

# FREEDOM

*anarchist fortnightly*

VOL. 37 No. 14

10 JULY 1976 TWELVE PENCE

## THE NAKED TRUTH

THE SHIP of state has been allegedly springing leaks in all directions - child allowances, immigration, thalidomide - and fears are expressed that this must lead to the sinking, not to say scuttling of the grand old vessel. On the other hand, the frequent discharge of the bilge water like the relief of an overloaded bladder is a necessary function conducive to the good ordering of the body politic.

The whole of public and governmental life is cloaked in vast swathings of secrecy. In war-time, and increasingly in the so-called peace of preparedness, the activities of the state are classified as 'Secret', 'Top Secret', 'Stratospheric Secret' with bureaucratic degrees of secrecy and bureaucratic reluctances to de-classify or re-classify 'secrets'. Peace, being merely the continuation of war by other means (particularly the war of the State against the non-compliant individual), has seen the intensification and preservation of official secrets.

With the growth of public ownership (who, me?) whole areas of once public life have become official secrets. The forces, naturally, the police certainly, the Prison Service assuredly; the Post Office of course; the Civil Service undoubtedly not to mention other minions in that vast enterprise designed to protect them against us, are all subject to a fearful oath not to divulge official secrets. It is not known what solemn ritual or esoteric ceremony marks the transmutation of one of 'us' into one of 'them' but it is certain that some bloody ritual or voodoo ceremony seals the lips of the Civil Servant who is by such an oath scarcely a Servant and rarely Civil.

It is claimed that such tribal taboos (even at Cabinet level) as 'confidentiality' safeguard good government. William Haley (former Moscow ambassador, editor of The Times, governor of the BBC) writing in the Sunday Times (27.6.76) about the Crossman diaries says "Human nature being what it is good government in our kind of democracy would be impossible without strict confidentiality." It is pointed out in press coverage of the child allowance 'leak' that this leak "might hinder good government but in this instance" (my underlining) "it can be argued to expose bad government."

From an anarchist point of view the best government is that which governs not at all and therefore such degress and divisions are purely academic.

One is forced to the conclusion that

officialdom is so ashamed of everything which they do that they do not wish anyone to know what they are doing so they make everything possible an Official Secret with penalties for disclosure.

It is ironic that public figures in politics who parade their private and public virtues every election-time retreat into coy secrecy once they have attained public office. This is not to say that the individual should have no privacy but those who live by publicity can have no cause for complaint when their activities (once they have, as it were, "gone public") are exposed.

A second argument for secrecy is that of the experts who claim that we do not really understand what it's all about and facts, freely given, would only serve to confuse us. Therefore we are left to our ignorance. It is possible, indeed probable, that for every 'leaking' official expert judgement there can be found another 'expert' judgement contradicting it. Why then should we not be left to judge on the basis of our prejudices and preferences between two experts? It is highly likely that the official expert welcomes the Secrets Act as protecting him from disclosing his errors.

### INSPIRED LEAKS

At present we are the prey of inspired 'leaks' and of the manipulation of 'leaks' for party purposes. We are told by a Sunday paper that the leak of a government report on exam results could be the prelude to GLC revision

[Cont on P. 2]



ARTHUR MOYSE

"JUST GOING FOR A LEAK,  
PRIME MINISTER."

## MARK'S NEW MOTOR

IS THE NATIONAL Enterprise Board paying Mark Phillips to drive around ostentatiously in his new Leyland Rover 3500? The integration of the nominal state, the actual state and big business has never been plainer. It's only fitting that the first product of NEB financing should be that symbol of oligarchy and plutocracy, the executive motor car, supreme polluter and destroyer of the countryside, and well beyond the pocket of even the highest paid of the workers who are said, by their union officials, to be so proud to produce it. (Though the fact that the custom-built factory is only operating at half capacity, might make one sceptical about the depth of the 'British pride').

Obviously the NEB is not "a step on the road to socialism" since its function is to facilitate the working of the present economic system. "Left-wing" Tribune M.P.s are said to attribute its lack of socialist potential to its inability to nationalise at will and undercapitalization. The "social democrats" who run the Government agree with the last point, since despite huge cuts in government spending, they are to pump another £100 million into the NEB's funds. In fact, the NEB's finances are shrouded in mystery -- six months after British Leyland and Rolls Royce shares were transferred to the NEB, no value for them had yet been agreed, and the Department of Industry has not as yet agreed on the appropriate capital structure for the board.

In fact the NEB bids well to become another unaccountable financial monster on the model of the Spanish INI (National Institute for Industry) and the Italian IRI (Institute for the Reconstruction of Industry), both products of the fascist era, which have survived well into the 70's and are the well-springs of financial power for the technobureaucratic élites, which determine the patterns of economic development, to their own advantage and perpetuation.

At the moment the NEB has very limited powers for the restructuring of industry - it has to have the agreement of the shareholders and directors of the companies concerned, but when a company crashes and turns to NEB for help, its objections to restructuring can't be too virulent. The "Tribunite" MPs want to increase substantially the NEB's power to nationalize companies "purposively". Eric Heffer, writing in the Guardian for July 1st, talks of the problem of advancing "from the present system of controlled capitalism, to a fully planned socialist economy, while avoiding the growth of a massive bureaucracy and maintaining and developing human freedom". And they call anarchists

[Cont on P. 2]

## THE NAKED TRUTH [cont from P1]

of examinations. 'Left-wing' and 'right-wing' factions in the Labour cabinet are undoubtedly responsible for the leakages to Child Poverty Action. Such leaks, inspired or un-inspired, help such Cabinets to keep going. The socially-conscious left feels it has done its duty by disclosing how the dirty deal was done or how the workers were once more betrayed. Their acquiescence is thereby atoned for.

