

Politics

IT COULD HAPPEN HERE

THE GOVERNMENT was in financial difficulties, it had tried for a loan and difficult conditions were going to be imposed. There were disagreements in the Cabinet and the Prime Minister went to see the King to offer the resignation of his Government; it is stated that the King suggested a coalition. The Prime Minister went back, sacked some of his colleagues and called in some opponents of differing political views and they ruled the country with frankly reactionary measures for ten years. . . The king was short of money and imposed a direct tax on the commercial classes who revolted and overthrew and eventually executed the king and set up a temporary republic. Three hundred years separate these events in Britain.

The Government was in budgetary difficulties, there had been a financial scandal. The Upper House refused to pass their financial measures and eventually the representative of the Queen decided to sack the Government and call an election with the Opposition party as caretaker government. The Government was in financial difficulty, the Prime Minister was found guilty of minor corruption in electoral practices and was deemed unfit for office. Many members of the Opposition and public figures were imprisoned without trial; press censorship was imposed and ultimately a Bill reinstating the Prime Minister was passed by a truncated Parliament. Almost immediately the Prime Minister released a leading opponent. Miles separate these recent events in Australia and India.

What all these events have in common is that they took place within a framework of parliamentary democracy. It is one of the many illusions of democracy that it protects the citizen-voter from arbitrary powers; for this purpose it is necessary, from time to time, to insert checks and balances within the system. All too often, these fail, and further checks and balances are inserted, and so on ad infinitum.

The most splendid idea of democrats is to introduce a second chamber, often a dominant class of ruler, quite often not elected, rather like Plato's philosopher-kings. In most countries they are not even above the party system and often represent the real ruling class. This chamber has generally powers of veto, the disastrous effects of which can be seen in the state of America's politics where the Congress is almost completely immobilized by the powers of the Senate which has a majority of the opposition political party in power.

been noted for its reactionary powers. It was they who vetoed Home Rule for the whole of Ireland. Money bills are now, in fact, passed automatically by the Lords; Lloyd George pushed this through by threatening to pack the House of Lords with home-made peers. The institution of life-peers holds a similar threat.

One of the peculiarities (and dangers) of the English democratic system is that very little is written down, much of it is a convention -- "the done thing". It is a convention that the House of Lords does not veto a Commons bill for the second time. Conventions are fragile things and democrats who voted for Ramsay MacDonald, Indira Gandhi and Gough Whitlam must have wondered what hit them.

On the other hand supporters of the National Government, of Indira Gandhi and of Malcolm Fraser had good and sound reasons, as always, for abrogating the democratic system; or using it to their own advantage. Given the right circumstances, the right excuses, any government, any party, is capable of the seizure and the extension of its powers.

The danger to the individual is not the eventual seizure of power by right-wing or left-wing extremists (those with some knowledge of those groupings realize the forlornness of their hopes) but the consolidation of powers already to hand - and willingly given - by those already installed within the democratic system.

Jack Robinson.



ARTHUR MOXEY

"GET YOUR SOUVENIR ROCKS AND CUT PRICE BUCKETS AND SPADES!"

The English House of Lords has long

When the Machine Stops

FRANCISCO FRANCO de Bahamonde has rotted and died - as generals normally die - in bed. The archetype of the tyrant general, he never won or even fought a battle unless it was against his own people. In his youth he was guilty of colonial repression. He fought the Sharan wars against the subjects of the State rather than against foreign enemies. His career of murder and repression against the people of Spain began in 1934 when he was brought in by the perfidious Spanish Republican Government to shoot down the workers on strike. It was he who brought in the Moorish soldiers to suppress the Asturian miners. His most 'distinguished' conquests took place between 1936 and 1939, when he rose against his employers and betrayed his oath, to ally himself with his country's enemies. He continued this war against the people of Spain until the last drop of watery blood came to a final standstill in his cursed body. He maintained rule by military occupation to a degree unheard of except by foreign domination. The massacres, tortures and repression which followed the war established him firmly in power, but they left scars so horrible and so deep that the suggestion of their renewal - because of the shooting or garroting of opponents - has left Spain in turmoil.

Bahamonde suffered the fate of all dictators in that he could not relax his grip on the regime: if he attempted to liberalise in any way the people would take advantage of the laxity to overthrow him. Yet at the same time he could not tighten the repression, for it was already tightened to bursting point. He could not tolerate a successor for that successor would have ousted him at the first opportunity. It is for this reason that the puppet Juan Carlos has been manoeuvred and compromised by his total subservience to the wishes of the Caudillo. There is no man of power to take Franco's place. If there were, the Right would have already put him forward to be groomed as successor, and to "groom" another dictator means to impose fear, and fear in turn cannot be imposed without severe repression. The Spaniards will not take another repression. They will either resist or they will leave it a ghost country as they have created ghost towns with the economic migration.

As Franco decayed and rotted on the deathbed he could see his empire decaying too. Perhaps in a last vision of dreadful clarity he saw his achievement without illusion for what it really is: a period of death and disaster, catastrophe and ruin, fear and agony brought upon a people for no other reason than that they failed to free themselves from Army rule. Or perhaps the shroud of the Virgin of Pilar and the holy water and the incantations and the rest of the mumbo jumbo are intended to drown out those visions?

Bahamonde's epitaph was spoken by Miguel de Unamuno long ago when the philosopher declared -- in the presence of dona Carmen Polo de Franco and of the notorious General Millan Astray who exceeded Franco in villainy: YOU HAVE CONQUERED. BUT YOU WILL NOT CONVINCE. Millan Astray's favourite saying was "Long Live Death", and Death has been the major achievement of Franco and his cohorts. Now it takes him too.

Stuart Christie.

CODSWALLOP

FROM AN article in *The Observer* (Nov. 16) comes a classic example of man's inability to cooperate, despite the desperate poverty that is common to all concerned.

Off the west coast of Ireland are the two richest oyster beds in Europe (at Tralee and Galway). During the season, which at its peak only lasts about six weeks a year, a fisherman can earn up to £300 a week. The rest of the year, though, he is likely to find himself on the dole. At the moment oysters sell at £5.50 per 100, which in oyster terms means 120, and a lot of work.

So far so good. But unfortunately the local fishermen of Tralee have gotten a bit greedy and resorted to "Luddite" tactics to keep out foreigners and strangers, which in Irish terms means up to 30 miles away, "over the mountains". Till now 12 boats have been dragged out of the sea and burnt, 7 small trawlers have been sunk, two without trace, and some have been dragged out of the water and beached.

If it wasn't for the fact that these are the boats of fellow-fishermen, who face the same poverty and the same ocean all year round, it would be a joke in bad taste. Since a licence to fish costs only £2, the greed and temptation of others to muscle in is too great apparently. For the fishermen of Tralee there is only the oyster season; for the fishermen of Dingle Bay there is salmon, plaice and mussels to fish all year round.

As to be expected the government has its own problems and is indifferent to the problems and poverty of the fishermen of western Ireland; what is surprising is that they haven't moved in considering the profits to be made.

In an industry which has the highest fatality rates, it appears the profits of businessmen and the upper-middle class market take priority over the welfare of the fishermen involved. Since the price of oysters in London is £2.80 a dozen across the counter at Harrods, and £5 (large ones, though) in Wheelers Restaurant, there is obviously a great deal of profit to be had. It goes without saying that only such a system as unjust and exploiting as this capitalist one would place such profits before the welfare of the fishermen involved.

Parallel to this situation, is the prospect of another "Cod War" between Iceland and Britain. The present talks in Reykjavik seem to have been undermined somewhat by the cutting of the trawl wires of two British boats by Icelandic gunboats. The cost to the companies is likely to be between £2-3000. The main Icelandic claim is that she is a one-industry country, that she needs all the reve-

nue from fishing to be economically viable, but also that her fishermen receive unfair treatment in British ports. So much for British claims that the 200 mile limit was declared unilaterally. Germany has offered to respect the limit if she is allowed to fish for anything except cod; Britain's main concession seems to be a drastic reduction on the tonnage of 130,000 tons. Both sides in the "sterile" discussions realise that time is running out and that the talks are bound to fail. Both sides can bargain away and make concessions, but it's the fishermen who have to fish in dangerous conditions and it's we the general public who face the rising costs due to the inefficiency of the present system of the fishing industry.

Some relevant discussions of the problem are highlighted in *Anarchy* 86 (April, 1968)* which deals with unemployment and the move towards workers' control in the fishing industry on Humberside. There is also an article on Spanish fishermen by Colin Ward.

Francis A. Wright

*Freedom Press, 15p.

UP AGAINST THE LAW

IT IS HARDLY necessary to explain today who 'George Davis' is. Details of his case are usually little known but what is known is that he is in jail and many believe in his innocence, and many more believe in his right to a re-hearing of his case. This publicity was gained by the exploits of a small band of dedicated friends and relatives who were prepared to lay themselves on the line in affirming his innocence and his rights.

Up Against the Law is an occasional publication (30p per copy: 90p to Lawyers and Professionals)* which reviews the iniquities of the law, the law makers and the police.

In an editorial U.A.L. reflects on its position which is of some interest to anarchists. "When Davis' supporters quote from speeches of such anti-democratic figures as Marie Antoinette and Queen Victoria in their leaflets and campaign in the name of 'British Justice' - 'not against the police but against police fit-ups' we recognise in which ways we differ. If Davis is freed UPAL won't put it down to 'British Justice' or any other jingoistic notion. UPAL supports many people who are up against the law, because, on balance, we believe that in a society as restrictive of those who seek help and at the same time help us to further our aims and understandings."

The editorial goes on, "Many of UPAL's contacts aren't up against the law for remotely socialist activity. One's contact with lawbreakers and prisoners fortifies this speculation. All too often such persons are ultra-reactionary and often merely concerned with the transfer and acquisition of

private property. The equation of law-breaker = anarchist is rarely true.

However there is a concern for 'fair play' and 'justice' however remote and however obscure such abstractions are. George Davis' friends have been prepared to demonstrate at personal risk on his behalf. To gain the publicity for his case - which no proof of injustice could gain - they staged a series of demos culminating in the heinous crime (to some) of scarring a cricket pitch and seemingly causing the cancellation of a Test Match! - which series we (England) might have won!

The law (as usual) took its revenge and with a rigidity which indicates the possible truth behind Davis' defenders' accusations, refused bail on what was, after all, only a minor offence to property - and cricket. Reluctantly granting bail for an inexplicably delayed case, the magistrate imposed conditions which amount to a virtual gag on not only pre-George Davis activities but to an indirect gag on those supporting such activities.

When one considers the labyrinthine nature of this case (or even of the demo-case) one feels that Dickens and Kafka in their fictional fantastic accounts of legal proceedings were coldly factual reporters. Reading through *Up Against the Law's* account of the London Electricity Board, Ilford hold-up and seizure of £7,615 one wonders how little it takes to entrap and ensnare a man - any man - once the police have resolved that he is their man. Three of the defendants were acquitted but George Davis is serving his sentence.

By an inexplicable (but hinted at) chance one of the detectives involved in the case - later to marry an identity parade witness - had several cameras with him at the scene of the robbery, and photographs taken are reproduced which only succeeded in obscuring the identity of the real robbers. Throughout the case botched identity parades, neglected forensic evidence, ignored alibis were used to build up a case against George Davis. It was possibly, as claimed, a 'fit-up'.

But if the police got (not for the first time) the wrong man, why did it happen? As a cynical observer of 'justice' at work, one sees this happen often. The George Davises of this world are the convenient scapegoats for unsolved crimes and it is up to them to fight their way out of it. Best of luck to George Davis and in his choice of loyal friends, but one feels, with UPAL, that this struggle good as it is, is not enough.

E. M. Forster, the English novelist, said "Only connect". If one can connect George Davis's fit-up, with police lies, corruption, inefficiency and brutality, with the smug hypocrisy of Sir Robert Mark and the defence of conventional morality, property and the state one gets nearer the anarchist concept of a society without property, or authority. *obtainable from Freedom Bookshop (postage 9p)

J. R.

DISAPPEARING TOWN & COUNTRY

MANY YOUNG people are busy freeing themselves from factory and ghetto. Abandoning the conditioned slave-culture of their exploited and defeated parents. Leaving monstrous conveyor-belts and grim towns behind. Victims of the Industrial Revolution returning to their peasant roots.

A decade ago, working-class youth were largely untouched by student dissent and the rejection of growth-technology and materialism manifested by middle-class dropouts. Today alternative ideas have intruded into working-class consciousness and many young humans are rejecting proletarian consumer-youth-culture (fashion clothing, top of the pops pap, spectator sports).

This has happened primarily because articulate university dropouts, rejecting degrees and consequent privilege, moved in large numbers to deprived ghettos. Working-class kids being presented with an alternative life-style which didn't preclude them. Not working their balls off to emulate the bourgeoisie (colour tv, car, fridge, washing machine, winter holidays) as the Left politico agitators would have them do. Rather, they've chosen to abandon the entire urban shithouse and make their revolution now. By growing organic food and learning essential crafts (furniture making, building, alternative technology, natural healing, gardening). Becoming group-sufficient in food, clothing, energy and shelter.

