent will, if at all hard-pressed, use violence; and the dynamics of non-violence posits a process of moral and political jiu-jitsu which transmutes the opponent's violence in such a way as to work to his disadvantage. Advocates of non-violence have never denied that 'under certain conditions violence need not degenerate'. That would make nonsense of their own position! What they assert is that the only condition under which it does not is when the violence of the opponent is met, not by counter-violence but by the determined and persistent non-violence of the resisters.

In principle this assertion is a matter of fact, open to empirical confirmation or disconfirmation. Determination of the matter, however, is difficult partly because of the vagueness of 'degenerate' and partly because the use of violence often has long-term and disguised effects: violence may apparently succeed in achieving its immediate objective but sow the seeds of future violence. To advance beyond the dogmatic positions

of asserting that violence either does or does not 'degenerate', it is necessary to distinguish different types of violence. The intuitively of the defensive/offensive distinction I have already discussed. A more useful set of distinctions would be in terms of: individual versus collective; unorganized v. organized; unpremeditated or spontaneous v. calculated; and short-lived v. long-lived. And I would hypothesize that, in terms of these distinctions, violence of the first-named types in this set would be less likely to degenerate. I would expect, however, that the degree of degeneration would vary between peoples with different political cultures and traditions.

PROLONGED STRUGGLE

Although Richards rejects what he sees as 'dogmatic' non-violence, he finds himself 'on common ground with the self-styled non-violence anarchists' in questioning the validity of prolonged armed struggle. In Spain, he believes, the point at which anarchists should have questioned armed struggle 'arose after a few months'. This, I feel, is a more significant concession to the non-violent position than he perhaps realises. In the actual situation of Spain and the world in 1936, there was little reason to suppose, once the militarists had launched their well-planned attack, that an armed struggle, to be successful, could be anything but prolonged. In such a situation, if one is not prepared to engage in prolonged armed struggle, it is more sensible not to engage in it at all. There is also a practical problem for anyone holding Richards' views. In taking to armed struggle one has joined a train that rolls with increasing momentum until the final crash that brings either victory or defeat. Jumping off a rolling train at some nicely-judged moment is not altogether impossible, but it is a difficult and dangerous feat, achieved successfully more often on the films than in real life. The non-violent anarchist, therefore, declines to join that kind of train and chooses another form of transportation, non-violent struggle. But he does so sharing the conviction of the contemporary advocates of armed guerrilla warfare that the struggle for liberation is almost certain to be prolonged.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

(This is the second of a three-part review.—Eds.)

Dissent on TV

UNFORTUNATELY ATTITUDES to television has still not recovered from the snobbishness with which the middle class dismissed this innovation which destroyed so much of their elitist world of intellectual pretentiousness, and disseminated much of worth to the common man and woman. The best playwrights of the 60's who captured the mood of the times were TV playwrights who later became the darlings of the middle-class trendies in the theatres. The most searching journalism outside the radical press was TV journalism. TV acted as the bush telegraph which spread the often unspoken word of political and cultural dissent to the sleepy world of my small-town adolescence. Despite the censorship, despite trivialization, the feet of clay of the mighty have been revealed for all with eyes to see.

The recent programme 'Radical Lawyer' which was a profile of the work and views of Ben Birnberg, the solicitor, showed that television really does try sometimes—even though the end product is not always altogether successful. The programme which was heralded by a critic in the *Sunday Times* as 'the most left-wing programme ever on British television' carried a nervous prologue from ATV pointing out that the views expressed were the personal views of one man but that the questions raised should be debated in a free society, etc. There were some well presented reports on a number of cases in which Birnberg has been involved: the Mangrove Case, the Quay Case and (after the Lord Mayor's Show!) the harassment of one

of the faithful selling *Workers' Press*.

What did not emerge was a clear picture of Birnberg himself. He had some things to say which really did deserve the label 'radical'. He made clear the violence underlying 'law and order' and the basic (if sometimes unconscious) role of police and army in maintaining the status quo. But then he went and spoilt it all! In a tut-tutting discussion with Reg Gale of the Police Federation both agreed that it was scandalous that the sentences for robbery were greater than that for 'child rapists'. (I presume they meant rapists of children not rampant six-year-olds!) Whilst fully supporting the contention that the prime function of Law is to protect property, I cannot join the cry for revenge on the sick people created by a sexually-repressed society.

In another discussion with Baroness Wootton and an assortment of instantly forgettable legal big-wigs Birnberg got bogged down in a plea for what he called 'democratic' magistrates. The dream is that if only some worthy proletarians were magistrates then everything would be miraculously changed. No doubt Birnberg believes that 'socialist' laws administered by 'socialist' judges would usher in an era of freedom and social justice. If only life was that simple! Whether or not I or the TV programme have done Birnberg an injustice will be better known to those who have availed themselves of his services. But he tries—and so do TV men sometimes.