The thalidomide 'scandal' was not strictly an official secret but the official reaction to the implied criticism of the Ministry of Health was predictable. The laws of libel and slander were sufficient to make impossible free comment on the responsibility for the sanctioning of thalidomide with its shockingly horrifying consequences. Not only do governments but also large corporations safeguard their detrimental secrets.

The Minister of Health disclaiming responsibility for the sanctioning of thalidomide was Enoch Powell who has no qualms about releasing an 'expert' report on illegal immigrants. This has been withheld by the government with the inevitable consequence that its unofficial release has given it more credence and importance than it deserves. The same could be said about United States UFO reports.

Secrecy touches all our lives. The welfare of the child, thalidomide, even the postwoman in a small Essex village. A postwoman told a customer about her worsening working conditions. The customer wrote under a pseudonym to the local paper pointing out the general deterioration in post office working conditions. Unfortunately the newspaper published the name of the village and the GPO rebuked the postwoman, presumably for a breach of the Official Secrets Act.

Prisons are veritable fortresses of 'official secrecy'. Every newspaper

## MARK'S NEW MOTOR [cont from P.1]

utopian!

Mr. Heffer ignores 50 years of economic disaster in the Soviet Union, where millions of bureaucrats fail to make a success of a "fully-planned socialist economy", but worst of all, like all governmental "socialists", he only conceives economic change in terms of the present relations of production, seemingly believing that the transfer of enterprises from private hands to those of the state will wring some kind of change. Despite his mouthings about 'human freedom', Mr. Heffer's prescriptions for the enlargement of the NEB and similar institutions have as much to do with the fulfilment of human potential and desires as the "laissez-faire" ravings of Mrs. Thatcher. Real change, as opposed to this masquerade, will come from elsewhere, and will take us all by surprise.

D. L. M.

reader knows of what happened (in some version, that is) at Winson Green prison when Irish 'bombers' were assaulted by wardens and prisoners. It is highly probable that such a story (or any of them) would not have 'leaked' were it not that the police were obviously afraid of being accused of having beaten up the bombers. The Official Secrets Act prohibits publication of what happens in jails. Even prisoners' correspondence is still read, and if necessary in the interests of security, censored. Many such incidents as those at Winson Green take place unrecorded and unpunished.

Another form of official secrecy is in the field of local government planning -- and in central government. Secrecy of development plans and road planning is preserved in order, it is said, to prevent speculators. But speculation goes on nevertheless and it is not unknown for those with knowledge of the plans to benefit therefrom; also intelligent guesses are possible. The last person to know is the private individual who is, as usual, more planned against than planning. The mock democratic ceremonial of a public enquiry (to determine what, rather than why) is the usual trivial concession to public opinion. Usually the decision has been made beforehand and can, in any case, be overruled by a superior department which has secretly made its own decision.

The most frequent trump card in officialdom's hand these days is the hal- lowed phrase 'sub judice' or 'we are waiting for the official report'. This is supposed to silence all criticism not only in the sacred cause of 'fair play' but carries with it a vague threat that it is illegal to say anything about a case which is already or shortly appearing before the courts. The long delays of the law and Royal Commissions will effectively block any nuisance of comment for quite a while. By the time the case is heard (if it is) or the report is issued (if it is) or the government does anything (if it does) even the complainants will have forgotten the point. Whatever happened to Reginald Maudling?

Our younger, more sanguine contemporaries in the fledgling United States (200) persist not only in the illusion that that citizen has the 'right to know' but in the equal illusion that they do know. The Press of the United States produces so many versions of the real truth that the true truth still eludes the reader. The C.I.A. cheerfully blows the gaff on its failed plots. (Its successes are, of course, approved by history.) Congress, or that solemn procession of Committees for this and that which America goes in for, lives under the permanent illusion that it can tame the tiger of the military-defence-espionage establishment on whose back it rides.

In short, Government is a conspiracy against humanity and secrecy is the means by which it covers its nakedness. Every disclosure is a step towards the final realization that, as in Anderson's fairy tale, the wonderful (allegedly) new suit of the King is an illusion and given the clear eyes and awareness of the truly free individual it will be seen as such.

Jack Robinson

# THE HARRINGAY CUTS

HARRINGEY's Labour controlled council finds itself in a perfect 'Catch 22' situation. It has been ordered by the government to cut £5 millions of its current budget by the end of the current financial year. Large scale cuts have already been made, despite assurances to the contrary; overtime is strictly controlled for many council workers and a no-replacement system is in operation when staff leave.

There are of course no plans to sell the mayoral Daimler or halt the redevelopment of the Wood Green commercial centre.

Harringey is already London's second highest rated borough. It has little industry to provide lucrative industrial rates. Yet its rate support grant is among the lowest in the country (36%).

With their eyes set firmly on next May's elections the swingeing rates increase necessary to fill the gap (which would come in April) would be political suicide for the Labour group.

It is equally unlikely that the council will become 'another Clay Cross' as the I. M. G. seem to hope. The cost of this crisis like all others will be borne by the poor, the disabled and the elderly.

There is of course the usual 'fight the cuts' committee, comprised mainly of the I. S., who seem to have forgotten about the dictatorship of the proletariat for the moment and have contented themselves so far with meaningless gestures of support for the council's public no cuts position and calling for support from 'figures of influence in the local Labour movement'.

The two organized demos so far have mustered no more than fifty people. Yet if only 1% of Harringey's  $\frac{1}{4}$  million population presented themselves outside the council chamber the no cuts decision would be automatic and the council's functions would have been irrelevant; similarly if council workers refused en masse to implement cuts. Direct action is in the short term our only means of defence.

This of course presumes that we wish to preserve the few grudging activities of the state.

If the inner urban areas are deprived of cash they may well in the near future explode. Whilst we might view this as a welcome prospect, it would mean misery and hardship to those who are supposed to do the exploding.