Future anarchic change in towns will come from lumpen youth (dropout, communist, acidhead, poet, freak; the whole alternative bit) and the real revolution will centre on urban counter-culture newly removed to rural homestead and farm.

Ancient working-class fantasies of technological utopias have almost been exorcised by ecological vandalism and scientific bankruptcy. As the cancerous flowers of pollution and famine grow gigantic, more people will return to the land; giving up motorised transport, audience entertainment and the fleeting comforts (immeasurably costly in real terms) of suicidal civilisations.

Urban dropouts, however active in squatting groups and claimant unions, are not usually revolutionary, inasmuch as they are merely parasiting off, and thus dependent on, the System itself. Our future lies with those who cultivate their vegetable patches and increase the life-sustaining fertility of our host planet. Struggling for higher wage packets to increase personal consumption is plucking out the life breath of Third World poor. The trendy New Left remains almost as deficient in imagination as existing Old Left remnants.

As much as we've no desire to take over the institutions of government, we've surely no need of their foul tech-

nology and alienated lifestyles. Life-styles as unrelated to reality as supermarket fodder is to food.

It's encouraging that some young people, from all backgrounds, are rejecting the ethics of ruler, manager and wage-slave. Hopefully lumpen and peasant will eventually disappear present divisions between town and country and replace it with a unified environment. Craft workshop, market garden, printing press and commune as one organic

unit. One human family which works, plays and fucks together in a truly satisfying way.

Dave Cunliffe.

LORD BROCKWAY, World War I C.O. and prisoner, in a letter to the "Times" calls attention to Labour Party's proposal in the Industrial Relations Act for recognition of religious conscientious objection only to union membership. He points out the left-wing stand against such a clause regarding military service. He admits that owing to a misapprehension he voted on the wrong side when the clause was discussed in the House of Lords under a Liberal amendment.

FREEDOM PRESS

84b Whitechapel High Street
(in Angel Alley) London E1

(US each 40c post free)

COLLECTIVES IN THE SPANISH REVOLUTION, by Gaston Leval.
368pp. Cloth £4 (post 48p) US \$10.00
Paper £2 (post 42p) US \$5.00

LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION 1933-1939, by V. Richards
240pp. Cloth £1.50 (p.48p) US \$4.00
Paper £0.75 (p.42p) US \$2.00

ABOUT ANARCHISM, what anarchists believe, how anarchists differ, what anarchists want, what anarchists do... by Nicolas Walter 32pp

15p (post 6p) US 40c

ABC OF ANARCHISM, by Alexander Berkman 25pp

25p (post 11p) US 75c

ANARCHISM AND ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM, by Rudolf Rocker 43pp

20p (post 9p) US 65c

ANARCHY, by Errico Malatesta 54pp

25p (post 9p) US 75c

BAKUNIN & NECHAEV, by Paul Avrich 32pp

20p (post 9p) US 65c

THE STATE, ITS HISTORIC ROLE, by Peter Kropotkin 56pp

20p (post 11p) US 65c

NEITHER EAST NOR WEST, selected writings (1939-48) of Marie Louise Berneri: I Defenders of Democracy;

II The Price of War and of Liberation;

III United Nations. Index. 192pp

35p (post 13p) US \$1.

MARIE LOUISE BERNERI, A Tribute (published for the M.-L. Berneri Memorial Committee) with photgs. 51pp

cloth 35p (post 13p) US \$1

TOWARDS A FREE SOCIETY, by Charles Martin. (published for the author) 62pp

13p (post 9p) US 40c

ANARCHY, monthly journal edited by Colin Ward (1961-1970).

Many issues are still available, at 15p each (post on single issue 6½p, 9p for 2, 11p for 3, 13p for 4, 16p for 5 or 6...

- 16 Anarchism and Africa/Ethics of Anarchism
- 17 Towards a Lumpenproletariat
- 19 The Theatre
- 29 The Spies for Peace Story
- 41 Anarchism and Agriculture
- 42 India
- 44 Transport
- 45 Anarchism and Greek Thought
- 46 Anarchism and the Historians
- 48 Lord of the Flies (a discussion of Wm. Golding's book)
- 49 Automation
- 50 The Anarchist Outlook
- 52 Limits of Pacifism
- 53 After School
- 54 Muhsam, Buber, and Landauer
- 55 Mutual Aid and Social Evolution
- 57 Law
- 58 Statelessness and Homelessness
- 59 The White Problem
- 63 Etienne de la Boetie: the Discourse Of Voluntary Servitude (translation)
- 64 Misspent Youth
- 65 Derevolutionisation
- 67 Black Anarchy in New York
- 68 Class and Anarchism
- 72 Strike City, Mississippi
- 75 Improvised Drama
- 79 Latin America
- 84 Poverty
- 86 Fishermen and Workers' Control
- 87 The Penal System
- 88 Wasteland Culture
- 91 Artists and Anarchism
- 93 Radio Freedom
- 106 What is Property?/Anarchism and Revolution
- 107 The Present Moment in Education (Paul Goodman)
- 108 Big Flame Flickering, an attempt at workers' takeover
- 109 Russell and the Anarchists
- 110 Jump My Brothers Jump, Poems from Prison by Tim Daly
- 111 Anarchism, Freedom and Power
- 112 Southern Africa
- 113 Women in Prison
- 114 Goldman, Berkman
- 115 Students and Community Action
- 116 Instant Anarchy/Pop Festivals
- 117 Urban Environment
- 118 Work and Surplus

BWNIC Trial

IN THE five weeks since the opening of the trial of 14 members of the British Withdrawal from Northern Ireland campaign on various charges under the Incitement to Disaffection Act, the prosecution has presented its evidence. The defence case opened on Wednesday 5th November with evidence from Gwyn Williams who is conducting her own defence, with a declaration of her support for BWNIC which "is not an illegal organisation... It is a political organisation which exists to oppose the union of Britain and N. Ireland, and in particular calls for the withdrawal of troops..." which objectives she would continue to support. In her speech she contested a remark by the judge earlier in the trial that there are no fundamental human rights: "I have a basic belief that there are fundamental human rights... I believe that in any society where a situation of discrimination exists, whether that discrimination is on the grounds of religion, race, sex, class, or occupation, the whole society is degraded... There is a very extreme form of degradation when one person may say to another 'You will die or kill'. She denied having tried to persuade soldiers to do anything: "If... the prosecution was ever able to bring a soldier who could truthfully say 'This woman persuaded me to do something I didn't want to do' I... would have sunk to the level of everything to which I am opposed." She explained her involvement in the campaign, from signing the initial statement early in 1973 (which was also signed by two of the people at the time active on FREEDOM) including her involvement in drafting "Some Information for British Soldiers" (for distribution of which Pat Arrow-smith was jailed in 1974) and "Some Information for Discontented Soldiers", (the main subject of the present trial). She ended her evidence by describing how she had gone to distribute leaflets to civilians in Aldershot a week after the raids which took place on 10 September 1974: "People who are raided or arrested should not allow themselves to be intimidated into desisting from political activity. On the contrary, where there is persecution we have an obligation to resist."

Her cross-examination by the prosecutor, Michael Coombe, continued into the seventh week. Towards the end of it she was asked how she would have defended Britain against an invasion by Nazi Germany. She pointed out that she was four years old when the Second World War ended, but she tried to give a brief explanation of basic pacifist principles "I am always in favour of resisting oppression, but I don't believe it is done adequately with armies: I don't believe fascism has been defeated"... and was interrupted many times by the prosecutor and the judge. Later that day, Chris Byrne, an ex-Marine was not allowed to answer questions about the way he

had actually witnessed in N. Ireland, even though he considered this relevant to the development of his conscientious objection.

Chris Byrne was one of three servicemen who gave evidence about how Gwyn Williams counselled them at the soldiers' rights organisation, "At Ease". He described how he had begun to question his role in the military when he did a four months' tour of duty in N. Ireland in 1973 and he decided he wanted to get out, though he knew of no legal way in which he could. Then when he was due to be posted to Cyprus during the crisis in the summer of 1974 he decided "to refuse to soldier, simply to refuse to wear uniform and refuse to obey all orders until court martial and, hopefully, discharge". While he was in detention awaiting court martial for desertion (he had overstayed leave for less than a day) he refused to wear any army clothing except underwear. He was contacted by Gwyn Williams, who advised him about conscientious objection, which he had never heard of before. After court martial and 112 days detention he was discharged.

Two other soldiers, Roy Hallett and Paul Machin, both described how they had been AWOL on several occasions, Machin for a period of over a year. They were put in touch with "At Ease" and were both counselled by Gwyn Williams to return to the army to get legal discharges. Roy Hallett had seen something about Sweden on television but Gwyn Williams "put me off the idea" and advised him to try for a compassionate discharge. After going AWOL five times, he was finally court-martialled, received 112 days' detention and was discharged. Paul Machin was still in detention when he gave evidence, and appeared in court in uniform and accompanied by two military police. He said that he had been absent on several occasions, and on the last one he had been AWOL for several months and was living in Notting Hill with a woman friend and their child when a friend obtained

the address of "At Ease" from Capitol Radio and he went to see what could be done about his situation. Gwyn Williams advised him to return to the army and face court martial, which he did, receiving a nine months' sentence and a discharge. He said, "If it were not for Gwyn Williams, I would probably still be absent now."

JOHN HYATT was the second defendant to present evidence in his defence. The prosecution seemed determined to include Peace News, of which John Hyatt is a co-editor, as part of the conspiracy, a mouthpiece for BWNIC, producing as evidence 3-inch news reports of BWNIC activities ending with a statement about the campaign continuing. John Hyatt described the relationship of PN with BWNIC as "friendly but critical" and his counsel (Michael Burton) produced a rather longer news cutting from The Guardian which ended in the same way as the PN report. John Hyatt said that when the London office of PN was raided he had just come down from Nottingham for a two months' stint as London wormer for the paper and that the 45 copies of "Some Information for Discontented Soldiers" found in a desk at the office were nothing to do with him. He refused to explain how they could have come to be there, saying he would not name anyone outside the dock "even if it meant going to jail for this ridiculous charge. I will not give evidence against my friends. I will not allow anybody to be put through this ridiculous charade of a conspiracy trial."

Myrtle Solomon, giving evidence for John, described the history and function of the Peace Pledge Union, the Continuing Committee of the Central Board for Conscientious Objectors, and "At Ease".

Opening on behalf of Chris Roper, his counsel Rock Ransey made a strong denunciation of the Incitement to Disaffection Act and an appeal not only for the freedom of the 14 but for free speech. He was followed by a statement from the dock from Chris Roper, who described his political development and growing involvement in active non-violence from the time when he began to question his work on aircraft which were used to bomb Suez, through the period of the Vietnam war to the early 1970s when he came to realise that the conflict in N. Ireland was "our responsibility - whether we like it or not". He described working to build a playground in County Antrim in 1973 and what it was like to be a ten-year old child in Ireland. "The army is not peacekeeping: it is keeping the level of violence at its present high level."

The trial had been stopped for the third time because of a possible contempt of court. In this case it was the showing of an "Open Door" programme made by the National Council for Civil Liberties, shown on BBC 2 television the previous weekend (November 1). In the course of discussing during the programme a number of aspects of the work of the NCCL, an officer of the Council

Continued on Page 5

POLICE RECRUITS
UNIFORM AND EQUIPMENT
ISSUING STORES



"This is your lot, lad
Uniform
Truncheon
Notebook
and One Pair of Steps, Accused, for
the falling down of."

LETTERS

ANARCHISM MEANS RESPONSIBILITY

WE HAVE to be clear in our minds concerning Governments, Military Slavery (Armed Service) and War: the prospect whether such will bring more abundant living and liberty to the peoples involved. The true nature of these, as with human persons, is revealed when they are confronted with the extremities of their existence. The chief causes of war are governments and the military basis of their authority. In the light of this - in settled times, such authority is effected through the Civil Law. When, however, this is compellingly challenged by freedom and the need of liberty to create a large measure of social justice to the people - converting the existing wealth and privilege to the life of the people; a true common wealth - then the Civil Law is repeatedly stretched and finally set aside, supplanted by a military authority and courts. If further extremes prevail -- summary convictions and the firing squad, or plain 'shooting it out'. Well-disciplined members of the Armed Services take pride that their actions can be done at total variance to their feelings and reason. It is a perversion and slavery. This is the nature of government and its minions revealed. Sheer bloody murder in the last resort.

As Alan Albon has written (25.10.75) "Life is a compromise in any society" and the prospect of happy human life does not lie along the road of police states, or the pattern of the beehive.

We have to live responsibly to our friends, fellow humans and our environment, eschewing all cruelty - the first evil - and with as much enjoyment and good humour as we can muster.