TERRY PHILLIPS.

THE DAILY TELEGRAPH devoted its editorial on June 15 to the subject of 'Wage Inflation'. The paper makes it clear that price inflation is not worrying them. 'One thing the Government would have to resist (if there were a wages freeze)', they emphasise, 'would be the temptation, and the pressure, to bring in a price freeze as well: for it is necessary to increase profits and thus investment for the sake of the long term growth of the economy.'

As far as the unions are concerned the *Telegraph* thinks 'the bleak truth is that they are too strong'. One policy mooted to deal with strikers is to make social security benefits to strikers and their families returnable loans: 'There is no humane or compassionate reason why the community should be obliged to subsidise a striker during his efforts to force the community to pay him more wages than he is really worth.' Naturally, the *Telegraph*, renowned for its compassion in defending the powerful against the weak, is not favouring a lowered standard of living since 'it is arguable that, in the long run, the unions have done more to hold back, rather than advance, the living standards of their members'. One only has to remember what happens and happened to workers without the aid of a trade union to ridicule such nonsense.

The *Telegraph* finally argues that although 'no sensible person would wish to see a repetition of 1926', the General Strike 'did signal a diminution of union power, and gave many years of relative peace to industry'. The paper would like to get the results of the General Strike without the trouble of having the confrontation.

The Industrial Relations Act, to the editorial, is 'a move in the right direction' but Lord Denning's Appeal decision 'largely destroyed its power to deal with unofficial strikes and blacking'. Thus, they conclude, 'the underlying question in British politics is the question of authority. It may be that it will not prove possible to govern this nation successfully until this issue has been resolved.' We note, the following day, the *Telegraph*, commenting on the likely national dock strike, ends 'the Government must prepare for an emergency' in default of 'helpful action' by union leaders.

The anarchist view of politics is that it is always 'a question of authority'. The will of the State is imposed by all sorts of devices. Essentially, coercion rests its authority on the use or

QUESTION OF AUTHORITY


threat of force. Force, in this context, involves not simply killing but the infliction of pain, the lowering of a standard of living by fines and imprisonment, etc., etc. The authority of the Heath Government is said to lie with the electorate but the authority of the State, which 'employs' the Heath Government to impose the will of the ruling class, is the use or threat of force.

The authority of shop stewards is their fellow workers' support. However the law of the State which the Conservative Government passed with the Industrial Relations Act, attempts to destroy the authority of the shop stewards. The decision of Lord Denning is marginal as compared with the real source of the stewards' authority. If the Industrial Relations Court deems the shop stewards are acting as if they were 'above the law', they pose the old argument so often used against the anarchist. Our answer is at one with those who do not recognise the authority of the State and who see their 'law' as based on mutual aid and solidarity. Some comrades might speak of 'moral

laws' or 'natural laws' as opposed to the law of the State. For myself, I am satisfied with our recognition that humanity is held together by solidarity and mutual aid. Our way of life is to obtain agreement by acknowledging responsibilities to the reality of social cohesion. The method of the State is to obtain 'agreement' by whatever means are most effective: hangman's noose, prison cell, machine gun, massacre, napalm bomb, concentration camp, gas chamber, starvation, torture—the list is endless.

With Wilson in the wings sensing his opportunity for the regain of power, we need to remind workers of the efforts of the recent Labour Government attempt to introduce legislation similar to the Industrial Relations Act. If moves towards a General Strike do emerge it is vital that the lessons of the last General Strike are remembered and the same outcome—many years of relative peace to the industry—must be avoided. Unless, of course, the outcome is also workers' control.

J.W.



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.
Essex & E. Herts.: P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (QM, FL.)
Sussex: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.
Yorkshire: Trevor Savage, Flat 3, 35 Richmond Road, Leeds, 6.
Manchester: Mat Cunningham, 9 Brifer Hill Avenue, Little Hulton, Worsley, Lancs.
Scotland: Secretary, Mike Malet, 1 Lynnewood 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 9853, 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

A Campaign of Selected Strikes

FOR THE FIRST TIME in nine years the unions in the building industry have called an official national strike to secure its demands from the employers. Since 1963, amalgamations have meant that most trade unionists belong either to the Transport and General Workers' Union or the Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians.

The unions are claiming £30 a week for a 35 hour week and longer holidays. This represents a 50 per cent increase in wages, much of which would be absorbed from bonuses. The employers have only offered £5 for craftsmen and £4 for labourers, spread over an 18-month period.

Strike action is being taken at selected sites and workshops throughout the country. The unions' ten regions each have six selected sites on strike in the first week of the campaign. Six more from each region will join these in the second week and a further six in the third week. In all, this will mean that 180 sites and workshops will be affected after three weeks.