The only real long term answer that anarchism has to offer is the development of mutual aid, not as an academic concept but as a practical living reality, to supplant and overthrow the welfare state.

Tony.

# ALL DOWN THE STRAND!

As with the liberal middle-class we have self-accepted public standards which we take an inner pleasure in putting into practice. Just as the Victorian liberal, yea, even to the elderly grandchildren, was and is polite to the disease-ridden poor of the society of the hour, never insulted another man's religious beliefs and would remove his hat in a confined public space, even in the presence of a woman cleaner, so we (and ask me not who we is) in our turn would never use the words "pak" or "nigger" in a private joke or public statement. Come the National Front demonstration we are there in the ranks of the anti-racialists facing the police and Webster's marchers, with our pink faces and our banners of righteous protest, as we march arm in arm with our coloured comrades; for to quote the late Christ, "It is far better to give than to receive". But in moments of anger when the tongue becomes undisciplined, in the apolitical debate when rage takes the place of rational argument, an unfortunate anti-semitic chord has too often marred the inspired diatribe. That this should be so can only proclaim the poverty of reasoned discussion, but from Moscow to the fashionable East Coast leftism of America, anti-semitism can, and still is, used as a turn of political abuse.

And its companion word in the gossip of political scurrility belongs to the homosexual, "the poof", "the queer", "the bent", for by its very use it presupposes the lesser breed within the law, and each group, political and apolitical, formulates its own laws. At high noon on June the 26th I made my way to the Temple Underground athwart the Strand, beside the Thames, for no other reason than to rubber-neck on a Gay Liberation demonstration. I sat in the cool shadows of the Underground station and watched the Gays assemble, and with them the police. The demonstrators were in their twenties, jeaned, sweat-shirted, and almost all clean-shaven. There was some holding of hands and a few kissed each other, and as the assembly grew so a dozen or so young lesbians moved among them joking and handing out leaflets. The police, who had kept in the background of the Underground

## THE MURRAYS

THE PROPOSED hanging of Noel and Marie Murray has been postponed until at least the 27th July, since both of them have been given leave to appeal, and the date set for the appeal is the 26th. The Murrays' solicitors are said to be trying to get Sean McBride, the Irish representative at the U.N., to present the appeal.

Meanwhile a defence committee has been set up in the Republic (155 Church Road, Celbridge, Co. Kildare, Eire) whose two principal aims are a reprieve and a re-trial. Letters have appeared in *Hibernia*, all highly critical of the way the trial was handled, and protesting at the savage sentence.

Pickets of Irish institutions have already been held, or are being arranged, in London, Manchester, Leicester, the Netherlands and West Germany.

station and the bushes, now began to move out into the sunlight, making with the jokes of pursed lips and "I didn't know you was one of them Charlie" with soft manly laughter pitched to baritone deep, and the demonstration was ready to move off. My years of membership of the NCCL triggered off my guard-dog reflex and I counted 150 Gay Liberation marchers. I then counted the green police coaches, and there were five, and each one carried 25 uniformed police men and women, so that with the police Top Brass, motorcyclists and plain-clothed police, there were approximately 150 police. One policeman to every Gay Liberation marcher, and the march was to Marble Arch and a picnic on the grass.

In jeans, sweat-shirts and shorts, the men and women of the Gay Liberation march padded along the Strand holding their picnic lunches while on each side marched a cordon of uniformed police. I walked along the pavement until the knowledge that, if this had been an anti-racist, trade-union, or a left-wing protest march, I would have automatically stepped into the bannered ranks, but it was a courageous Gay march by men and women still rejected by the goodies, so I stepped into their marching ranks. Feeling like a "sexogenarian winsome hippy" I prayed that no comrade would see me, for there was no hatred in the eyes of police as on any respecta-

ble left-wing march to burn down an embassy, only contempt, and 150 marchers plus one. can be a very small group in the crowded streets of London. Down the Strand, through Trafalgar Square, along Regent Street to Piccadilly to honourably bow out to the dark basement of Ward's masculine Irish pub, and to query under what circumstance would the black and scarlet flags be carried in such a demonstration.

In the great American political purges men and women were asked if they were communists, and there were those who refused to answer, be it "yea" or "no", for to answer gave credence to those who used the noun as a political smear, and in this bicentennial year their imprisonment gave a meaning to American freedom in the practice, and not in the prose. Therefore, when I stepped into that Gay Liberation march I knew that I could never answer the two questions that flutter on amused lips for to affirm or deny is to give credence to the last of the smear words of the vocal left.

On Wednesday the 30th June men and women of the Campaign for Homosexual Equality mounted a demonstration outside, and within, the annual meeting-place of the British Home Stores shareholders over the "enforced resignation" of a trainee manager for kissing his boyfriend on a television interview. On that day in the Marylebone Road, Angus Wilson, a popular novelist and middle-class figure of the Establishment, took his stand in that demonstration that the militant left still fears to join because of the opinions of passing militant and non-militant left, for guilt by association still applies, and guilt is the gentle, but knowing, racial smear, and the patronising smile even among the self-electing noble and the just.

LUMPENPROLETARIAT

## BAKUNIN

### COMMEMORATIONS

THE CENTENARY of Bakunin's death in Berne on 1 July 1876 was celebrated in London at two separate occasions. On the previous weekend, a disco was held at the Roebuck pub, arranged by the Federation of London Anarchist Groups, to raise funds for anarchist causes.