S. L. R.

THE OTHER I.L.P.

Dear Comrades,

In the October 25th issue of FREEDOM a letter* was published claiming to present "a true perspective" on the internal changes that had occurred in the I.L.P. The remarks contained in the letter are so far removed from reality and so malicious to members of the I.L.P. that it is necessary for us to issue a denial.

However in rejecting the charges levelled against the I.L.P. I am anxious to avoid any protracted debate in the letters column of FREEDOM centred upon such wild accusations. There is always a danger in these cases that the whole matter degenerates into mud slinging from which no-one benefits.

If we were discussing the political issues involved in the transformation of the I.L.P. that would be a different matter, and one in which it would be reasonable for us to reply.

I would appreciate it therefore if FREEDOM would consider issuing a denial on our behalf. This way we may hopefully avoid the possibil-

ity of a public slanging match.

Should you be agreeable to this suggestion I would be very grateful. I would be obliged if you would consider something along the lines of "The I.L.P. have asked that we make it known that the charges made against it in the letters column of FREEDOM (25.10.75) are from their point of view without foundation. The I.L.P. wishes to make it clear that the transformation from Independent Labour Party to Independent Labour Publications was conducted democratically at its Easter Conference and not as suggested by the 'majority' seizing assets etc. They further reject the charge that the changes are designed to give backing to 'Harold Wilson & Co', far from it. The ILP states its perspective is one that stresses that if socialism is to be achieved it will first have to be placed on the Agenda of the Labour Party. Should anyone wish to know more about the I.L.P.'s political outlook they suggest you send for a sample copy of their paper, the Labour Leader, from 49 Top Moor Side, Leeds LS11 5LW1.

I do hope that you will give my request your full consideration.

Yours fraternally,

Barry Winter Secretary,
National Administrative Council,
Independent Labour Publications (formerly
Independent Labour Party (address above).

*The letter was from George Carter, Independent Labour Party Wolverhampton and Bilston Branch, 53 Vale Street, Ettingshall, Wolverhampton WV2 2EH, announcing that 'the minority, including this branch, continue to function (albeit on a very low level at present) as a political Party of the "Socialist Left".'

THE PRICE OF DEATH

Dear All,

It's been announced that the owner of a coach which crashed through his - or his agent's - negligence, killing 32 people, has been fined £ 75. A rate of under £ 2.34 per death. Since he killed rather more people than the Birmingham, Caterham, Woolworth or Guildford bombers, the fact that the hangers and floggers who want to restore the death penalty for political murders do not suggest it for him, is surely somewhat revealing.

Yours,
Laurens Otter.

BWNIC TRIAL

Friends,

I would like to reply to a number of points about the background to the current BWNIC 14 trial, and about the British Withdrawal from Northern Ireland Campaign itself, that have been made in the last two issues of FREEDOM.

Peter Neville says (25 October) that the Campaign might get a name for supporting only one side in a civil war situation (because it only has a leaflet giving information to British soldiers, not one for IRA soldiers). I could understand the criticism if it said the Campaign only seemed to oppose one side - but even then I would refute the criticism.

The initial political statement of the BWNIC started by clearly condemning the militarists on all sides (at least three, not just two, Peter).

As British people, however, our primary responsibility is to counteract what is being done in our name, with our money. If there were IRA barracks known to us in Britain, no doubt leaflets would have been distributed there - in fact pacifist literature from both Britain and Ireland has been distributed in parts of London known for their Irish Republican supporters. And in any case, the work of giving information to soldiers telling them of ways out of the army is but a small part of the work of a political campaign. Since it is the part the authorities are currently getting worked up about, it gets a disproportionate amount of publicity, in FREEDOM as elsewhere.

J. White says in the same issue that anarchists should not defend the rights of soldiers. As an anarchist as well as a pacifist, I would suggest that starting to treat soldiers as human beings instead of as instruments - and acknowledging their problems and needs as human beings - is essentially subversive of the nature of the armed forces. After all, it's the army we're against, not the soldiers - we want them to decide to be something else, and perhaps by showing them some humanity they might follow our example.

In the November 8 issue, Peter says why should the British Army leave whilst Ulster is part of Britain? Well, if he had read BWNIC material he would know that the ending of the Union - as well as a military withdrawal - is the aim of BWNIC. And the Campaign puts this in the context of attempts to break up the whole political monolith of Great Britain. Though the BWNIC is neither a totally anarchist nor totally pacifist campaign, most of its active supporters are one or both - certainly his indirect suggestion that BWNIC is an apologist for nationalism (of any sort) is wide of the mark.

Break the guns! Burn the flags!

Love, peace, and thanks for many of your readers' support and solidarity.

from the Dock, Albert Beale
Court 12, Old Bailey 10.11.75

BWNIC ... continued from P. 4

criticised the law of conspiracy and the Incitement to Disaffection Act (under which the 14 are charged) with an out-of-focus blow-up of the leaflet central to the trial "Some Information for Discontented Soldiers" behind him; another officer described the case of an AWOL soldier (not one concerned with the trial), and there was a brief shot of the picket outside the Old Bailey on the opening day of the trial.

THE TRIAL is likely to continue until at least the end of November. The Defend the 14+ Campaign asks for continued support in the public gallery of Court 12, on the picket of the court (phone 837 9794 for details of leaflets and placards), and for money for the welfare of the defendants as well as campaign expenses. Send to BWNIC Defence Group, Box 69, 197 Kings Cross Road, London, W.C.1.)

-- from the Defend the 14+ Campaign press release.

CAPITALISTS' POLITICAL ROLE

THE NEW ideology of the modern-day private entrepreneur has been elaborated upon with great clarity by the "big boss" italiano Gianni Agnelli. At the round-the-table discussion held recently at Alpbach in Austria, Agnelli gave a highly competent "performance" in which he indicated the political role which the entrepreneur must take up in society. This is not the first time that Agnelli has shown his "love" for assuming "enlightened" positions, and we do not believe that his exploits amount to mere academic exercises; in fact we can isolate a constant theme in his utterances which we must try to understand down to the last detail so as to recognise and be able to evaluate the strategy of one of the major enemies of the working class.

Confindustria in which he redefines the role of himself and of his colleagues in order to re-launch the "already declining" image of the entrepreneur. It is in this light that we can understand the attempts (on the whole crowned with success) towards the institutionalization of a close dialogue with the unions, summed up in the formula, "whilst the entrepreneur is called upon to work hard for the effective management of the firm, the union representative is asked to contribute towards reduction in the waste of resources". This is the equivalent of saying: by all means give more power to the unions in the firm, prov-

ided they are able to regiment their rank and file, eliminating absenteeism and wildcat strikes and controlling by themselves their right to strike.

--Translated from Rivista Anarchica 7.10.75).

This passage demonstrates the advisability of following the old proverb: "Beware of strangers bearing gifts." This is especially true when considering industrial relations. Whilst we allow the work relationship to "advance" according to these reforms of dubious benefit for the exploited, the winner will always be the exploiter. Small wonder that the likes of the Tories (as well as the Labour Cabinet) are now also advocating greater "industrial democracy". After all, why waste a salary on paying a jailer when we show ourselves quite capable of locking our own handcuffs and cell doors if only we are given the opportunity?

Nino Staffa

NON-REVOLUTIONARY REPUBLICAN

AN ARTICLE by Bernadette McAliskey entitled "Revolutionary Republicanism?" which has appeared in the latest (Oct. 31) issue of the Dublin fortnightly Hibernia reveals some of the thinking behind the formation of the Irish Republican Socialist Party (IRSP), more commonly known as the Wyatt Earps. Some of us would seem to have misjudged the IRSP because, according to Bernie, it represents "the ongoing development of Revolutionary awakening, and offers almost the only opportunity of analysing the problem, the place for those socialists who think they have a constructive answer is inside the party."

The article briefly traces the development of this revolutionary awakening and is concerned mainly with the republican movement, its origins and philosophy: "Republicanism was ever a rural phenomenon, a peasant ideology, combining agrarian radicalism with the struggle for independence. It was, and in essence still is, a conspiracy, organising on a clandestine basis, its policies pieced together in the hills."

A few other rather obvious truths about republicanism are noted, such as the fact that the few convinced socialists of which the movement can boast, developed their socialist philosophy in Britain, outside and in isolation of republicanism.... "Connolly's articles and speeches were not a representation of the thinking within the republican movement. On the contrary, they were directed towards moving the movement beyond its traditional limitations."

But the IRSP appear to have drawn no lessons from Connolly's failure to do so --the lessons, glaringly obvious, that Irish republicanism cannot be changed

and that socialists must not only remain outside it but must constantly expose its pretensions to being anything other than it is, namely, the most militant expression of Irish nationalism, a movement which has more in common with the vintage European fascism of the thirties than with anything else. There is some superficial criticism of the CPI for its attempts to take over the movement and lead it in the direction of Moscow, but "the ideology was a discredited one, proven time in number, outside of Ireland not to have worked".

So far so good you may think: at least if there is nothing new here it may represent the start of something new. But after this "rethink" what conclusions are arrived at? Should socialists in Ireland attempt to build a movement independent of republicanism? Definitely not, because it is "a common occurrence in the struggle against imperialism for even the most chauvinistic reactionary nationalist position to coincide with that reached by scientific socialist analysis." In other words the provisionals are doing the right things but for the wrong reasons and by implication all that is needed is the "correct leadership". This leadership will presumably be provided by the IRSP but there may be snags involved, particularly since "revolutionaries are not made by importing a programme, and superimposing it on an existing organisation".

Since no socialist programmes or policies have ever originated in Ireland, the socialist content of Connolly's policies all being "foreign" in origin, we are left in the dark as to where they are to come from. All that we can do is wait for the IRSP to provide us with the answer.

H. B.

In general lines the "progressive thought" of Agnelli reveals itself as a deep understanding of consensus politics ("whilst technology is conservative in its general tendencies, social conditions are unpredictable and the stability of the system must base itself on the consensus of all the interested sections of society") and agreement with a visionary solution cutting across class lines ("the future of the firm must not only be based on the best use of resources with the maximum efficiency, but also on the cohesiveness of an innovative social process, such that the as yet permanent conflict of the different sections of society become part of the mechanism in a dialectic game").

By following the utterances of Agnelli for these past few years we can trace the coming of age of the ideology of advanced Italian capitalism. The entrenched opposition towards the unions having been abandoned, the modern entrepreneurial manager aims towards a functional redefinition of roles, which whilst indicating those in the government and the unions who are to be granted the privilege of "partnership", also identifies the arrival of the moment when "the industrialist must have the courage to openly declare the political significance of his role and to disassociate himself from the concept of a neutral technology".

Agnelli, in his deliberations, enunciates upon a sociological innovation: the entrepreneur should be given by society a "mandate" entrusting him to organise the factors of productions. Given the position which the entrepreneur occupies "he is able to understand better than anyone else the complexity of life today".

"What bloody cheek!" the majority of our readers will say. We do not believe, however, that the implications merely amount to cheek but more likely constitute a serious rethink by this president of the exploiters [note: Agnelli is president of

MEETING

REPORT ON AN ANARCHIST GATHERING IN MINNEAPOLIS

OVER THE weekend of October 24-26 probably the largest Midwest anarchist gathering ever was held in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Between 200 and 225 anarchists and those curious about anarchism came from Wisconsin, Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, New York and Minnesota to attend the weekend events.

Highlighting the gathering were several discussions held on Anarchism-Feminism. The significant interaction between men and women this weekend had long been absent from left politics locally. A number of women commented on the generous, non-threatening feelings they got from those attending. Hope was expressed that men and women might be able to work more closely with each other in the future. The strong statements by many women on their commitment to anarcha-feminism were positive signs of political and personal efforts by women to share with anarchist men at the gathering. Feelings generally ran high throughout the weekend.

The weekend was a fine mixture of anarchist theory, practice, culture and just a damn good time. Sam and Esther Dolgoff, both anarchists in their 70s, came from New York to share some of their experiences. Sam spoke on "The Misconceptions of Anarchism: Are its Principles Applicable to Modern Society?" Mulford Sibley offered a workshop on "Anarchism, Socialism and Pacifism". The Avant Guard Theater from Duluth put on a play titled "The Rebellion in Portugal". Workshops were held on workers' self-management, politics of means and ends, neighbourhood industries, anarchist organization and others.

Out of the gathering came the beginnings of a local anarchist federation. People were urged to start or join small discussion groups and a newsletter was organized to continue communication. Regular forums on specific topics were planned for the future. One group began work to propagandize the nature of the S-1 bill now going through Congress. This bill would sharply curtail freedom of assembly and speech in this country.

One woman said that she had been an anarchist for six months but before the weekend had never seen "a real live anarchist". The positive energy coming out of this gathering excited many of us. The love we shared will grow.

Tony Salvatore and Tom Copeland.

PLAID CYMRU (the Welsh Nationalist party) decided at their annual conference by 84 to 64 votes to allow a motion on workers' control to "lie on the table". There was much discussion as to what 'workers' control' meant.