Places selected are those where penalty clauses are most likely to be a part of the contract. These include hotels where contractors are rushing to finish before the government's £1,000 subsidy for each bedroom, ends in April next year. On those sites not selected, members will be banning overtime.

As UCATT finances are in the red, a £1 levy is being collected from each member to give those on strike trade benefit.

The union's tactic is to have the maximum effect on the employer with the minimum hardship on the unions and their members. The industry is not only poorly organised by the unions but stoppages have little financial effect on an employer or the economy of the country.

But although the tactic might be correct, the unions first six selections in London do not seem to be very well organised. At a meeting last week of London shop stewards some of the six sites were not even represented. Reports from others indicated not only surprise at being selected but also doubts of whether the men would respond. With so much 'lump' labour, and companies moving in their 'royals', some of the sites are not so well organised. Certainly one could have picked a stronger six to hit the employers in the first week. I only hope the other areas are stronger in this first crucial week.

As usual workers are going into battle with one arm tied behind their backs. The employers are determined to keep basic wages down while paying high rates to 'subbies'. This undermines union organisation and sets one worker against another. The employers' federation has instructed their members not to make individual company agreements. So it looks as though building workers will have a tough fight on their hands. The thing is, are the unions up to it?

ORGANISED CHAOS CALLED RAILWAYS

British Railways' chief has just been given a salary increase of £4,000 a year

by the government, while many railwaymen have to work four years just to get that increase.

BR in its haste to make profit has discovered that posters advertising day trips to see Boeing 747s at Gatwick Airport have had to be scrapped because these aircraft do not use that airport. But BR are mad bent on causing more chaos. They plan, in their crazy drive to make railways financially viable, to make 20,000 more men redundant. The ban on rest day working, during their recent dispute, proved that BR are in fact short of staff.

As with other public services, all have to bow before the Altar of Mammon. Mr. Marsh's Labour Party background does not prevent him from wielding a Beeching axe. With Socialist friends like Mr. Marsh, the railwaymen and the public don't need Tory enemies.

CHOBHAM FARM

An agreement has been reached whereby registered dockers will be employed at Chobham Farm. Between 30 and 40 are expected to start work there in July. Men already employed will not be losing

their jobs.

The dockers were, in fact, after other men's livelihoods. While they are claiming the agreement as a victory, their whole campaign has come too late. Even if they manage to secure the work at container depots this will only mean about 500 jobs. If new ones are built then the work should be done by registered dockers rather than see more men made redundant.

But although dockers are fighting for jobs the formula of reducing the hours of work has not been raised.

Meanwhile Sir John Donaldson, president of the National Industrial Relations Court, is unhappy about the way and the number of dockers who picketed Chobham Farm. Sir John seems to be a law unto himself and determined to completely undermine the trade union movement. Although not so well paid as Mr. Marsh he gets paid handsomely for attempting to jail trade unionists.

Paradoxically, the people who actually contribute the least to society get paid the most. While those who do the most essential jobs, are the lowest paid.

P.T.

The French Tests

LIBERTY, EQUALITY AND RADIO-ACTIVITY, Freedom Press Pamphlet, 5p.

PUBLISHED six or seven years ago, at the time of an earlier series of French nuclear tests in the Pacific, this pamphlet hardly dates at all, except that Mongerel has left the scene. Douglas Kepper, Jack Robinson, John Rety, Mike Walsh, Mary Hays Weik and Anne Vogel write on different aspects of nuclear technology and its dangers, the poison it spreads, the earthquakes it has caused in North America and the Soviet Union and the monstrous births (so far only those of animals can be established) which radioactive contamination produces.

At the time when this pamphlet was written there were protests in the various countries which lie around the Pacific. But these were much less vigorously pressed than today. They were mainly official protests and these governments were content to express their alarm, which of course had no effect on the French at all. Conditions are different today.

A boat called *Greenpeace III*, with a crew of four, has sailed into the danger zone and escaped a French warship which tried to take it in tow. Whether on account of this boat, or because of the widespread protests, the tests (at the time of writing) seem to have been delayed, although the French deny it. A group with inflatable rubber dinghies are planning to parachute into the testing

zone, and hope to join up with *Greenpeace III*.

The Stockholm Conference on the Environment has condemned the tests. Dockers and airport workers in New Zealand and Australia are refusing to service French ships and aircraft. An Australian textile firm cancelled an order worth £116,000 from a French firm. The French consular agent in Adelaide has resigned, and in Auckland fire bombs were placed at the office of a French airline. The Peruvian government has broken off diplomatic relations with France, or threatened to do so. In Canberra someone painted slogans on the car and the home of the French military attaché. (Most of the above information has been taken from *Peace News*, 23.6.72, which is following the adventures of *Greenpeace III*.)