On the centenary day itself, about fifty people attended an informal meeting at the Centro Iberico to remember Bakunin's contribution to the anarchist movement and to discuss his relevance a hundred years later. The chair was taken by Wynford Hicks, and the opening speakers were Nick Heath, Albert Meltzer, Nicolas Walter, and José Martin-Artajo:

The speakers emphasised that they came to praise Bakunin, not to resurrect him. Unlike Marxists, anarchists are not labelled by the individual they follow, and we do not believe something because it was said by Bakunin (or anyone else); indeed Bakunin said much that most anarchists no longer believe. But we praise him for his devotion to the liberation first of oppressed peoples and later of oppressed classes, for his consistency in putting theory into practice, for his courage in risking his own life and liberty in the insurrections of Paris in 1848, Dresden in 1849, Poland in 1863, and Lyon in 1870, for his vitality, which enabled him to withstand years of imprisonment and exile, for

his socialism, which drew him into the International in the 1860s, and for his anarchism, for which he was driven out in the 1870s. He was not the father of anarchism, but he was one of the founders of the anarchist movement, and his essential ideas inspire it still and illuminated the discussion at many points.

Bakunin would probably have been amused or appalled at the idea of such a gathering, but it provided a good opportunity for anarchists from many groups to exchange opinions in a comradesly atmosphere. The speakers agreed that Bakunin's ideas are at least as relevant as they were a hundred years ago, and such meetings make it possible to discuss such ideas properly.

N. W.

## LETTERS [cont from P. 4]

and its products in equality. We do not need to be compromised. We can afford to advocate such a system from Ulster to Angola. Any group with such a policy would also be libertarian and therefore presumably gain our support.

Problems surrounding military resistance can also obscure the aims of libertarians. As a pacifist I understand the main task is to promote and practice a society of peaceful operation. However faced with the reality of a death-bringing fascism or imperialism it is more or less inevitable that a struggle will follow. But even a people's army can apply libertarian principles and operate on collective decision making.

Your brother,  
Andy Molony Anderson.

## THE PRICE OF BUREAUCRACY

THE RECENT riots in Poland over the government's proposed rise in prices not only caught the Polish Communist Party by surprise but also the press in the West which seemed at a loss to try to explain the incidents. Of course, we were provided with long accounts in the "respectable" dailies of how this was embarrassing for Gierek with these "acts of vandalism" happening just before the European Communist Parties' summit in Berlin and even the Catholic self-proclaimed intellectuals eventually expressed solidarity with the Polish workers (whilst not approving their actions) a week after the workers had already won their immediate economic demands of stopping the price rises. The usual reactionary sneer to strikers in the West of "Why don't you go to a Communist country? You'll find it's impossible to strike there!" was made to seem refuted in this particular instance since the government was forced to not adopt its policy, for the time being.

Several features of these incidents

## LETTERS

MORE ON  
"THE REVOLUTIONARY"

Dear Freedom,

I've just learned that N.W. has quarrelled with my review of Hans Koningsberger's books. [Review section 29 May]. N.W. regards The Revolutionary, Koningsberger's novel, as a fable more than anything else. This is a reasonable view, and readers who pick up the novel in the same spirit that they would a manifesto will doubtless agree with it. However, this interpretation cannot explain the book's power.

New York.

Yours,  
Paul Berman.

## NATIONAL FRONT

Dear All,

N.V.H.'s suggestion of stickers attacking the N.F. (FREEDOM 12.6.76 "Racist Murders") has some merit though I think the slogans he uses would be self-defeating; a better slogan for the N.F. would be easy to choose. They (the N.F.) already use the slogan: "NF puts Britain first"; in Croydon we occasionally added: "to the gas chambers" and it was interesting that the NF then felt it necessary to remove the message --with addition.

Laurens Otter.

## LIBERATION STRUGGLES

Dear Comrades,

It would appear that from time to time libertarians are faced with the problem of how to approach a national liberation struggle and whether or not to support this or that faction. Such problems however need hardly arise. Libertarians advocate a system of collective decision making and the sharing of labour

[cont on P. 3]

# POLAND

bear some consideration. Firstly, it seems that the Polish government was incredibly stupid in announcing such massive price rises, especially since Gierek was placed into power as a result of similar riots in the Baltic ports in 1970 over the same issue of proposed price rises. Secondly, the workers were not just taking action over economic issues but also over issues such as the close control of elections in the party, the unions and the government, exploitation at work, the division of society along opposed class lines, and the domination of society by the new State bourgeoisie, the bureaucracy. Thirdly, there seems to have been a lack of any hierarchical co-ordination of these actions by the workers and no apparent collaboration between workers taking action in different sectors.

The reason for the announcement of these dramatic price rises when it was clear that the likelihood of a reaction from the workers was very high, can be explained by the absurd system that is employed in the administration of the country. Marx provided a brilliant analysis of the workings of the capitalist system, of its inherent contradictions and of the manner in which the system is based on exploitation of the workers. The answer which the Marxists have since put forward is that of a rationally programmed society in which the distribution of resources etc. is to be carried out according to "scientific principles". For this to come about, however, there is a need for democratic centralism whereby a central body can make these "rational, scientific" decisions. The only economic principles available to the Marxists, however, were the analyses of the capitalist system in the "sacred" texts by Marx. This produced two major defects in the State-capitalist system: (i) a bureaucracy was set up to try and perform the same exploitative process which was developed organically by the market mechanism; (ii) these bureaucrats assumed that the micro-economic question of prices was of little relevance compared to that of the allocation of resources.

However, since the 1917 Revolution the problems created by the arbitrary fixing of prices in a State-capitalist system have been the cause of much debate between East European economists and in Stalin's time the fate of economists who came out with "marginalist" theories was almost instant persecution. Several attempts were made to replace the profit motive as an incentive for production. One such attempt was that of awarding prizes to factories producing the centrally-determined quota of production. The main problem was that of choosing the criteria by which the

quota was determined. Would it be according to weight, according to number, or what? Most studies of the Soviet economic system quote the amusing case of the factory manager who was told to produce a specific weight (e.g. 10 tons) of tea or coffee mugs. This enterprising manager wasted no time in ordering vast quantities of lead and so fulfilled his quota easily by producing the heaviest and bulkiest mugs ever seen.