IN BRIEF

IN RHODESIA a medal has been awarded to a District Commissioner, making him a member of the Order of Merit, with a reference in the citation to his services in winning "the confidence and respect of tribal leaders, tribesmen and spirit mediums in his area of administration". The D.C. made a special study of spiritual beliefs. He said "Their spiritual beliefs play an extremely important part in their lives and should never be dismissed as unimportant in dealing with them... The medium normally calls up the spirits only once a month so he needs to be warned of your coming." This is done, said Mr. Herd, the D.C., by sending a messenger with a length of black cloth and some snuff.

NICOLAS WALTER, managing editor of the Rational Press Association's journal New Humanist, described Dr. Coggan's 'Call to the Nation' as impertinent, irrelevant, infantile and intolerable: impertinent 'because it was absurd for the leader of the established Church which is patronised by the state to pretend to offer any kind of solution to a crisis largely caused by the establishment and the state'.

RONALD LEE and Clifford Goodman, of the Band of Mercy, serving sentences for wrecking animal experiment laboratories, were refused leave to appeal against 3-year jail sentences. The appeal court judge said that the damage caused deserved immediate imprisonment 'even though the offences were committed for reasons which seemed to them good and proper'.

THE ARMY Royal Corps of Transport stationed in Hong Kong is to discontinue the use of mules on grounds of economy.

THE BBC refused to withdraw its 'Open Door' T.V. repeat of a programme on the National Council for Civil Liberties and the case against the law of conspiracy called "So you think it's a Free Country". The question of the programme was raised at the Old Bailey BWNIC trial and the jury were forbidden to watch the repeat programme. The question of 'contempt of court' was raised.

THE GENERAL Secretary of the British Communist Party reported to its 34th congress that membership had declined by 1,400 and the circulation of the Morning Star was down. He pointed out the lack of young people in the party and 'the ground ceded in recent years to Trotskyist groups'.

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN who is 73 and in poor health, was released 'on parole' after five months of detention without trial for opposing Mrs.

Gandhi. He is now in hospital under guard.

GOVERNMENT counter-inflation advertisement ("Inflation--We Can Beat It Together" is the slogan) appeared in the Morning Star featuring Jack Jones and Gordon Hobday, chairman of Boots' Chemists. The Morning Star has been shrieking for a share of government advertising loot. The Guardian carried an advert (Monday Oct. 20) by 'the committee for fairness in sport' citing that black boxers feature (two out of six Amateurs) in S.African championships. The committee is based in Joubert Park, South Africa.

PAUL JOHNSON, former editor of New Statesman, socialist and Catholic, made an argument in the "Daily Mail" for return of the death penalty for terrorists. Does he want to increase the noble army of martyrs for the wearing of the green and the numerous Dannels and Larries commended in Republican song? As a good Catholic he must know that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.

A YOUTH on trial for the murder of a nine-year old girl claimed that he was influenced by the film "The Exorcist" and the use of an ouija board to contact evil and satanic spirits. He told the jury later that he had made up this story about being possessed by the devil in the hope that the police would let him go. "I am not interested in black magic or Satan; football I like and pop music. I did not kill Sandra." He was ordered to be detained at her Majesty's pleasure.

EMPEROR HIROHITO of Japan, after his return from his American trip, gave his first press conference. In answer to a question about nuclear bombings he said, "I feel it regrettable that nuclear bombs were dropped. I feel sorry for the citizens of Hiroshima who were victims of the bomb but since it occurred during war there must have been no other alternative." He was also asked by Koji Nakamura of the "Times": "Is Your Majesty's remark at the White House that you 'deeply deplore the unfortunate war' to be understood that you feel responsible for the war yourself, including starting it? And further, how does Your Majesty think about 'war responsibility'?" The Emperor replied, "I have not studied literature on the nuances of words. Therefore I find it impossible to answer such a problem." Ah-so!

THE WORKERS' Revolutionary Party held a protest meeting in Trafalgar Square about a police raid on their country weekend centre, heavily reported and informed on by The Observer. The police, finding some 22 bullets, took no action but W.R.P. suspects

Continued on Page 8

CONTACT

WE WELCOME news, articles, reviews, letters. Latest date for receipt of copy for inclusion in next Review section is Monday 24 November. News/Features/Reports/Letters/Contact Column Monday 1 December

NEXT DESPATCHING date of FREEDOM is Thursday 4 December. Come and help from 3 pm onwards. You are welcome every Thursday afternoon to early evening for informal get-together and folding session.

MEETINGS

BWNIC London Meeting. Tuesday 2 Dec. at 7.30. Venue: Dick Sheppard House, 6 Endsleigh Street, W.C.1. All London supporters of BWNIC welcome. BWNIC goes on regardless!

ANY COMRADES interested in forming an East London Libertarians Group are welcome to attend an informal meeting on Wednesday 26 November at 123 Latham Road, East Ham (near East Ham tube). Starts 7.30 p.m. Contact, discussion & exchange of ideas.

CONFERENCE on Sarvodaya 'A Vision for a Communitarian Society', Dec. 13, 9.30 am - 6 pm at Conway Hall. Meetings Fri. 12th & Sunday 14th at Eastbourne House, Bullards Place, Bethnal Green, London E2. Participants: Lanzo del Vastro, E. F. Schumacher, &c. Tickets £1. Enquiries to Satish Kumar, Eastbourne House.

Women Against Fascism in Spain meet Fridays 6 pm at 38 Earlham St. WC2, anarchist women would be welcome.

Anarchist Forum, Speakers Corner, Hyde Park, alternate Sundays 1 pm. Speakers, listeners and hecklers welcome.

Every Sat. & Sun. evening at Centro Iberico/International Libertarian Centre, 83A Haverstock Hill, London NW3 (entrance in Steele's Rd., 2nd door) (tube Belsize Park or Chalk Farm) discussion, refreshments &c. from 7.30 p.m.

NEW YORK: Libertarian Book Club Thursdays 7.30 pm at Workmen's Circle Center, 369 8th Avenue, NYC (SW. c.m.r. 29 St.) :- December 11: Anarchy and Authority, talk by Sharon Presley.

Free admission, coffee, tea, cookies. Libertarian Book Club, GPO 342, N.Y. 10001.

PEOPLE/ORGANIZATIONS/WANTS &c.

TO Peter, Sue and Simon, a son, Christopher, Kit. Good luck old mate."

11-year old daughter of a Swedish comrade has been learning English at school for 3 yrs. Father asks "is there any friend with a child of approx. same age as Anna who would like to have correspondence with Anna?" (Carlos Maynar, Stovargatan 83, 12441 BAND-HAGEN, Stockholm, Sweden.)

PORTUGAL. The Portuguese Anarcho-Syndicalist paper A BATALHA (sales 5000 copies per fortnight) needs the support of all comrades outside Portugal. Send your donations, books, pamphlets &c to A BATALHA, Rua Angelina Vidal 17-2-E, LISBOA, Portugal.

ANARCHIST FEDERATION CONFERENCE at Warwick University, weekend 28/29/30 November. Details in Federation Bulletin (available from Corby Anarchists (see groups))

WANTED. Copy of "The Knapsack" by Herbert Read, good condition if poss. Geoffrey Hazard, 13 Belsize Park Gardens, London NW3 FOR SALE. "Defend the 14" Badges, 10p: Poster "We only feel the chains when we start to move", 4-colour silkscreen 75p +15p post, from BWNIC Defence Group, Box 69, 197 Kings Cross Road, London WC1, and from Freedom Bookshop.

The Defence Group meets every Friday, 6 pm at 6 Endsleigh St, WC1. Support welcomed

GROUPS

ABERGAFENNI Contact 21 Monmouth Road.

BATH Anarchists & non-violent activists contact BANANA, c/o Students Union, The University, Claverton Down, Bath.

BOLTON Anarchists, contact 8 Stockley Avenue, Hatwood, Bolton.

Anyone interested in the Syndicalist Workers' Federation in Bolton area contact or write SWF also at above address.

CORBY anarchists write 7 Cresswell Walk, Corby, Northants NN17 211

Every Sat. bookstall Corporation Street 2-4 pm. Come and help.

COVENTRY. Peter Come c/o Union of Students, University of Warwick, Coventry.

DUNDEE. Brian Fleming, c/o Anarchist Soc., Students Union, Univ. of Dundee

EDINBURGH. Bob Gibson, 7 Union St. Edinburgh

GLASGOW now has a centre at 17 Bute Gardens, Hillhead, Glasgow.

HARROW. Write Chris Rosner, 20 Trescoe Gardens, Rayners Lane, Harrow HA2 9TB

IRELAND. Libertarian Communists contact Alan Marc Simoin, 4 Ard Lui Park, Blackrock, Co. Dublin, view to form organizat'n

LEICESTER Anarchist Group. Contact Pete and Jean Miller, 41 Norman Street (tel. 549652)

LEICESTER anarchist 'Libertarian Circle' continues to meet every Thursday at Black Flag Bookshop, 1 Wilne Street.

OXFORD Anarchist Group c/o Jude, 38 Hurst Street, Oxford.

PORTSMOUTH. Rob Atkinson, 21 Havelock Rd., Southsea, Portsmouth, Hants.

SIDCUP & BEXLEY: will any anarchists contact 29 Halfway St. Sidcup, Kent.

NEW ZEALAND: Steve Hey, 34 Buchanans Road, Christchurch, 4 (tel. 496 793).

PRISONERS

RONNIE LEE (184051) HM Prison, Du Cane Road, London, W.12, serving sentence for action against vivisection &c., at present on trial as one of BWNIC 16. Postcards please. DUBLIN ANARCHISTS Bob Cullen, Des Keane, Columba Longmore, address for letters, papers: Military Detention Centre, Curragh Camp, Co. Kildare, Eire.

STOKE NEWINGTON FIVE Welfare Committee still needs funds for books &c. Box 252, 240 Camden High Street, London, NW1

GIOVANNI MARINI Defence Committee: Paolo Braschi, CP 4263, 2100 MILANO, Italy

John Nightingale (446510), H.M. Prison, New North Road, Exeter, Devon would welcome letters from old friends and new ones.

ARTICLES printed in FREEDOM may be reprinted here and in other countries - we ask for acknowledgement of source.

IN BRIEF continued from Page 7

that the premises may have been 'bugged'.

ERIN PIZZEY and her Chiswick Women's Aid group (for battered wives) moved and squatted into Palm Court Hotel, Richmond - which has been empty for years. The local councils have failed to do anything for the work of Women's Aid.

Sancho Panza''

Soviet Report

LAST Monday Amnesty International brought out their report on Soviet prisons and criminal law, entitled Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR, their treatment and conditions. This report, claimed to be "one of the most detailed ever produced by Amnesty International on a single country", will be reviewed in the next issue of FREEDOM.

PRESS FUND

30 October - 12 November

DERBY: G.B. £4; WOLVERHAMPTON: J.L. 90p; J.K.W. 10p; LIVERPOOL: Anon 15p; LONDON E.16: P.W. £2; LONDON E.7: G.H.N. 65p; In shop: T.C. 15p; Anons. £1.31; NORTHWOOD: D.N.D. 34p; LLANSTRISANT: P.S. 50p; GRANTHAM: J.G. 70p; LONDON NW11: A.W.U. £5; KEW: H.H. £2; EBBW VALE: P.T. £1; ANCHORAGE, Alaska: J.M.B. £1.15; E.HAMPTON USA: R.M. £2; LONDON E4: S. & A.G. 50p; WOLVERHAMPTON: J.L. 90p; J.K.W. 10p; MORE: CAMBE: A?D. 80p; OXFORD: Anon £1; COLCHESTER: S.C. £1.

TOTAL: £26.25

PREVIOUSLY ACKNOWLEDGED: £1197.15

TOTAL to DATE: £1223.40

SUBSCRIBE!

SEND THIS FORM WITH REMITTANCE TO FREEDOM PRESS in Angel Alley, 84B Whitechapel High St., London E1 7QX

12 months £4.30 (\$10.00)

6 months £2.15 (\$5.00)

3 months (7 issues). .£1.16 (\$2.50)

I enclose Please send FREEDOM for months to

Name.

Address.

Published by Freedom Press, London, E. 1. Printed by Vineyard Press, Colchester.

Book Review

RADICAL CHIC

RADICAL REGENERATION : Protest, Direct Action and Community Politics, by Peter Hain (Quartet Books, £1.50).

THIS REVIEW is dedicated to the editors of FREEDOM, since, esteemed comrades, I can well understand the tactical considerations that led you to send me such a book as Peter Hain's *Radical Regeneration*. Mr. Hain, as the publishers of his effusion insist on the cover, is "one of Britain's most prominent and successful radicals"; Mr. Hain, as he himself does not tire of telling us, is Britain's Whiz Direct Actionist, super at pouring glue into the locks of South African athletes' hotel rooms, magnificent at sit-ins on tennis courts, and consulted by every spinster with a problem about pets that might be cured by suitable non-violent public manifestations. Brits have obviously had a lot of Mr. Hain; send the book to the old comrade in Vancouver, who - one hopes - will never have heard of the chap!