Nowadays people are much more conscious of environmental pollution than they were a few years ago. When the Freedom Press pamphlet was published it was a number of voices crying in the wilderness. The American bomb was hated because it was a symbol of the most powerful and hence most detested country in the world. The Chinese and the French bombs were rather approved of. They were gestures of defiance aimed at the Americans.

But the voices in the wilderness were not crying in vain. The much greater sophistication of the present time is the produce of their efforts.

JOHN BRENT.

Turkey on the Way to Socialism

I AM WRITING this article in London, where I came on my way to Scandinavia to seek political asylum. I was an economics student at Ankara University. Two and a half years ago I joined the underground to fight alongside my comrades for socialism.

I happened to be discovered by the Turkish police, and I had to leave the country because of this, otherwise I would have run the risk of being executed or being sent to prison for six to eight years, a rather long time. It is sometimes more horrible to be imprisoned than to be executed immediately.

The reason why I am going back now and taking these risks is that I have had trouble in continuing my journey, and there was no real chance for me to settle in Britain. I found it rather sad here, many comrades are talking about things happening far away about which they probably know nothing. If they knew more perhaps they would do more.

Before I go back I want to write the following in order to show what we are doing and what our people are struggling for. The authorities may kill our comrades, they may torture our wives and they may ask our children at school to find things out about us, they may put us in prison and may execute us... they can, of course, destroy our comrades' right to live, but they cannot destroy our resistance movement. There will be others who will continue the fight until they have broken the system which is destroying us, our rights and freedom. The more the authorities destroy, the more the struggle will go on. That's what we want! For this great goal we should be prepared to give our lives, if necessary, but we must never give up.

Since 1968 our movement has been growing continuously. It was the year of students' riots, and Turkey was involved. Before 1968 we had only a very small movement, consisting of some students at the Universities of Izmir, Ankara and Istanbul. But these movements were not very important. Since the Russian-Turkish War, in 1914-1917, Russians have been hated in my country. The Russian Revolution of 1917 has made one reason more. The Communists were known to be against religion, and religion is very important in Turkey. We believe in Islam which means 'the only correct belief'. Another reason may be the ethnic difference between these two peoples. In the course of time all these elements seem to have got mixed up, and anti-Communism (basically because Communism is atheist) is confused with war memories. The result is the development of racial prejudice.

Today we can see that the Turkish mind is confused. The Turkish people are reacting very emotionally. Turkey is the only country in the Middle East which is a member of NATO. There are US bases (rockets) at Izmir for example. The rockets are pointed towards Russia. The position of Turkey in the Palestine-Israel conflict is a rather neutral one. We have diplomatic relations with Israel, the only Islamic country which does. This is probably the result of political developments after 1914, 1917 and 1922.

Our country has almost no industry at all. We are a completely agricultural state. As a result we do not have a real class of proletarians, so to begin with we do not have a mass to politicize as you have in Europe. It seems to be a sociologically proven fact that agricultural regions are rather conservative. The structure of our society is a purely feudalistic one. We have not reached the later phase of capitalism as it might be called in Europe. Turkey is not to be compared with Europe. That is why it is necessary to explain the reasons for our struggle. A CORRESPONDENT.

MORE LAW

Continued from page 1

of the law must be revised to the detriment of the other 90% (who may possibly be innocent in some sense of the word). One is reminded for some inexplicable reason of the trial by ordeal of witches who were thrown into water. If they swam they were held to be witches helped by the Devil. If they sank it was another innocent to go to heaven, after aiding the course of justice.

The myth of the big criminal exactly suits the newspapers' passion for sensationalism. A recent 'expose' of the Mafia in Britain on the BBC seemed only to disclose that the Mafia wanted somewhere to invest its money in Britain, surely a laudable business aim. When crime becomes really big it becomes respectable big business. To parody Harrington, 'Crime ne'er doth prosper / in our time, / For if it doth prosper / None dare call it crime.' Or in prison graffiti, 'Steal a loaf and go to prison, steal a railway and go to the House of Lords.' The crime of adulterating food, cheating the shopper by shoddy goods, swindling the population by inflation or currency devaluation are all crimes carried on in this society on an extensive, respectable scale, which no policeman may touch whilst they are in the defined bounds of law and order.

JACK ROBINSON.

Letter from Australia

IT'S GREAT to receive FREEDOM regularly—my copies are soon disposed of as more and more people groove on the concept of anarchism as an alternative and not just an establishment smear word used by the mass media.