Bakunin foresaw what a society organised and governed according to scientific and rational principles would be like. His forecast helps us to understand why the Polish workers were taking action recently not only over specific economic issues such as price rises but also over questions of liberty and against the State bureaucracy. He saw, first of all, that to organise society according to scientific principles was absurd since science can only comprehend the concept of reality but not reality itself. The second aspect he saw was that a society organised by "scientific experts" would be preoccupied with the consolidation of the power of that "scientific" ruling caste. Hence the claim made by the Marxists that theirs is a "scientific" analysis of social relationships and that the answer to the exploitation they have "scientifically" discovered is "scientific" socialism is not only an absurd notion to an anarchist but it is also a highly dangerous one.

Poland is one of the East European countries where the various experiments at, firstly, providing alternatives to the profit motive and then to reconciling the profit-motive with their "scientific" socialist principles, have led to substantial openings of trade relationships with the West which has constantly been developing similar class relationships between the bureaucratic high priests of economic theory and production and the rest of the population. It is this relationship exemplified in the massive FIAT FIAT plant in Poland, for instance, which has introduced certain symptoms of the international capitalist crisis into scientific socialist Poland. The Polish workers have responded with what Bakunin would have called the "rebellion of life against the government of science" (from "Anticipazione anarchice sui nuovi padroni", by Nico Berti: Interrogations No. 6, Mar. 1976)

This "rebellion of life" is a defence against the authoritarian method of the "government of science" not with the scope of destroying science but merely putting science in its proper place in a manner which should guarantee that science becomes and remains the servant of the people and does not become again the government. The threat which the Polish workers' actions pre-

sented to scientific government (both East and West) was clearly recognised by government commentators in both sectors and in Poland meant the picking out and imprisonment of those workers who took part in the riots. This was not a question of finding the "leaders" and punishing them because there were no leaders. In fact, the only possible source of "leadership" against the Communist government in Poland, the Catholic "intellectuals", expressed solidarity with the workers after the battle was over and at the same time deplored the actions, thus leaving the government to isolate each worker and steadily repress all revolutionary demands in time for the announcement of these price rises in several months' time. The Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci used the term "intellectual" in a sarcastic manner to describe little puppets ruling on behalf of a central administration. Clearly the Catholic "intellectuals" with their facade of opposition are carrying out a similar function.

The Western press was mostly concerned with the effect this would have

of London, of Warsaw, of the Kremlin, of Zurich, of Wall Street and so on, will do all in their power to ensure that the price of bureaucracy is not borne on Gierek's position since "clearly" the workers were being rather silly in taking to the streets against rising prices. Our economic experts tell us that prices must rise and wages must be kept under control for the system to survive. Hence the only disapproval of the Polish governments' actions was concerning the sudden and high price rises because tactically it was wrong. No tears are being shed by the press here, however, for the hundreds of unknown who are now being persecuted for opposing the Polish government's economic policies. After all, suppression of workers' demands has become a practised art in the western world with the workers themselves providing the means of suppression through our mammoth union organisations. Further, the West's history has not been short of violent suppressions of similar types to those now going on in Poland.

The reason for the unrest by workers and the economic instability on both sides of the "iron curtain" which East and West collaborated in building and maintaining, is that the capitalist system which both sectors have been exploiting for the furtherance of their power over resources has been in a state of transition for some time between a purely productive relationship in industry towards a bureaucratic corporate state where the maintenance of the administrative machine becomes the primary objective. Hence the "scientific" socialists' attempts to reconcile socialism with the profit motive (the spark which ignited the recent riots) can be seen to be futile since the profit motive and all its "free-market" associations is also in crisis in the Western sector.

Clearly many sacrifices will have to be made for the sake of this transition but the techno-bureaucrats of the City by them. The workers in Poland are in the process of paying the first instalment.

Nino Staffa.

## A FOURTH CHOICE

The Polish workers' riots last week against planned price rises of up to 100 per cent, when workers outside Warsaw tore up railway tracks, lorries blocked the streets and shops were burnt down, were described by the chairman of the Polish television and radio committee, Maciej Szezepanski, as acts of "anarchy and vandalism". These acts of "anarchy" in the areas of Radom and Ursus (notably the tractor factory) were "too deplorable" to be discussed, he said, after stating that letters from blue-collar workers had come pouring in to the central committee offices in support of Edward Gierek. But the Polish daily paper *Zycie Warszawy* considered the events both deplorable and worthy of discussion, and concluded that any civilised country, "without regard to the system of government", had to repress such demonstrations of disrespect against one's betters.

Riots against food prices are not an unusual occurrence in Poland, a country which the Guardian last year described as naturally "anarchistic", and which had seen the destruction of two of Warsaw's main food stores last spring. But the scale of the rioting this summer recalls the rebellion in 1970 in the Baltic ports of Gdansk, Gdynia and Szczecin and in the textile towns like Lodz (where the predominantly women textile workers are well-known for their militancy). Then 44 people were killed, as compared to 2 this year, and the extent of workers' opposition to the government was thought so serious that Gomulka, who had himself come to power after the bread riots of Poznan in 1956, was replaced by the more flexible and intelligent Gierek on the understanding that he would be able to gain the trust of the working population and prevent further trouble.