Never heard indeed, for Mr. Hain's exploits are not among those whose reputations cross frontiers and oceans! But willing to learn, and learning is easy when an extrovert like Mr. Hain is in operation. After almost two hundred pages of his glib confusion-confession, I feel I would recognize Mr. Hain turning the corner of any street, and take my evasive self in the opposite operation. All of which may smell reprehensibly of the *argumentum ad hominem* - but how can that be avoided when *homo insapiens* so provocatively parades himself as Britain's No. 1 radical actionist!

How far, in fact, is Mr. Hain a radical? Here, on the farther shores of the Atlantic, it is at least taken fairly consistently by friend and foe to mean someone well to the left of Liberal, dedicated - in whatever way he chooses - to a "root-and-branch" transformation of society, which of course is a fairly direct following of the actual meaning of "radical". But in Britain the word has historically been applied to a whole succession of people on the remoter verges of ordinary political parties whose motives are at best reformist, from the famous Radical Jack (otherwise known as the Earl of Durham, Governor-General of the Canadas and *bête noire* of all good French Canadians) down to Lloyd George. What unites many of such marginally authentic radicals is that they have operated in the shadow of the Whig party (once the great party of the English landowning magnates) and its successor the Liberal Party. It was the Liberal Party that in the mid-nineteenth century absorbed the original Radicals who in their turn had defused the genuine radicalism of the Chartists by restricting it to reformist aims and parliamentary channels. In competition, the Conservatives developed their own brand of Tory radicalism, represented by figures like Lord Shaftesbury, and later, Randolph Churchill, and this enabled Disraeli by a series of shrewd manoeuvres to steal a great part of the working class vote away from the Liberals, who countered partly through Lloyd George's "radical" social insurance measures - borrowed from Bismarck, a man honest enough to pose as no more than an adaptable Junker conservative - and partly through patronizing the early Labour Party, whose candidates in the beginning appeared under the electoral aegis of the Liberal Party, its then radical wing. In the end, as we all know, the radicals - whether they belonged to the working class or to the intelligentsia - abandoned the Liberal Party and took Labour into the independence that resulted in a new polarization of British politics and the end of the Liberal Party as one of the two genuine contenders for political power in Britain.

The Liberal Party has never died. For fifty years it has

defended a handful of ethnic fastnesses in the Celtic fringe of Britain - in Wales and Cornwall and Scotland - though these have recently been eroded by the rise of various nationalist movements. And it has continued to provide a between-elections safety valve for popular discontent (who worries if a Liberal wins a bye-election so long as the boiler is saved from bursting?) and a rallying centre for those who have lost any trust in the major parties but still retain enough illusions about the old political process to reject the authoritarian logic of the Marxists and to evade the libertarian logic of the anarchists.

After so much divagation, let me come back to Mr. Hain, to whom all I have said is notably relevant, since he is not only among our "most prominent and successful radicals", but is also the President of the Young Liberals and the editor of their newspaper. It is this fact that emphasises the confusion which lies in Mr. Hain's mind and which inspires his book, perhaps a calculated confusion, since no man who has a notable amount of mental honesty could say some of the things Mr. Hain says and conscientiously retain the position he holds. The conclusion must be either that he is deceiving himself or that he is trying to deceive us.

Radical Regeneration is presented on its first page as "almost an epitaph on the New Left", and indeed most of the earlier part is devoted to an analysis of radicalism in the 1960s, an analysis that is slick without being profound, for while Hain does expose the way in which much that came out of the alternative culture of that decade lent itself admirably to the interests of consumer-exploitative capitalism, he does not have the courage to expose how far certain sections of the self-styled New Left borrowed their tactics from Fascist and Nazi youth movements or how far political aberrations flourished in that period under the guise of their opposites, so that black racism and Arab racism were not - and to this day are not - denounced by most western radicals for the dangerous and pernicious things they have become. What Hain in fact presents is ineffectual instant history, decorated with silly assertions ("To me the most important single event of the period was the occupation of Hornsey College of Art for six weeks during the summer of 1963") and redeemed by blinding flashes of conventional wisdom: "Too much of the youth revolt rested on symbolism, rhetoric and style." "It is now obvious" - says Mr. Hain - "that we were naive to imagine that the world could be changed by picking up a banner and hoisting it in Trafalgar Square" - but who, except Mr. Hain and his friends, was in fact so naive?

But *Radical Regeneration* is more than a quicky resumé of the stormy Sixties; it presents an approach to the future which shows that Mr. Hain has at least read all those radical chic books he mentions in his bibliography. It is an approach based on a theoretical division of the historic radical movement into two main streams, the authoritarian one which embraces Communism on one bank and social democracy on the other, and the libertarian one which he sees as spreading from anarchism on the left to liberalism on the right. The attempt to include liberalism within the radical polarities at all is duolous, and certainly the attempt to link liberalism and anarchism makes historical nonsense; no such link can anywhere be traced. But such sophistry does enable Mr. Hain to incorporate a whole collection of anarchist concepts, including direct action and workers' control, decentralization and the recreation of viable local communities, into his scheme for a Liberalism which parades as anti-statist and opposed to monolithic capitalism.

You will note that in the last sentence I have shifted Liberalism back from the lower into the upper case. For one cannot

ignore Mr. Hain's official standing. He remains President of the Young Liberals. This means that even if he is perpetually critical of Jeremy Thorpe and other high party bonzes, he remains a leading functionary in a movement recognized as a subsidiary organ of the Liberal Party. The function of youth movements has always been to gather young hopefuls who will later swell the ranks of party workers and party candidates. It is expected that such young hopefuls will have ideas of their own - otherwise they would hardly be worth cultivating - and that to allow them a little rebellion now and again merely helps to keep the party in trim.

Of course, nobody objects to Liberal functionary Hain having paid tribute to a group of concepts developed by anarchists. We do not claim copyright on them, since they are ideas that spring from millennia of human experience and belong to anarchists as such no more than they do to anyone else who can put them to good use.

What is disturbing about Mr. Hain's use of them is, first of all, his vagueness when he does discuss them, so that the phenomena which relate to the concepts never come to life in his discussion. Compare, for example, the clear concreteness with which various forms of direct action are presented in Colin Ward's *Anarchy in Action* with Hain's remote and very generalized presentation, and the latter's inadequacy immediately becomes evident.

It also becomes evident, as one reads on, that such borrowed forms of action are regarded by Mr. Hain as additional to rather than distinct from normal political methods. He has a disconcerting way of speaking about power, of seeing decentralization and community politics as ways of establishing nuclei of power, thus giving them a clearly political role as part of what one can only see as a Liberal play for victory.

It is true that at times he speaks contemptuously of electoral methods, just as he does of party politics, but one has the uneasy feeling that this is because electoral methods alone have not brought political victory to the Liberals and because party politics have been dominated in recent decades by Tories and Labour. Indeed, at one point in *Radical Regeneration* Hain actually talks of a restructuring of British politics out of which would emerge four major parties, in one of which "libertarians" (he is at least realistic enough not to say "anarchists") would find themselves lumped with him and his followers in one of the parties. All this smells too much for my taste of the old game played in new ways, with some good libertarian concepts added because they have gained popularity and been widely discussed in recent years. They are incorporated, in other words, not for their own sake, but for the purposes of political strategy, which is a context in which they might all too easily be discredited.

As earlier parts of this review suggest, I have never really been comfortable with the word "radical", for though in North America its connotations are fairly acceptable, it has covered some odd and ambiguous policies at various times in history. It has a bad smell in France (Laval I remember used the label) and in Spain there was the notorious "radical" Lerroux, who cleverly manipulated left-wing slogans to build a great following among the Barcelona working class, but ended as the reactionary Prime Minister during the "black years" of the Spanish Republic. My answer to any politician - and I count the Presidency of the Young Liberals as evidence of politicians - who talks of being a libertarian or a participatory democrat is to invite him to prove his good faith by cutting his party connections, radical or otherwise, and taking up the struggle outside politics, where liberation begins.

George Woodcock.

THEORETICAL

THE HUMAN PERSON FIRST

IT IS significant and, on reflection, a most hopeful sign, that might should be so concerned in our times to present itself as right. It is not simply a matter of bad conscience on the part of the mighty, but also a necessity resulting from several factors which need to be emphasized, albeit not too sanguinely. One of them is a very wide awakening to ethical issues in all countries and social strata which, however misguided and deceived, cannot be ignored. Another is that modern powers have not the same ethnical, religious and cultural cohesion possessed by former ones, while a collective goal, a moral and messianic purpose, has proved to be a reliable binding force. Finally, an extraordinary development of means of communication and information has so shrunk the planet that any one power may be said to have borders with all others. The permanent threat of war, which is intrinsic in the existence of separate powers, has thus become very exacting and difficult to sustain, so that, while at peace, each power has to justify itself before the others with tokens of peaceful intentions. Might execrates, but right judges, and wherever might does not reach, judgement falls upon it inexorably. The chief reason why every power needs to become absolute is its exposure to judgement, which is most formidable when fear least affects it. Human reason and human conscience which fear does not distort and pusillanimity does not corrupt cannot but condemn any affirmation of might.

Ethics puts human beings, each human being, first; and anarchism, unlike other political theories, puts ethics first. Anarchism is a political theory in that it is concerned with power, but it is concerned with power only in order to condemn it, and to help in freeing society, every society, from its political and military apparatus, and from a State which, claiming at its humblest to be its natural, organically developed carapace, is more like an artificial, cumbersome and stifling armour. Political theories which do not only wish the State to be retained, but put it above all else, obviously fail to put human beings first, and are therefore unethical. Any ideology, whether traditional or revolutionary, deifies an abstraction, a purpose, a will, an ineludable force or what-have-you, so that, in effect, human beings may be righteously sacrificed. The mind which thinks it unrighteous

to sacrifice human beings has no need to deify and worship any entity, be it the Fatherland or Revolution. When an entity is deified we seldom fail to find that some human being is deprived of some essential human quality by having cast upon him the curse of a hateful appellation, so that the killing of him may be carried out with a clean conscience.

By putting the human person first, and by rejecting its subordination and sacrifice to any notion, abstraction or ideal, anarchism lays for itself the foundation for its claim to being not only the most ethical of social views, but also the most authentic. An anarchist denies any man, himself included, the right to speak with any authority beyond his individual mind, his knowledge, his skill and life example. Speaking in the name of ethics he does not arrogate to himself the authority of ethics, but appeals to its authority in others, where it must of necessity reside. The ethical will cannot be monopolized without automatically destroying itself. Not so any other kind of will which needs power to affirm itself and expand. The ethical will can only be satisfied by conditions of equality: equal power for all, equal antipower or equal lack of power. For ethical purposes no other equality matters, and the ethical anarchist will seek no other. Given the genetically and culturally founded human diversity, and each person's right to be what he is (a different thing from the right to do what he wants) any other kind of equality is sheer tyranny. The anarchist ideal is one of growth; that of the egalitarian, as of the authoritarian, is one of fabricating, shaping, arranging and rearranging. That of the anarchist is love to see things grow; that of others enjoyment to see things made, and to have a hand in their making. In the exercise of power, even though it be for equality's, and not a hierarchy's, sake, men are treated unlovingly as things, and one's integrity cracks under the pull of standards that vary according to whether they refer to one's own otherness-moulding and history-making person or others' to be corrected and moulded, made to bear the stamp of one's own. There is no genuine anarchism without respect for the human person, and wherever there is this respect there is anarchism, however differently it may be called.

G. Baldelli.

AUTOPSY ON A REVOLUTION

CARLOS SEMPRUN Mora's *Révolution et Contre-Révolution en Catalogne* attempts what Federica Montseny calls an "autopsy of the [Spanish] revolution" from a libertarian point of view, confining itself to the far too narrow range of about one year (1936-1937) almost entirely to Catalonia, the stronghold of the Spanish Anarcho-Syndicalist movement. Within such tight limits, it is impossible to understand the full scope of the Revolution in the rest of Spain, or even in Catalonia itself. In view of the "third world revolutions" in China, Eastern Europe, Cuba, Indo-China, Africa etc., the main theme of Semprun's work: what should be the role of the anarchists in a revolution? is still relevant.