Black power is coming of age here with the 'Aboriginal Embassy' outside Canberra—the collection of tents and tin sheds opposite the pomposity of Parliament House. The Gurendje tribesmen in their bid for total control of their environment have thwarted capitalist (Vestegs—a fine ol' British firm!) and government threats and meddling since 1966. It seems that their ferocious hold on 8 square miles of the Northern Territory as 'their land' is now sinking through—the government, to induce fragmentation, have built a group of little boxes (however, far superior to the one window, one door, fibre shacks they usually supply) just outside the communal territory—with genuine folk solidarity the aboriginals have let these rot. Right On! They'd rather build their own with the resources they could muster.

Lil' Red School Book again. Banned as obscene in Victoria (one of our glorious hanging states), the bureaucrats have been thwarted again! 15 to 20,000 copies were circulated this week to

schoolkids, free at the school gates.

The 'authorities' are silent! But there is a new law being pushed for abandoning trial by jury for obscenity cases—magistrates are far more reliable, and for allowing a crack-down on 'obscene and objectionable' literature. (The second word arouses particular interest in me).

Enclosed is the May 1 proclamation from Melbourne anarcho-syndicalists. 10,000 have been circulated; Melbourne poster up a five-language poster; 1,000 four-page leaflets on the Haymarket Massacre and the origins of Workers' May Day have been distributed. 300 people marched in the Festival.

While the ever-growing National Socialists (on radio their spokesman said, 'Hitler would have burned this *Little Red School Book*'—wonder why?) conferred in Melbourne, a group of Zionist Youth (Zeig Goldameir?) burnt down an outhouse and smashed up the windows of the National Socialist training camp.

It is very amusing too that the National Socialists wrote an open letter in a recent newspaper, pointing out their parallel thinking with The Returned Servicemen's League. The prominently publicised response from the League pointed out that they wanted nothing to do with 'these ratabags', however the points made weren't challenged. C.P.



Any book not in stock, but in print can be promptly supplied.

Please add postage & cash with order helps.

- Terrible Garden World**
(22 Drawings in Folder)
Arthur Moysse £0.25 (4p)
- Bakunin on Anarchy**
(ed.) Sam Dolgoff £5.25 (25p)
- Call to Revolution: The Mystical Anarchism of Gustav Landauer**
Charles B. Maurer £4.00 (21p)
- Native American Anarchism**
Eunice M. Schuster £6.00 (134p)
- General Idea of Revolution in the Nineteenth Century**
P.-J. Proudhon £6.00 (21p)
- The Movement towards a new America: The beginnings of a long revolution**
(ed.) Mitchell Goodman £3.95 (30p)
- The Parts are all around us**
(Parts 1 & 2) Bob Dickens £0.16 (24p)
- The Revolution in Everyday Life** (Parts 1 & 2)
Raoul Vancigen £0.60 (4p)
- Anarchy and Organisation**
Murray Bookchin £0.06 (24p)
- The Invasion of Compulsory Sex-Morality**
Wilhelm Reich £1.40 (74p)
- The Spanish Labyrinth**
Gerald Brenan £1.40 (12p)
- Franco's Prisoner**
Miguel Garcia £2.25 (12p)
- The Utopian Vision of Charles Fourier**
(ed.) Beecher and Bienvenu £3.95 (21p)

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 9249
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)	
Airmail		
Europe &	1 year	£4.00
Middle East	6 months	£2.00
The Americas	1 year	\$12.50
	6 months	\$6.25
India, Africa, &c.	1 year	\$4.50
	6 months	\$2.25
Australasia &	1 year	\$5.00
Far East	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 &	12 issues	\$4.50
Far East	6 issues	\$2.25

Schoolroom Maoists

Dear Friends of Freedom,

As a sixteen-year-old new convert to anarchism (a rather self-styled kind), and a victim of the State school system, I would like to voice my opinion on what has been named by the capitalist press 'Pupil Power'.

'Pupil Power' to the Maoist, red book tossing SAU, I gather is the replacement of the present system in school with a sort of participatory democracy within a general revolutionary society.

Their national organ *Vanguard* has advised each branch to impose certain codes of conduct on members, which are:

(1) All members shall attend branch meetings. If a member is unable to attend he or she must send an apology to the Branch Secretary.

(2) All members shall sell *Vanguard* and other SAU literature.

(3) It is the task of all members and supporters to recruit as many people as possible as soon as they themselves have joined the SAU.

(4) SAU members shall refuse all punishments if they are concerned with their work within the SAU.

(5) No members shall speak to the press or put posters up without the permission of the branch press officer.

Thus for SAU members the 'Dictatorship of the Head' will be replaced by the 'Dictatorship of the Majority of their Elitist Group'. This seems to be a far cry from their demand that school discipline be replaced by a 'code of self-discipline', which I believe is a feeble slogan in any case.

Their recent strike will probably do more to help legislation by the government to repress students rather than gain for them greater rights. They are caught up in the whirlpool of the socialist-capitalist system, the whirlpool of power struggle, which only anarchists, and one or two minor groups, know how to escape from.