Gierek was local party boss in the Silesian coal region, and when he took over had support among the Silesian miners for his defence of their interests when Gomulka was trying to downgrade the industry. Gierek pledged himself to the making of a "second Poland" - to fast modernisation and industrialisation, to bureaucratic and agricultural reform in the

country where 80 per cent of the land was still run by 6 million small private farmers and which had bad memories of early, clumsy efforts at State collectivisation. He toured the factories and the Baltic shipyards, chatting benevolently to the survivors of the riots. He dispossessed the middle tier of bureaucrats in local government. There was a frenzied investment boom and a property tax was imposed on the rich - the "zloty millionaires", the political and managerial and intellectual elites. Anxious to avoid further trouble among the workers, the Soviet Union guaranteed Poland long-term supplies of grain, oil and other basic commodities. A long price freeze was imposed while between 1971-75 the workers' wages rose by over 40 per cent. . . then well-paid workers began to find that demand outstripped supply and there was trouble.

Following the riots of March 1975, on account of the food shortages, the Polish politburo warned of the effects of bad harvests and referred to "some economic tensions". In fact, the boom was over, leaving a large balance of payments deficit and a shortage of hard currency. This meant a big cut in housing and less consumer goods. The farmers began to hold back supplies of produce from the State, saying they could get far better prices in the open market. The recent elections for the Sejm (parliament) showed that the number of spoilt ballot papers had tripled, and that enthusiasm was least high in the areas of the 1970 riots - Gdansk, Gdynia and Szczecin.

Until now Gierek has been as careful as possible not to offend those on whom he depends for his position in the party apparatus, and it was on the political rather than the economic level that the regime began to show its teeth. In 1975 a member of the anti-authoritarian socialist "Ruch" movement, which had given some political expression to the aspirations and grievances of the workers, and whose members had been imprisoned in 1971, was re-imprisoned for circulating a memorandum on prison conditions. Two schoolboys aged

16 and 17 were arrested for membership of an informal group called "Free Speech" and for drawing anti-party graffiti on the walls and fences of Warsaw. Three students from the Catholic university of Lublin were arrested for bill-posting notices announcing a requiem mass for the workers killed during the Baltic coast riots in December 1970, and complained of police beatings and electric shock treatment and there have been other incidents of people taken for interrogation and psychiatric examination for criticising the regime, even in private correspondence.

The case of the three students from Lublin raises one of the sadder aspects of opposition to the regime in Poland, a country where the only legal opposition is an authoritarian and doctrinaire religious hierarchy. Its own jealously guarded position pits it with other opponents against attempts at increasing CP control (as in the constitutional crisis of February this year) and the hardening of its attitude to the State after the police attack on the Gorki chapel this Easter, brought it to speak out in favour of "free" elections, "free" trade unions and an "independent" justice. Virtually by default, as at Lublin, it has provided a certain amount of cover for students proclaiming their sympathy for the workers' demands, and greater freedom, though this hardly prevented their persecution in the end.

In Poland today there's a kind of fire-and-frying pan situation in which the real opponents of authoritarianism find themselves sandwiched between two self-seeking monoliths of power and intrinsic oppression, both claiming to provide the bread and flesh of the population's needs. To turn to either would get the workers nowhere. Nor is the solution a new opposition party in the Sejm - the dream of such liberal socialist campaigners as Edward Lipinski and the famous "59" - it is not a more parliamentary democratic "third Poland" on such lines that will end the riots we have noted with such pleasure. It is a fourth choice, the formation of a new libertarian "Ruch" that will channel the workers' demands towards real anarchy and self-government - and blow up a few more of those ridiculous statues on the way.

G.F.

# AFRICAANS

THE ENFORCED use of Afrikaans in urban South African schools was the trigger for the recent uprising in Soweto.

Schoolchildren and students in Soweto had drawn attention to this particular language situation in education. In spite of appeals over several weeks to all levels of "authority", their rejection of Afrikaans had not been heard. Their nonviolent protests went unheeded and were answered with the calling in of the police and threats of expulsion from school.

Realising that their peaceful protests fell on the "verkrampste" ears of the ruling minority in South Africa, they took their protest to the streets. And what began as a nonviolent protest developed into the most brutal killing of Africans since Sharpeville, when white policemen killed 69 Africans in a demonstration which stemmed from a peaceful protest against the pass laws. "Official estimates" put the dead at 90 in Soweto and the Witwatersrand area, and more than 1,000 Africans are known to have been wounded and over 300 arrested by the police and army.

The police and army used teargas and fired into crowds "to protect lives and property" of the ruling South African classes "at all costs" and have been ordered to use every available means at their disposal to maintain fascism in South Africa.

And what kind of fascism is it?

The Africans have been pushed out of the towns, are controlled more strictly by the police since Sharpeville, are forbidden to form their own rank and file organisations, to meet white women and men, to hold meetings and to take part in the socio-economic decisions of their everyday life. The ruling one quarter of South Africa dictates them what to do. But the oppression and exploitation of three quarters of South Africa's population turns slowly and steadily to the "One day when the whites turn to loving they will find we are turned to hating" (Alan Paton: Cry the Beloved Country)

In the old days the Boer farmers, presiding over his obedient African workers, was confident that he could exploit his workers for ever, could joke with his worker, patronise him, let his children play with his own kids. But now most ruling Afrikaners live in the towns like Durban, Johannesburg, and the "apparent naturalness of the feudal colour-bar" has been replaced by a barrage of legislation and fear. On top of the Afrikaner's irrational attitude and behaviour, there is the old Afrikaner trouble about the natural sexual lure of the Africans. The cases under the Immorality Act have gone up. Hundreds of white women and men have been charged over the last years. And there has been a mounting number of Afrikaners committing sui-

cide in an almost ritualistic fashion, after being charged.

It might be illogical that, having their great wall of apartheid, the Afrikaners should now complain that they cannot see over it. But this is part of a longstanding schizophrenia. They set up a vast police apparatus to prevent real African socio-economic activity and self-realisation, and at the same time complain that the Africans do not seem to talk any more, or even to smile any more.

For the Church, of course, the lack of contact is especially disturbing. The liberal minded pastors are afraid that the Africans are becoming more and more aware of the religious hypocrisy and the antagonistic contradictions in all religions in general.