Semprun presents a distorted, oversimplified description of events, a scenario, which could be summarized as follows:

- 1) In Catalonia, a full-scale, spontaneous social-revolution was made by the masses. The government had legal, but not real power, and the capitalists fled, abandoning their property, which was then taken over by the workers' and peasants' organizations.
- 2) The masses were in every respect far more revolutionary than the leaders, including the anarchist CNT-FAI.
- 3) According to Mora, "...the programme of Libertarian-Communism was sacrificed on the altar of anti-fascist unity..." Most of the anarchist leaders (like the Russian Government and the "democracies") did not want, and helped "suffocate" the social-revolution, and for this reason bear almost as much or even greater "...responsibility for the Franco victory... than the German and Italian (fascist) armies..." These are very grave accusations which must be sustained by adequate evidence. But Semprun does not seem to grasp the magnitude of the tragic dilemma of our comrades, the Spanish anarchists. The libertarian movement was hopelessly trapped between the cruel choice of collaborating with its anti-fascist enemies, betraying the principles of anarchism by trying to establish a dictatorship over the other organizations in Catalonia and in the rest of Spain (an obvious impossibility), or accepting - at least partially - the awesome historic responsibility for the fascist victory.

Although Gaston Leval (as well as José Peirats and others) opposed collaboration of the anarchists in the republican government, he (as do ALL responsible writers on Spain) nevertheless, graphically portrays the situation far better than Semprun:

"...at the end of 1936" writes Leval (Né Franco, Né Stalin) "all those among the anarchists preoccupied primarily with the revolutionary question, oversimplified and underestimated the political problem. The social-revolution, they believed, would sweep away the entrenched institutions. The political parties would [automatically] disappear. The parasitic classes, no longer able to count on the support of

the State, would disintegrate. And all that would remain to be done would be to organize the anarchist society..."

"...while the State was severely crippled after the fascist attack of July 19, 1936, it was by no means as impotent as is generally assumed. All the machinery of the State was still intact; the ministries and their officials, a police force, an army (though weakened) and an entrenched bureaucracy still survived. Notwithstanding the over-optimism of the revolutionaries, the STATE still constituted an effective force in many provinces and cities. It was only in three or four cities (Barcelona was the most important) that the anarchists dominated the situation, and then only for three or four weeks... It is therefore fallacious to assume that the anarchists were the masters of the situation in Catalonia... When some of our comrades still insist that we were in full control, they base themselves on the euphoric atmosphere that prevailed for a few weeks in Barcelona and a few other smaller cities..."

Leval, after demonstrating by facts that the anarchists did not exercise full control even in Catalonia, points out that in the rest of republican Spain:

"...the republican authorities, supported by the civil guards together with the agencies of the national government in Valencia, were firmly in control and accepted the collaboration of our comrades only because it was not to their advantage to refuse it... Another serious problem was that in all of Eastern Spain there were no arms factories, no raw materials, no iron, no coal and the principal arms factories were in Fascist territories (cut off from republican territory).

"...It is obvious," concludes Leval, "that it would be almost... impossible to make the revolution under such circumstances... it became necessary to collaborate with our anti-fascist enemies against the much more dangerous common enemy... they could not sweep away the political parties controlling the municipalities, who with equal fervour were fighting with them against fascism..."

(Né Franco, Né Stalin, pp. 76-94)

Semprun surely exaggerates the revolutionary temper of the masses. Though strong in Barcelona and a number of other sections, the many millions of rank-and-file workers, socialists of the UGT unions, republicans, Catalan and Basque separatists, petty bourgeois peasant proprietors, etc., far outnumbered CNT-FAI members (nor were all CNT members convinced anarchists). In this connection, Leval's testimony is worth quoting in full:

"...the great majority of the people living in Republican Spain were above all dominated by the fear of a Franco victory, and they could not understand

why the political and social movements should not constitute a united front. The people were not committed to a set of political-philosophic theories. They wanted the CNT and the infinitely less powerful FAI to enter and collaborate with the government to ensure the unity of action and coordination which they deemed indispensable..." (Espanne Libertaire, p. 360) / See Chapter XV, "Political Collaboration" Collectives in the Spanish Revolution (Freedom Press, 1975).

In spite of all this, Semprun illogically proposes a 100% uncompromising Anarchist revolution, completely unacceptable to the masses. A programme which would inevitably provoke an internal civil war between the anti-fascist forces and guarantee the victory of fascism. Such a programme could only be installed by terror, by subjecting the masses to the despotism of an "anarchist" minority. Must the anarchists follow the example of the Bolsheviks?

One need not endorse the ideas of the "collaborationists" to agree with them that the dilemma of the anarchists was to choose between 100% libertarian communism, which under the circumstances, means an anarchist dictatorship or collaboration with the anti-fascist front and participation in the republican government. But Semprun calls this, the most crucial problem of the Spanish Revolution, "...a false dilemma..." Granting that the policies of the so-called "collaborationists" failed, it is also true that the 100% "pure" anarchists like Semprun and others, have not been able to work out a practical alternative.

Semprun's "bête-noire" is the CNT-FAI "bureaucracy". For him the "bureaucracy" is most responsible for the defeat of the Revolution. That "...on becoming government ministers or officials in various departments certain anarchists became infected with the virus of power..." as Leval puts it, is true enough. But to charge (as Semprun does) that the CNT-FAI "...degenerated into a virtual bureaucratic dictatorship..." is a gross exaggeration, bordering on slander. John Brademas' *Anarcho-Syndicalism and Revolution in Spain (1930-1937)* denies that the anarchist ministers were motivated by lust for power and glory, maintaining that the policy of governmental collaboration was approved by the overwhelming majority of rank-and-file militants. Gaston Leval grudgingly admits that: "collaboration had been ratified by the assemblies, plenums and congresses of our movement..." (Collectives in the Spanish Revolution p. 31 (see footnote).

Anyone who took the trouble to read the anarchist press of that period knows that the issue of collaboration was thoroughly debated and dissenting views exhaustively aired. According to Semprun,

Continued on Page 12

the CNT (and its predecessors) the most democratic labour movement in the world, with a degree of freedom unrivalled in the whole history of the revolutionary labour movement in a few months became an unendurable bureaucratic dictatorship! He ignores the fact that the CNT "bureaucrats" had no way of compelling the members to obey their orders or accept their decision; that the membership would defy anyone to do so and instantly repudiate them. CNT membership (unlike those for generations trained to take orders from the top) were accustomed to exercise full freedom of action and would under no circumstances tolerate dictation from above. The CNT with only one paid secretary for a membership of over one million was structured to preclude or reduce the danger of bureaucracy to an absolute minimum.

There is, of course, no form of organization (not even a group of a dozen people) which will unfailingly prevent abuse of power. But Semprun's obsession with this question leads him to reject all but the most primitive form of organization, totally unsuited to the complex, intricate economic and social operations of an increasingly interdependent world. For example: "...all workers' organization is condemned to bureaucratization... therefore revolutionary organization is a myth..."! Gaston Leval's call for "...socialization... the management of integrated industries by the syndicates..." Juan Piero's suggestion that "in the revolutionary organization of the economy... priority must be given to creating organizations capable of managing and administering the new economy..." in Semprun's opinion only "camouflages" the bureaucracy and dictatorship of a "...new hierarchy..." Unable to work out a constructive, practical approach to the universal problems raised by the Spanish Revolution, Semprun becomes an escapist; retreats into a sterile, self-defeating, narrow-minded, pedantic individualism -- (in the words of Luigi Fabbri) "...the most anti-social form of individual rebellion" Sam Dolgoff.

The passage in Collectives in the Spanish Revolution from which this inference is drawn reads: "We could be told that collaboration had been ratified by the assemblies, plenums and congresses of our movement. But in fact what happened was that, drowned by the bursts of eloquence of our interminable speechifiers, the delegates of the provinces, the small towns and villages approved of the ministerial collaboration because they were overwhelmed by a situation that was presented to them in the most sombre colours, and lacked information and oratorical abilities to refute the promises, the unverifiable explanations, the arguments the validity of which they were not in a position to check. But once back in their towns and villages, they continued to build the new society. They did not feel tied by the political manoeuvres, and they were right, for not only would we have lost the war anyway, but the magnificent experiment of the Spanish Revolution would not have taken place." --FREEDOM Eds

SUCCESSFUL SEDITION

THE POLITICAL climate of Ireland breeds treason and sedition. Even this year the President of the Free State attended the Vatican canonization of a saint (Irish of course) among whose exploits was a suspected treasonable collusion with the French. From McNally to Roget Casement, from William Joyce to the current Old Bailey defendants the issues of treason and sedition have confronted, befuddled and occasionally illuminated the Irish situation. Sir John Harrington, a courtier of Queen Elizabeth, himself served in Ireland attempting to subdue the rebellious nobility and was himself in trouble for fraternizing too obviously with treasonable rebels. He, from his experience summed up the situation quite neatly in the words: 'Treason ne'er doth prosper/And what's the reason?/If it doth prosper/None dare call it treason.'

The success of treason or sedition generally alters the political atmosphere so vastly that a tremendous revaluation of terms takes place and the dire word 'terrorism' is replaced by 'patriot' and 'treason and sedition' are accounted by history as statesmanship and skill. The IRA soldier De Valera becomes an elder statesman, the terrorist Irgun found a new state -- Israel. Even the revered Franco acted seditiously and treasonably to get power.

It is salutary to draw attention during these weeks of an Old Bailey trial for sedition to examine instances of outright treason and sedition which took place in Ireland, went unpunished and were quite obviously the source of many (if not the major) problems of Ireland today.

Yet the perpetrators went unpunished, indeed they never repented their treason, attained high office in subsequent governments and died, full of honour, in their beds. One became Lord Chancellor, one became Home Secretary and a third became a judge and a law officer sitting in the House of Lords. Successful treason indeed!

The law officer once said, "We will shortly challenge the Government to interfere with us if they dare, and we will with equanimity await the result. We will do this regardless of all consequences, of all personal loss, of all inconveniences. They may tell us, if they like, that that is treason. It is not for such men, who have such issues at stake as we have, to trouble about the cost. We are prepared to take the consequences, and in the struggle we will not be alone, because we have the best in England with us." Later this revolutionary said "...we further solemnly and mutually pledge ourselves not to recognise its authority. I do not care twopence whether it is treason or not; it is what we are going to do."

The next year in Belfast he said, "Go on, be ready. You are our great army. It is on you we rely. You must trust us to select the most oppor-

tune methods for, if necessary, taking over the whole government of the community in which we live. I know a great deal of that will involve statutory illegality, but it will also involve moral righteousness." Strong stuff!

Later in the same year he said (among other things), "Don't be afraid of illegalities; illegalities are not crimes when they are under taken to assert what is the elementary right of every citizen, the protection of his freedom, and if anyone tells me I should be ashamed of myself I tell him it is the motive I live for, and if I am threatened I am prepared to defend myself. We will not allow any individual or any body of men, whether they call themselves a Parliament or a Government, to take away what we consider essential for the carrying on of our rights and privileges." All this from a K. C. and future judge and law officer!

In more of a high style the future Lord Chancellor said, "From that moment we on our part will say to our followers in England: 'To your tents O Israel!' From that moment we shall stand side by side with you, refusing to recognise any law, and prepared with you to risk the collapse of the whole body politic to prevent this monstrous crime. The sands are running down in the glass. The time has arrived for action on your part and ours." This future law-giver was also involved in and boasted of illegal drilling and the smuggling of weapons.

The future Home Secretary was even more oratorical: "The people... have behind them... the Party. Behind them is the Lord God of Battles. In his name and your name I say to the Prime Minister, 'Let your armies and batteries fire. Fire if you dare; fire and be damned!'"

These inflammatory, seditious and treasonable remarks were made in 1912-13 by Sir Edward Carson, by F. E. Smith (later Lord Birkenhead) and by Sir William Joynson Hicks respectively, all to attain high office in Conservative governments of the 'thirties. The treason and sedition was successful for the Conservative party favoured retention of 'union' (hence Conservative and Unionist). Home Rule for Ireland was postponed till after the 1914-18 war -- and the Easter 1916 rising, and the setting up of the six counties of Northern Ireland was a direct product of this movement. Its motto was "Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right." And it succeeded.

The set-up of union and loyalty that came out of it was responsible for much of the trouble that he bedevilled Ireland ever since. Not that the so-called free state of Ireland hasn't contributed, with its retrograde religion and oppressive cultural censorship, to the devil's brew, but this instance of successful treason and acceptable sedition sowed the dragon's teeth.

Smith, Carson and Joynson Hicks never appeared at the Old Baily, except well outside the dock.

CRISIS OF COMMUNISM

THE CHANCE of some serious social or political conflict in at least one of the communist states seems very much on the cards this winter. Rising costs of raw materials, the poor harvests in virtually all areas of Eastern Europe, even the side effects of the West's own economic difficulties, are all contributing to the problems of the Comecon countries.

Poland has been very hard hit by the recession in the West, and now has the biggest deficit in East Europe, which is being made worse by its need to buy 7 million tons of grain from North America. Big price rises are on the way, and there have already been some increases despite the official price freeze. But because of the coming Party Congress and the memory of the riots which followed the Xmas price rises in 1970, the government is likely to delay taking action to put up prices until the New Year. Mr. Gierek however has already warned his miners that wage rises will slow down in the coming Five Year Plan.

Hungary is reported to be adopting similar tactics, since her trade deficit is \$600 million. It looks highly likely that inflation there will increase and that if the country is to finance trade at the present rate, then more drastic measures can be expected.