It is at this point where I ask the question, 'What the hell are we going to do about the mess in education at the moment?'

The Libertarian Teachers' Association is proudly advocating libertarian education methods, but there seems to be no anarchist school students' movement. School students must act. I see a certain amount of adult chauvinism mixed up in the anarchist movement, and libertarian educationalists seem to be addressing adults on how to encourage our natural social, intellectual and sexual growth. But what about us? We are the people who are being moulded into complacency

LETTERS

by the capitalist system, and we need to be addressed.

I personally (although others may not) envisage a sister federation to the LTA, a federation of undisciplined school cells, that will put into practice libertarian methods of education at lunchtimes in secluded places and on the playing fields, a sort of school underground.

I am not however naive enough to believe that all students could go back to their schools after the weekend and organise lunchtime classes. They would most likely be told to fuck off by those happy to be repressed, or by the followers of trendy socialism.

Fellow libertarian school students must form a correspondence club working towards a future anarchist/libertarian school students' federation and must work in co-operation with the LTA.

One of the most important things that peace-loving anarchists can do is to work within the school system, for there is to be found the bedrock for a future anarchist society.

Peace, love and sunshine! May we all one day bathe in the sparkling and purifying waters of anarchy.

Blackburn, Lancs. J.
P.S.—How about a *Little Black School-book* someone?

Politics of Rape

Dear Comrades,

Ian S. Sutherland's review of Susan Griffin's 'Politics of Rape' in *FREEDOM*, April 22, was one of the sexiest articles I have read in *FREEDOM*. In the past year that I have been reading *FREEDOM*, this attitude has run in low-keyed form through certain articles but this review is too blatant to be ignored.

The entire review treated Susan Griffin's article as a joke or a case of paranoia. He claims Miss Griffin does not back up her statements but pulls numbers out of the air, i.e., number of rapes committed in US in 1968 multiplied by 10 for true count. Whereas, the article states specifically, 'In 1968, 31,060 rapes were reported'. According to the FBI and independent criminologists, however, to approach accuracy this figure must be multiplied by at least a factor of ten to compensate for the fact that most rapes are not reported. . . Mr.

Sutherland makes a statement, 'The harsh fact that women are, generally, far more inclined than men to support the Powells and Goldwaters of this world would doubtless bounce off Susan Griffin like rape off a duck's back.' Why was there no citing of source for that 'harsh fact'? I've heard that the majority of women are inclined to support whom-ever their husbands or companions support rather than think independently. Around and around we go, need a statistic, it is bound to be there!

He believes, 'birds in hot pants, see-through blouses, minis, kinky boots, etc.' are inviting rape. The reality that women dress to please men nine times out of ten points out the vicious circle of a woman's existence. Damned if you do and damned if you don't.

Mr. Sutherland says, 'Capitalism practically exists on the fact that we are all too shit scared to do anything about it'. He then says in his next breath, 'my woman gets three meals a day and clean straw once a month'. Now there is a nice capitalist attitude, boss toward worker, which apparently is all right to have when it proves advantageous for him.

I don't know if Mr. Sutherland's attitude is indicative of a large percentage of men who call themselves anarchists/libertarians, but if it is then the sisters who hold with anarchist ideas should start pointing out male chauvinism whenever it rears its ugly head. Otherwise, what change can really take place if libertarians believe 'three meals a day and clean straw' is enough to grant any human being, especially if that human being is a 'bird'.

USA

LINDA LEWIS.

Anarchy & the Law

Comrades,

In a recent essay setting forth the anarchist opposition to laws (6.5.72), John Lawrence argues that workers have every right to strike even if their refusal to work prevents others from working or going about their normal business. Referring to railway strikes, he says, 'No man has any natural right to use the labours of another man. People can travel on trains only so long as other people are willing to drive and service

those trains.'

That's a clear enough and brave enough statement, but its implications trouble me. If we say that each trainman is free to combine to strike for higher wages, do we as part of the other half of the freedom say that each railway is free to fire people at will, or free to hire other free individuals who choose to work for lower wages? If this were granted, strikes would have almost no effect. (Furthermore, why aren't union combinations in a strike as great a coercion as a law?)

I raise these questions because Mr. Lawrence states the individualist position strongly; yet it makes me fear that the absolute freedom to strike implies the absolute freedom to employ who one wants. Could Mr. Lawrence speak to these doubts.

Fraternally,

ELIOT GLASSHEIM.

USA

Bill Dwyer

Comrades,

Bill Dwyer, who was busted with 1,400 tabs of LSD last December, is now remanded in Brixton Prison awaiting trial. He needs two sureties of £500 each (no cash required).

If you can help or want more information please contact Peter Bell 01-229 5655 or write to: Bill Dwyer, Number 110679, HM Prison, Jebb Avenue, Brixton, London, S.W.2.