The ruling class's policy of Bantu education and apartheid is breaking up most social contacts between Africans and white women and men. And the natural bridge between black and white is being smashed by the ruling fascism in South Africa.

The only people who can move easily across the apartheid lines are the **Special Branch**, and they do, in great numbers and all kinds of disguises -- brutal and subtle, black and white, uniformed and plain clothed, assisted by armies of informers like in Nazi Germany. Nearly all the information that the government obtains comes through the Special Branch, through BOSS (Bureau of State Security) and its Special Branch General Van den Bergh.

All their information is obtained through fear, through the techniques of terror which becomes increasingly brazen. The police, jealously preserves its "black kingdom" and people are terrorised through every available means, resembling the horror methods of Nazi Germany. The informers are much more than an extension of the police system. They are the means of corrupting and brutalising a whole society. With the vast differential between black and white wages "a relatively small outlay can produce big returns", and some informers operate simply to pay off old scores, or out of an obsessive desire for security. Many of the "tsotsis", the "gangsters" who once ruled some of the townships, have been brought over to the side of the informers.

"You know, I dare not even tell my own brother what I am thinking," an African friend told me. And this same dehumanisation applies to the few whites engaged on the Africans' side. "The worst part of this job," said one of the white lawyers who is defending political Africans, "is that one has to force oneself to be inhuman. If anyone who I am not sure about comes to me for help or advice, I have to turn him away, in case it is a trap."

To pass behind the "apartheid curt-

ain" today is to pass very briefly from a world of "safety" and boredom into a world of ever-present fear. Since 15 years ago South Africa has developed all the features of a Nazi state run by Gestapo methods.

Talking to Africans is quite impossible these days, and if one tries, one often hears the following sentence: "It is not that we stopped thinking about politics. It is just that our lips are sealed."

Talking to Africans of the middle-aged generation - those who had seen a wider world, and then had been pressed back into a fascist one - the sense of the strain of their lives, the fear, frustration and lack of opportunity, show through in their faces, and in every gesture. Drink is the obvious escape. And many have been destroyed by it.

"Life lost its meaning. Truth to say, the more those guys push us down, the more they get tamer and tamer. It is the fear first, and then the frustration." Talking to such people, shut off from self-realisation, one could imagine that the South African fascists have succeeded in destroying a generation, that they have set about creating a Red Indian situation, of a people decimated by drink and despair. Certainly the whole operation of apartheid, the harrying, moving on, separating husbands from wives and parents from children, seems designed to this end. The system of separating men from their families, on which the diamond and first gold mines were built, has been extended much further. The old Verwoerdian claim that apartheid would strengthen African family life is a mockery. And one Minister, Mr. Fronemann, administrator of the Orange Free State, referred to the wives and children in the urban areas as "superfluous".

## THE FUTURE?

One generation might have been broken, but the events in Soweto show us that one cannot oppress people for ever.

Soweto is just the beginning. Nearly every African thinks of the intolerable frustration in the townships, is conscious that there will, before long, be a massive explosion in South Africa. They can sense it in the packed buses and trains, the barometers of African opinion. And since Sharpeville the police force has been reorganised so that within a quarter of an hour the mobile police can be anywhere in the cities, with dogs, tear gas, and armoured cars, as was seen in Soweto.

The difficulties of African organising their day to day activity had been revealed once quite clearly in the trial of Winnie Mandela and 21 others, who were accused of supporting the banned African National Congress and trying to make contact with the guerrilla fighters. After nine months in detention, prolonged torture and a short trial, the case was dismissed. And they were promptly rearrested under the Terrorism Act.

Some Africans believe that they can

# TURN AGAIN MOSCOW

THE LAST few days of June saw the latest conference of the European communist parties. This conference, however, marked a significant change for conferences of this type. In the past the undisputed champion and overlord of the Communist world has been the Soviet Union and the PCSU has constantly insisted on a centralized Communist organisation in which the Soviet Union provides the lead.

On this occasion, however, the European parties' conference came out with a formal statement which included 3 features for each national communist party. One principle: that of autonomy in the elaboration of policy and the use of criticism. One prerogative: that of diplomatic and political independence. And one method: that of consensus.

This does not mean that the orthodox Communists such as Gierak of Poland, Husak of Czechoslovakia and Honecker of the German Democratic Republic did not put up a fight to keep things as they always were. However, the western

parties of Italy's Berlinguer, France's Marchais and Spain's Carillo won the behind-the-scenes debate to such an extent that even the speeches of different delegates were in conflict in public, which constitutes a major departure from past policy.

Nevertheless there is a certain element of truth in the theory that if the Western European parties have won it is because social conditions are prevailing which allow them to do so. The simple fact of the matter is that whilst the East European parties are struggling both economically and socially and are constantly looking out for signs of almost imminent rebellion, the Western parties are advancing. There is no doubt that the Italian and Spanish parties have recently taken great strides forward.

The Western parties, however, are libing side by side with western capit-

alism and they have seen, much sooner than the eastern parties, that far from greater divergences occurring between western capitalism and the Communist movement, their characteristics are steadily becoming similar. The Italian party, for instance, negotiates political moves in a friendly manner with powerful industrialists like Agnelli of FIAT. The Agnelli brothers have also become more and more openly embroiled in Italian national politics. Further, since the Communist gains in the Regional and Administrative elections in Italy last year, the party in Turin has been busy arriving at many amicable agreements with Agnelli. All this suggests that both parties have seen their interests to ultimately be similar and hence the answer is collaboration.