East Germany, owing West Germany alone DM 3 billion, is trying to solve its problems by cutting down on imported

goods. As a result, shops are less well stocked with consumer goods. At the same time, the East German economy is producing vast stocks, particularly of chemicals, which remain unsold because of the low demand in the West.

MORE WORK : LESS GOODS

In Czechoslovakia there is a big campaign on to try to get people to work harder. It seems, according to official estimates, that the workers there are 'wasting' about a quarter of the working hours: holding celebrations at work or attending to their private affairs, or just taking days off. The Czech economy, already suffering from price rises on Western and Third World produce, will suffer another blow when the rest of the communist bloc put their prices up in the New Year. Czechoslovakia is a heavy importer, especially of raw materials. It buys according to the official figures, over nine-tenths of its oil from Russia, who has just put up the price 130%.

The other communist states are in a similar situation, having to rely on Russia for most of their raw materials, and compared to raw material prices outside the communist bloc, having to pay through the nose for the privilege. So the Comecon countries are having to help invest in and develop Russia's raw material resources, and pay a high price for Soviet raw materials as well.

To tackle this situation the Comecon partners are having to press their people to work harder. Wage growth rates are being cut, shopfloor discipline tightened and the spirit of competition among workers encouraged. At the same time cuts in consumption are expected all round the communist bloc countries.

THE RUSSIAN SOLUTION

It is in Russia itself, faced with serious problems in agriculture and labour relations in some areas, where the attempt by government to screw down and control labour has been taken furthest. In order to stop excessive labour turnover in some major cities, special tribunals have been set up to send people sacked for misconduct at work, to a low-skill, low-paid job for a period of three months.

Persons disciplined in this way are not entitled to bonuses and are shoved down lower on the housing waiting list. Persistent offenders become liable to legal penalties under the 'anti-parasite' laws, which allow for sentences of up to a year of corrective labour or even prison.

In the agricultural districts the low wages (between 75% and 85% of the industrial worker's wage), the less social benefits and the poor quality of life in the villages, has resulted in a declining rural population. Young farm workers, especially in East and West Siberia, and the Urals where farm labour is in short supply, go to the towns to get industrial jobs. Attempts by the State to stop this movement through the use of

Continued on Page 14

BOOKSHOP NOTES

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

84b WHITECHAPEL HIGH STREET
LONDON E1 7QX Phone 01-247 9249

All the titles in this article are available from Freedom Bookshop at the prices - plus postage - itemised.

Bookshop open : Tues. - Fri. 2 - 6 pm
(Thursdays until 8 pm)
Saturday 10 am - 4 pm

WHAT HAS, somewhat glibly, been termed "prison literature" has always - and perhaps for obvious reasons - been a rich vein for anarchist writers and readers. Two classic works in this genre are Alexander Berkman's Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist (£2.10 + 42p) and Peter Kropotkin's In Russian and French Prisons (£2.00 + 42p); and two others destined - unless I am much mistaken - to become classics are The Prison Diaries of Pietro Valpreda : The Valpreda Papers (£6.00 + 42p) and Miguel Garcia's Franco's Prisoner (£2.25 + 24p) - by

the time this appears in print Franco may, mercifully, be in no position any longer to imprison, but alas doubtless his successors will carry on his evil work.

There are also a number of interesting pamphlets on this subject - also by Miguel Garcia is Spanish Political Prisoners (10p + 7p) and by Kropotkin Law : The Supporter of Crime (8p + 7p). Clarence Darrow - the radical lawyer - gave a talk to the prisoners of Cook County Jail, Chicago, entitled Crime and Criminals which is available in pamphlet form (8p + 7p); and the Social-Revolutionary Anarchist Federation have published an interesting little pamphlet entitled The Anarchist Solution to the Problem of Crime (5p + 7p).

Friends of Malatesta in the States have published much interesting material including one that is especially relevant to this theme: Anarchism & Law by Alexei Borovoi (15p + 7p); also available from them are Rudolf Rocker on Decentralisation (30p + 7p) a short extract from his sadly out of print, monumental study, Nationalism and Culture.

They have also printed a series of short extracts from another out of print Freedom Press title, Malatesta his Life & Ideas by Vernon Richards;

entitled Errico Malatesta : Selected Writings. It is available for 25p + 7p. Lastly from F.O.M. is Rudolf de Jong's interesting study Provos & Kabouters (25p + 7p).

A Miscellany to end with, from Solidarity there is a new title, Women in the Spanish Revolution by Liz Willis (reviewed in our previous issue) 10p + 7p, also available of theirs is Maurice Brinton's The Irrational in Politics, a study of Authoritarian Conditioning and Sexual Repression (40p + 11p). Journeyman Press (who, incidentally, distribute Oriole Chapbooks in the U.K.) have published the study by Edward Aveling and Eleanor Marx Aveling on Shelley's Socialism (60p + 9p).

To complement Freedom Press's new title, there is Sam Dolgoff's anthology The Anarchist Collectives - Workers' Self-Management in the Spanish Revolution, with an essay by Murray Bookchin (£2.00 + 24p).

We have again in stock the Association of Little Presses' publication, Little Press Books in Print, a mine of information at 50p + 16p. Finally a magazine, Sindicalismo (20p + 7p), a monthly syndicalist magazine published in Madrid, in Spanish of course - we have latest issue (No. 7) in stock as well as a number of back issues.

J. H.

FLAWED BEAUTY APOSTROPHE 'E'

IT WAS Dashiell Hammett and Raymond Chandler who gave modern literature a fresh character permutation when they raised to star status, an integral part of the complex plot, the small time vamp who, though desired, must be sacrificed in the name of the greater good. For the man there was always redemption in battle or the wedding ceremony and he could slough off his past like yesterday's drunk, but for the woman it was always a damp suture in the river or a quick nip of poison from the medicine chest. In *The Maltese Falcon* and *Little Sister* these two writers created women that they used as a pattern for their own work and as prototypes for much of contemporary film writing: the female lingo, not only as immoral but as strong and as ruthless as the males she found herself in conflict with, and the puritanism in Hammett and Chandler decreed that no matter how desirable she is as a woman, personal honour dictates that she must be sacrificed to the law or the private gun. In brothel literature such as the filmed *The Happy Hooker* we learn to love and literally live with Xaviera Hollander, in Richard Brooks's *Bite the Bullet* we allow Candice Bergen to ride off into that ol' western sunset, even though being involved in one killing, because she was a prostitute and as such outside the heroic morality. But in Ross Macdonald's *The Drowning Pool* we are once more in the world of fake morality when in Stuart Rosenberg's over-directed film Joanne Woodward kills herself and by this Wagnerian sacrifice we leave the cinema to rejoin happy happyland.

In 1926 a Joseph Moncure March published a satirical sheaf of doggerel that one believed was long lost down the lavatories of time, but it resurfaced to form the background for James Ivory's film *The Wild Party* on the unfortunate affair of the actor Fatty Arbuckle who was broken for breaking, physically, Virginia Rappe in a drunken sex play in suite 1221 of the Hotel St. Francis in sunny San Francisco in 1921 and even the £2,000,000-a-year Adolph Zukor could not save his favourite son from the wrath of the second-rate over the breaking of second-rate morality. Lie it or nay there are accepted levels of moral codes that we accept or are expected to accept such as the doctors have a moral right to strike, the miners are immoral to strike. For in the world of the second rate, moral codes are in the end dictated by the politics of our societies. We can love Peter Bogdanovich's film *Paper Moon* because we are no longer committed to that society of semi starvation. *Twelve Chairs* is mildly amusing because it is no more than a rehash of Dvenadtsat Stulyev's USSR film that was not very funny when Uya Iif and Evgenii Petrov churned out the book in the dim Soviet past and we are no longer committed to that ghastly way of life. Incest, claims Dr. Melitta Schmideberg writing in the *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, produces cases where incest can

have beneficial effects on a family but Polanski in his film *Chinatown* knows that the time is not ready for this view and Faye Dunaway who has had a child as the result of being raped by her father John Huston dies the obligatory death in a bullet riddled car. Our day to day morality is shaped by the politics of the moment so that not only will the culture-loving Town and his bowing frau queue at the Gate cinema to pay homage to Yasujiro Ozu's dreary run down of a humourless lower middle class Japanese family hang-up in the film *Ohayo* but at the same time await the arrival to view and eat the poisonous Japanese fish Foo Goo, a Japanese form of Russian roulette for it carries a built-in guarantee that a number of Japanese Foo Goo eaters have already eaten the wrong mouthful and died the death. Ozu died on 12th December, 1963 and it is sad that his small talent should be remembered this way but the man that directed *A Story of Floating Weeds* in 1934 and ended with *Ohayo* has small claim on the world's attention. It was once said that the poets were the legislators of the future but the speed of communication now follows on and does not precede the deeds so that Jack Starrett's film *Race with the Devil* with Peter Fonda and Warren Oates fighting 1975 Texas devil worshippers and human sacrificers should be a giggle were it not that the high-price pornographic industry has beaten them to it, for in Los Angeles' and Miami's porn belt films are being hawked around, at £800.00 a time, of actual murder being committed such as sex acts between an actress and one or more actors when the unfortunate actress is brutally stabbed to death and her body mutilated all in the name of entertainment folks, for remember that the actual murder films that Charles Manson made and the dying terror of small children recorded on tape by the Moors killers still exist and how long before they seep out to a paying public as happened with the German concentration camp films and photographs?

MORAL DIALECTIC

In 1945 the medical minds of the freedom loving victors had to decide whether they had a moral right to use the results of experiments carried out by the obscene medical hacks of the Third Reich and I doubt if anyone now remembers the answer when our own State witch doctors publicly debated the necessity of slaughtering the aged and the infirm in the public wards of our State hospitals and the New Jersey Superior Court must now decide on the legality of killing off 21-year old Karen Quinlan yea even to quoting Pope Pius XII who, it is claimed, stated it was o.k. on moral grounds to pull the respirator out of a patient's mouth to allow him to depart in peace as a sort of dialectic to the Kiss of Life. All morality is false but there are moral absolutes hammered out by time and hardened by the tears of the uncounted dead that we must live by, and the ultimate and absolute sanctity of human life is one. One stands within the Piccadilly Galley in Cork St.

BRITISH ANARCHISM.

Dear Editors,

I share Nicolas Walter's concern at John Quail's misrepresentation of the ideas of Kropotkin in "British Anarchism" (FREEDOM 8 Nov. 1975).

Surely it was unlikely that Kropotkin would have joined the Socialist League when he came to England in 1883, for it included men who could hardly be called anarchists, such as Aveing, and even Morris who for all the implicit anarchism of his socialist views was

COMMUNISM cont'd from Page 13

internal passports and residence permits, have not met with much success.

While the direct control of labour and labour movement by the agencies of the State may not be actively resisted in many parts of Russia, it would be less easy to apply to the rest of the communist bloc. In the other East European countries a clash of some form would seem likely if the governments there fail to persuade their peoples to tighten their belts voluntarily.

B. B.

LETTER

avowedly never more than semi-anarchist and who insisted that he did not accept the anarchist arguments of Kropotkin (see 'How I Became a Socialist' -- Justice, 1894.)

Mr. Quail's criticism of what he regards as the essentially non-agitational attitude of FREEDOM at its inception in 1886, implies a poor understanding of Kropotkin's view of the role of a journal in the revolutionary movement (obviously however Kropotkin's views are not to be identified too closely with those of FREEDOM later on). It is clear from his writings and letters, particularly during the Nineties, that he thought it essential to help the poor clarify their aims and not to tell them exactly what to do. It was his belief that if the poor were stirred purely into a negative upsurge of violence against repression, without having a clear idea of their aims, then revolution would fall into the hands of a new élite (see *The Conquest of Bread* *Memoirs of a Revolutionist, Une siècle*

d'Attente 1789-99, *Revolutionary Studies*, 1891).

This did not mean remaining aloof and uninvolved in social movements but to avoid wild statements about calling the workers to the barricades and threatening an immediate and bloody uprising which at worst, only excited derision and repression, and at best, could only lead to a negative revolt rather than a creative revolution. Such an attitude can be seen clearly to have emerged in the circle of *Le Revolté* in its arguments with the wilder elements of the movement in France in the middle Eighties.

And as to the absurd allegation about Kropotkin's English being "not very good to appalling...", Kropotkin carried on an immense correspondence in a number of languages, when he was often in very poor health, and it would be said indeed to condemn anyone's linguistic capacity on their less polished letters! After all he did write *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* and *Fields, Factories and Workshops* in English as well as a number of important articles. There are undoubted faults in his style but its simplicity and eloquence could hardly be bettered.

Caroline Cahm.