PAUL PAWLOWSKI.

Malcolm X— a correction

Dear Comrades,

While agreeing with Jack Robinson's argument (*FREEDOM*, May 27) that violence is rather a symptom of the problems we face than a true problem in itself, I feel he is wrong in describing Malcolm X as a 'right-wing figure'. I have not read Malcolm's ghost-written autobiography, but if Jack reads his collected speeches he will see that, while initially adopting the narrow racist ethos of the Black Muslims, Malcolm developed and matured after his break with them from a bigot (however understandable his background made this) into a free, loving, and articulate human being. While he lacked some of the unique moral force of Martin Luther King, he had more awareness of the life of black urban ghettos and a more thorough grasp of political realities than King, and his death was undoubtedly a considerable loss to America's black people.

Fraternally,

RODERICK A. PARKES.

PRESS FUND

Contributions

June 15-21 inc.

Marlow: R.G.B. 25p; Hamburg: J.L. £1; Glasgow: A.J. 40p; Vancouver: S.R.A.F. 38p; Bangor, NI: J.T. £5; Harrow: M.J.S.D.L. 50p; Wolverhampton: J.L. 40p; J.K.W. 10p; Taunton: D.P. £2; Aberystwyth: Anon £2; Ontario, Canada: D.N. £1; Larkhall: Anon £2.97; Hove: H.C. 35p; London, N.W.6: R.R. £22; Manchester: G.B. 20p; Oxford: J.H. 50p; Wiltshire: A.S. £2; London, N.W.11: J.H. £5; Coventry: J.L. 20p; Hull: E.K. £2; Hull: B.H. £1.

Total: £49.25
Sales (Voline): £4.00

TOTAL: £53.25

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

Amount received to June 21 £1,654.21

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

Amount received June 15-21 inc. £53.25
Previously acknowledged £601.49

TOTAL TO DATE £654.74

Holiday Closing

The bookshop and office will be closed for one week Monday-Saturday, July 24-29 inclusive.

Correspondence will be dealt with as usual.

More Capitalist 'Libertarians'

READERS WHO SAW mention in *FREEDOM* recently of the *New Banner* and the American anarcho-capitalists will doubtless be overcome with excitement at the news that Britain now has its Guerrilla Capitalists who also call themselves 'libertarians'. Present at an inaugural meeting in London recently were

a few Tory MPs and representatives from such subversive groups as the Monday Club, Aims of Industry and other 'libertarian' organisations renowned for their defence of the principle of wringing every possible penny out of workers whilst they produce the most useless of junk in the most soul-destroy-

ing manner possible.

'Libertarian capitalism' is one of those contradictions in terms like 'good politician' and this jolly band of guerrillas reveal their true nature in wishing to retain the State for maintenance of law and order. (The State is not, of course, ultimately essential to the capitalist: a private bunch of thugs could also protect his property rights. However, the legalistic veneer of the State helps to hide the big stick.) In other words they do not wish the State to take any of their profits but they find the armed might of the State very useful to defend their property rights against those workers who might be impressed by the notions of 'free enterprise' and who might decide to seize control of their own industries and run them without the parasites who control them at present.

T.P.

WHAT IS ANARCHISM?

WHAT IS ANARCHISM? by Noam Chomsky.

IN THIS ESSAY Chomsky sets about the unenviable task of consolidating recent libertarian practices and concepts into a general critique of both Leninism and the bourgeois state form. The internal battles of anarchism are largely ignored except perhaps that of individualism which Chomsky defines with a quote from Humboldt: 'The isolated man is no more able to develop than the one who is fettered.' Chomsky places rather too much emphasis on the syndicalist aspects of anarchism quoting Rocker, de Santillan and Pelloutier but ignoring all the anarchist-communists. At least Chomsky does not try to find a glib central definition of anarchism but he does come close to it with an emphasis of anarchists as 'sons of the enlightenment' and the heart of socialism.

Most of the polemic centres around the recent developments in workers' council-communism. Chomsky sees these administrative organs as the very basis of a free society always intent on further liberation from the social, educational, and political fetishes of the old state society. The examples of Spain are quoted but unfortunately Hungary in 1956, Algeria in the early sixties, France in 1968 and the many councils created during occupations of factories and colleges are not discussed. The area of council-communism is one which is filled with students from syndicalist, 'left wing Marxists' and many other branches of

socialism. Here again is a grave omission. None of the groups like Solidarity (UK), Socialisme ou Barbarie, or the Situationist International are mentioned, and certainly their varied ideas are not explored. There is a strange idea that Lenin's *The State and the Revolution* is his most libertarian work, and the author continues with a brief study of Lenin's 'left-wing deviation' in 1917. This is surely when Lenin, swimming like a fish with the current—a concept he had refuted earlier—began cashing his political capital in the revolution by supporting first the factory committees then the soviets and eventually himself. He then swims like a fish against the current by which time he is in fact the current.

In a way Chomsky falls between the two stools of the past and the future without answering his question. However a valid introduction to the fringes of the growing libertarian socialist movement is made. For those interested in council-communism I can only suggest reading Solidarity Pamphlet 40, *Anarchy* No. 7, and perhaps one or two histories of the Algerian, Yugoslavian and Hungarian revolutions—but certainly not the official nor the academic ones. Council-communism and workers' control are bound to be increasingly important issues in British socialism as the authoritarian party monoliths crumble and the newer groups have at least to take on a libertarian facade, and often come very close to the anarchist idea of self-controlled production.

DAVID BROWN.

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.

Sussex University. Society for Direct Democracy formed. Those interested contact Brian Behan, 36 River Bank, Shoreham-by-Sea, Sussex.

Two Young Italian Anarchists urgently need accommodation in London for one month from about July 10. Contact Box 5 at Freedom Press.

Magic. All kinds of alternative community info. 10 a.m.-10 p.m. 7 days at 7 Summer Terrace, Manchester, 14 7WO. Tel. 061-224 9087.

Return Appearance. Song and poetry from Maureen Benjamin, John Sivy, Bill Fay, Jeff Cloves. Cockpit Theatre, Gateforth Street, Marylebone. Sunday, July 9, 8.00. 25p.

'Peace News' for theory and practice of non-violent revolution. £4.95 p.a. (students less 10%). Trial sub. 7 weeks for 50p with free M. Duane 'Biological Basis of Anarchism'. 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

BLAST — Bristol Libertarians Against State Tyranny. Address c/o 8 Cowper Road, Bristol 6.

Vancouver Social Revolutionary Anarchist Federation has begun to publish a monthly newsletter in an effort to foster communications between anarchists scattered across Canada. To receive a copy write to SRAF, c/o Volunteers, Box 34074, Station 'D', Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

Inside Story. 25p. 'This beautifully produced magazine is a sort of anarchist Private Eye . . . an excellent publication'—*FREEDOM*. 'Well researched and well produced'—*Mole Express*. 'A lot of research has gone into producing this paper . . . good hard information'—*Frenz*.

Catonsville R. R. 36 contains articles on S. Africa, Kids' Lib, Teacher-Pupil Relations, etc. £1.25 for 12, 1 copy for 8p. 28 Brundretts Road, Manchester 21.

Two Cats need a home as owners are going abroad. Contact Chris and Rose Reeve, 3 Holywell Street, Oxford.

Oxford Anarchists meet every Friday, 8 p.m., 1a Woodstock Road.

S.E. London Dwarfs & Anarchists meet Sundays 4 p.m., 61b Granville Park, S.E.13. Street theatre starting. Contact J. Dixon, 44 Pendragon Road, Bromley, Kent. 01-698 8596.

Stoke Newington 8 Trial. Send all aid to '8' Fund, Compendium Bookshop, 240 Camden High Street. Meals, fruit, papers, books (new ones only), cigarettes and money needed.

Holiday Accommodation. Will exchange 2-bedroom cottage in Gloucestershire for similar accommodation in Norfolk or Suffolk. August 13 to 26. A. Jacob, Grove Farm Cottage, West-end, Stone House, Glos.

Changed Addresses. Jeff Cloves now at 26 Grosvenor Road, St. Albans. Terry Phillips now at 7 Cresswell Walk, Corby.

The Census Saga continues

THE Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration, Sir Alan Marre, having investigated the wording of the census forms has decided that it is 'contradictory and misleading'. The wording is to be changed for the next census. Sir Alan began his investigation after a complaint by A. F. Lightfoot, who was fined £20 for not completing his form.

A. F. Lightfoot complained that despite the assurance on the form that no information about named individuals would be passed on to other government departments his census form was seen by both members of the solicitor's office of the Department of Health and Social Security, not to mention by a private solicitor employed by the prosecution.

It cannot be said that Sir Alan's proposals have much to recommend them. All he wants is 'to remove misunderstanding' and make the solicitor of the Department of Health and Social Security the solicitor to the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys. Big deal!

The Registrar General has accepted this, and is 'to strengthen measures to ensure that census correspondence is not passed inadvertently to officials of the department'.

There is a much simpler solution, for the individual who wants to protect his privacy, don't fill up the census form at all.

Jack Robinson, *FREEDOM* editor, is due to appear in court on July 4 for non-payment of his fine, imposed on him for refusing to fill in his census form.

A.W.U.

ATTENZIONE!

Comrade Michele Corsentino has been known to us for many years and despite rumours in circulation he is NOT a police-agent. Italian papers please copy.