W.I. admiring the magnificent etchings of Richard Muller yet despising the man for what he did with his life. With Wilde one accepts that art is amoral and one should not deny that these etchings are the major work of a major artist, the finest that the Town has seen for many a long lean year. Of the oils! good Teutonic surrealism, solid uninspired academic paintings, fashionable in the '20s and '30s, but Muller died in Dresden in 1954 at the age of 80 and the East and West German press ignored the man for he was the bad conscience of the hour. Most of Muller's work is in Eastern Germany and the West German Art Establishment do not wish to know while the East German art politicians choose to remember the man who betrayed his fellow artists. A man who accepted the Nazis in their taking of political power Muller, who it is claimed was the father of the avant garde left-wing "Neue Sachlichkeit", was like Emil Nolde a right-wing disciplinarian. It was Max Klinger who died in 1920 who taught Muller etching and this master of the macabre the blasphemous and the erotic, and Alfred Kubin, an associate of the Blaue Reiter, and the homosexual in act and art subject matter, Sascha Schneider, were companions of the left hand to be shrugged off on the way up. All this would be unimportant for it is no more than the small man crawling upwards but in 1933 while Director of the Dresden Academy Muller signed the dismissal notice of the artist Otto Dix, using his new political power to destroy an artist whom he envied. Otto Dix died in 1969. Their oils have much in common in style and subject matter; as an etcher Muller was without doubt the finer artist but as a man small and worthless.

ROYAL ACADEMY

And that can be said of the Landscape Masterpieces FROM Soviet Museums for this rubbish was a cultural exchange deal for the exhibi-

tion of Turner paintings shipped for exhibition to the USSR. That the Town and his marching frau have got the sticky end of the deal is open to display. It would seem that the Russian authorities have dredged most of the disposable junk from their museum cellars to hang on the walls of the Royal Academy. One expected a good solid display of academic paintings but here are dated pastiches of yesterday's fashionables. Fifth rate painting by Pimenov, a pleasant Redfern Bond Street canvas by Nissky, a ghastly Xmas card affair by Kustodiev and all the Victorian rubbish by Shishkin (including, mate, the 1891 "In Countess Mordvinov's Forest"), Levitan, Kuinji, Arkhipov, Serov and the rest. Comrades the Russians have pulled a fast one on us when they unloaded this junk at the docks. A single Picasso redeems this awful exhibition and it is awful by virtue of the fact that it is publicly called Landscape Masterpieces from Soviet Museums. But on Press day we had free whisky once more and the world and Griselda Hamilton-Baillie smiled on us. But the world can be good to the seeker after truth and beauty and one hundred of us sat in the British Museum lecture hall while the Bulgarian Ambassador gave us the low-down on the exhibition of Thracian Art Treasures coming to London in January 1976 and at question time mine was the small still voice that asked if the exhibition would be free and the smiling questing answer was yes, but I feel in my heart that it will be the 40 lbs. of gold that will drag in the indifferent mob for objects dating back over 5,000 years. But with Bulgarian wines, caviar, smoked salmon and pages of press hand-outs for the grabbing one can come to terms with the past, and as this exhibition will be a cultural exchange I suggest that we ship the Bulgarians the Russian junk hanging on the walls of the Royal Academy, as one satellite to another your health comrade.

Arthur Moyse.

REGENERATION OF INDUSTRY

IN A WHITE Paper presented to Parliament in 1974, entitled "The Regeneration of British Industry" (Cmd. 4710), are set out plans for the increased integration of the state and industry, not just by further nationalization but also by government intervention in the private sector. This article is a brief summary of the White Paper, which is expected to become law in the near future, together with some comments on its (considerable) importance for the future of this country.

The introduction states that Britain's present economic difficulties are due to, among other things, a chronic lack of investment in industry and in order to "correct" this state of affairs it proposes that the government must rethink its present relationship with industry, which is one of safeguarding the interests of the State against those of Big Business, and that "Industry and the government should also be partners in the pursuit of the objectives which spell success for industry and prosperity for this country." This is to be achieved by two moves: first, Planning Agreements between the government and certain companies, providing for financial support for the company, in the form of grants or loans, in the inception of new projects, and secondly, the creation of a National Enterprise Board (NEB), which will take over the management of some State-owned industries and also increase government shareholdings in private industry (that is, to provide equity capital). The NEB "will act as the agent of the government in the efficient restructuring of industry".

Planning Agreements will result from consultations between a company and the government over the company's plans for the following three years. (The company will be required by law to provide this information, but will not be forced to enter into a planning agreement.) Negotiations will lead to agreement over those plans and over the type and scale of financial assistance which the company may need (for instance a regional development grant to enable the company to open a plant in an area of high unemployment), thus providing the company with investment capital and at the same time reducing government spending on unemployment benefit. Also, "The intention is that the outcome of discussions with companies will have an important bearing on the formulation of the government's own plans; in this way the needs of companies and the economy will be better served." That is, the intention is to unify the

aims of capitalist industry and those of the State or, in a word, Corporatization. And what of the needs of the workers? Well, these are not to be forgotten, as the White Paper states that the plans to be covered by the Planning Agreement shall be drawn up by the management in "close consultation with trade union representatives from the firm" -- the question being will these representatives in fact represent the employees or merely the union executive? Moreover, the government will require that the company disclose the contents of a Planning Agreement to the unions -- but does not guarantee that the information will reach the shop floor.

The NEB will assume responsibility for the management of certain firms already owned by the State, such as Rolls Royce and Nuclear Enterprises Ltd., as well as taking over and extending state shareholdings in private companies. As to the NEB's intended function, "It will have the power to start new ventures and participate in joint ventures with companies in the private sector," and moreover, "its guiding financial objective will be to secure an adequate return on that part of the nation's capital for which it is responsible". That is, it is to make a profit by taking shareholdings in financially healthy private industries and provide them with investment capital to expand; good capitalist economics from a "socialist" government institution. The NEB will have the power to make loans, take part in the reorganization of industries or in establishing new ventures, either on its own -- or in collaboration with private companies. In any case its main aim will be to provide industrial efficiency -- which presumably means the more efficient exploitation of labour, witness the fact that the paper mentions regional development grants and aids several times (these grants will be available to companies setting up new plants in areas of high unemployment in conjunction with the NEB).

By these strategies the government intends to weld the interests of the state to those of industry -- committing it not just to a mixed economy but to "State Capitalism" in a liberal sense. The importance of this White Paper for the Labour Movement, I feel, lies in the fact that, in general, workers have been fighting for better pay and conditions against private capital, and the government (Labour or Tory) has not intervened because it relies on workers' votes to remain in power at election time. In the future, however, governments may have to weight the possible loss of votes against the State's financial interests in industrial disputes and this may lead to more repressive union laws. Couple this to the possibility of Tory-controlled corporate unions (as put forward in the article "Creeping Fascism", FREEDOM 25 October) and you have the complete Corporate State.

J. White.

PIER PAOLO

An Irreparable Loss

BBC's 'FILM NIGHT' and Sunday paper tributes (like *The Observer's*) to Pier Paolo Pasolini, the Italian film director, writer and poet murdered at Ostia on the night of 1-2 November, have been quite awful in their (nevertheless habitual) superficiality and cheap stupid claptrap. To believe Russell Davies' little masterpiece in this genre that forced its way into *The Observer* on 9 November, no one would have the remotest idea of the shock and emotion with which many Italians in fact received the news; on the contrary, it would seem, the unsentimental brutes rejoiced in the neat paradox of the "real enfant terrible" striking down "the metaphysical one". "For Pasolini was really not much loved" and in explaining why, Mr. Davies appears to lean entirely on the criticisms of those Pasolini embittered most by his own, the so-called "figli de papa" of the New Left and in particular the (Stalinist-orientated) Movimento Studentesco, and their intellectual supporters in the media. "The Decameron", in Britain, only attracted the "middle class voyeur" states Mr. D., smugly pleased at this little sally (while then proceeding to display his ignorance of Pasolini's background by mentioning how "paradoxical" was his early success with Friulian poetry - he was, you see, born in Bologna, not Friuli, and "learned the dialect deliberately". He was "an outsider trying to get in," says Mr. D., evidently quite unaware that Pasolini's own mother comes from the Friulian peasantry.

Next it is spelt out to us how Pasolini was not the mere luckless victim of the monstrous anti-Pasolini campaign he seemed to be. Basically he got all that was coming to him by his own incessantly controversial attacks on "several well-chosen targets" - the R.A.I., the Church, Moravia (who remained in fact a close friend). On top of this he was unbearably narcissistic, had irritating casting fetishes, used "raddled non-professionals" and quite frankly "I do not much look forward to the 120 days of Sodom" which will be quite "unlovable". In short, Mr. D. ends without beginning to give us one small glimpse of the real artist but merely a reflection of his own inadequacies.

Of course Pasolini whipped up a lot of strong feeling one way or another. That was his wish and his value. He angered and perplexed because he couldn't be slotted away into any political category (his emotional attachment to both Catholicism and Marxism was later complicated by his increasing closeness to the libertarian Radicals, though from these too he remained apart in his opposition to divorce, abortion, "permis-



siveness"). He was openly homosexual in a society that fiercely professed its heterosexuality. He was contradictory and outrageous because he had the moral and physical courage - amounting to recklessness - to speak his thoughts aloud (revealing the troubled contradictions that are a part of all our lives) and because, as soon as one section of society began to applaud his attacks on another, it became his next smarting and bewildered victim. Thus the Church, after the simple luminous splendour of the "Gospel According to Matthew" smiled benignly on Pier Paolo, only to be enraged by the pagan, the bestial "Pigsty". Thus the New Left, fresh and exhilarated from its battle with the police in the Valle Giulia, was stung by his poem, "Il P.C.I. ai giovani!!". Pasolini's furious criticism of the rich student rebels' failure to come to terms with an Italian police force made up of the "sons of the poor", people he knew well from the southern borgate, and whose poverty it was that had forced them into servitude. He also criticised the students' abandonment of an old tired Communist party to which peasants and workers still clung and to which Pasolini himself remained attached through his memories of the Resistance and through his (somewhat arguable!) view that it still aimed at the ultimate abolition of power; and so too, he attacked the student slogans, themselves looking forward to a seizure of power. ("A redeemed bourgeois" he told them "must renounce all his rights and reject once and for all the idea of power.") But the Communist parties were not left unscathed either, with their failure to carry revolution through towards decentralised statelessness with proper worker autonomy, and their undeniable, bureaucratically stultifying effect on the intellectual life of Eastern Europe.* And the intellectuals of Western Europe were in their turn rattled by Pasolini's pointed praise of the political radicalism of the United States - especially of the New York ghettos where he experienced something of the old Partisan atmosphere of his youth - and of a culture Europeans looked down upon and even completely denied.

But the twist was, Pier Paolo couldn't "accept anything of the world in which I live; not only the centralised state apparatus - bureaucracy, magistrature, army, school and the

rest - but not even its cultured minorities". Himself part of one and of Roman high society, he continually sought refuge and friendship in the slumlands of suburban Rome. His writing, like his films, could convey an extraordinary power and intelligence (parallels with Michelangelo spring irresistably to mind), in the combination of a unique poetic and linguistic sensibility with a sustained anger at the misery and violence of the modern world and a deep feeling for its links with the classical past, the myths of classical literature.

There is something ambiguous in this gift of passion, this sense of cruelty and misery (not forgetting the bawdy, often breathtaking beauty and sheer joy and humour of a film like "The Decameron"), yet at the same time this visceral hatred of a technocratic neo-capitalist order, slowly destroying the poor peasantry and proletariat and above all the "lumpenproletariat" he loved, for whom he had an insatiable, even tormented curiosity but who, he was convinced, had been corrupted and criminalised by a frenzied consumerism.

I mean that in Pasolini is the paradoxical criticism yet also exaltation of pov-

"A REDEEMED BOURGEOIS MUST RENOUNCE ALL HIS RIGHTS AND REJECT ONCE AND FOR ALL THE IDEA OF POWER." Pier Paolo Pasolini, in *The End of the Avant Garde* (1963).

erty, the myth of chaste poverty that revolutionaries have often shared with early Christianity and with Catholicism. And it was in fact his constant search for it, for a rare kind of purity, that lay behind his terrible death that night on the beach at Ostia.

Of course that still doesn't answer, *Why?* A question that must remain on the lips of many of those who valued his work or who will at least feel his absence. Had Pier Paolo survived he would almost certainly have written of that night, and that boy, attempting with his usual uncomfortable sincerity to provide an answer. As it is we shall never know.

G. F.

*(Pasolini, incidentally, took the side of Marx against his "nice but in effect slightly mad" anarchist "competitors" and was certainly an insecure ground here, since he had no time for the modern communist functionary who made "condemnation of anarchy today - when in the communist countries centralised power and bureaucracy triumph - sound ridiculous and deadly". Yet this reflection, dating from 1965, in itself would seem to justify Bakunin's "tiresome" criticisms of Marx, in particular his opposition to an initial state power grab -- Bakunin, after all, was the better psychologist of the two! In any case, in later years Pier Paolo moved closer and closer in sympathy to the Radicals, at whose annual congress he was to speak the following day.)