Both sides have seen that capitalism as we always conceived of it is constantly in crisis. To save the privileges which capitalism has conferred in the past state intervention and a bureaucracy which keeps close control of the workers' actions is essential. Wealthy landowners like Berlinguer (secretary of the PCI) have also seen that the old world which guaranteed their privileges is fast disappearing. However, to attain the same privileged positions as the capitalist bourgeoisie the party officials have to win their so-called "traditional enemies" over and for the bourgeoisie to maintain their privileges they have to win the Communist Party over. The difference with the diehards in the East European parties is that their bureaucratic machines and the privileges it bestows on its leaders has provided them with a reasonably comfortable living for some time. That, coupled with increasing economic difficulties and workers' unrest has made the likes of Gierak slightly more intransigent than several other party leaders.

Hence, we should not be too surprised to see Berlinguer at the European Parties conference offering "a socialist society which has as its base the recognition of the value of collective and personal liberties and their guaranteed existence; ... the pluralism of parties and the recognised possibility of a change in the majorities ruling in parliament; the autonomy of the unions, religious freedoms, freedom of expression, culture, art and science." To achieve this he proposed the "democratic programming of the economy, with the collaboration of the various forms of initiative, both state and private."

Berlinguer's solution would have been described by Bakunin as the "government of science" which he bitterly attacked as the basis for both capitalism and state oppression. Several comrades have now developed the term "techno-bureaucratic government". Small wonder then that in a world where both East and West are fast developing "techno-bureaucratic" features and are increasingly collaborating in trade etc. whilst using each other's existence as a facile excuse to oppose dissent that the West European parties should have won at this conference.

Francisco.

AFRIKAANS

[cont from P. 6]

achieve something by working through the government stooge organisations like the Urban Bantu Councils in the cities or the parliaments in the Bantustans. "If the government wants apartheid, let it have it. We shall open the fraud from inside," Africans argue.

But the limitations of politics in the Bantustans are extreme. Not only that any form of government will prove to be the new oppressor of the people, but also the police are just as active in the Bantustans as in the towns to prevent any kind of libertarian organisation. The Bantustans are not independent and free from governmental interference and intervention at all. The imposition of a fake democracy in the Bantustans may give Africans a taste for libertarian socio-economic organisation and the anarchist philosophy.

Other Africans believe that higher wages will make life "more bearable". They hope for a black consumer society and a black middle class, with everyone getting richer together. And here we are back to the "capitalist optimism" of the white businessmen. The liberal market researchers have been busy in the townships to try to show the scope of the African market. But really they have got disappointed. Their figures show how far South Africa is away from any consumer society. According to the Langschmidt report, 45% of the urban Africans owned none of the stock household possessions, and only 31% had electricity in their homes. The average income of an urban African household (6 persons) is about £29 a month -- about 15% of the average white household. If more of us would

take a closer look at their incomes," concluded Mr. Langschmidt in some dismay, "then we would not be so sanctimonious."

There is a kind of black middle class, of businessmen, doctors or lawyers preoccupied with money-making. Nevertheless, even the rich African, too, can be sent to jail or endorsed out from the townships into the reserves.

More and more Africans, especially after the events in Mozambique and Angola, put faith in the guerrillas coming in from the North, infiltrating villages and agitating the villagers.

Faced with all the dead ends of their situation - the network of informers, the stooges in the reserves, the torturing and killing of Africans by the police, the Terrorism Act which allows unlimited detention and is now applied to any case where it suits the ruling class to have people out of the way and the daily brutal exploitation - the desire for total resistance increases and the language issue of today is just a sign of what will and has to come in South Africa: armed resistance against South African fascism.

As an anarchist I would like to see a free South Africa -- free of all kinds of repression. And I would like to see that the Africans turn back to their decentralised socio-economic communities before the Europeans brought destruction and terror to Africa.

Abraham.

As we were going to press, it was announced that the South African government has rescinded its edict on compulsory use of Afrikaans in school teaching.

## MEETINGS

Saturday 10 July Blackburn ANARCHISM, a day of ideas, debate & plans for the future. 2-10 pm at Regency Hall Blackburn (North-West Anarchist Federation)

Sat. 17 July, London. SOCIAL ACTION Projects (Drug Dependents Care Group) meeting and social gathering 2.30 p.m. at 6 Endsleigh St. WC1. All interested invited.

24th - 26th September, Venice. An International Conference of Bakunin Studies will take place in Venice from the 24th - 26th September. Many scholars have already agreed to participate. All comrades interested in the initiative, and wishing either to send suggestions or financial contributions, or to participate in/be present at the conference, are invited to get in touch with: Nico Berti, C.P. 541, 35100 Padova, Italy

# CONTACT

INTERNATIONAL CAMP France. July 15-Aug. 15 at St. Mitre les Remparts (on Highway D50 between Istres and Martigues, 50 km west of Marseilles). Apply to Frances PORTILLAT, 3 square Guy de Maupassant, Groupe Millon, 13110 PORT-DE-BOUC, France.

NORTH WEST Anarchist Federation for meetings, activities & newsletter write 165 Rosehill Road, Burnley, Lancs.

SOUTH-EAST London Libertarian Group meets Wednesday. Contact Georgina tel. 852 6323

KINGSTON Libertarian Group interested persons contact Pauline, tel. 549 2564

Anarchists/Libertarians Colchester area interested in local group contact Hilary Lester 32 Well esley Rd. Colchester for mtg. details

HYDE PARK Speakers Corner (Marble Arch) Anarchist Forum alternate Sundays 1pm.

Speakers, listeners and hecklers welcomed.

S. E. PARKER, editor of Minus One, is willing to speak on various aspects of anarchism & individualism to groups in London and the Home Counties. For more information write to him at 186 Gloucester Terrace, London W.2.

# PRESS FUND

LEEDS: G. H. L. 50p; LONDON N. 3.: A. L. S. 84p; DERBY: B. C. 70p; BOLTON: G. M. 85p; TEDDINGTON: H. W. L. C. 40p; WOLVERHAMPTON: J. L. £2; J. K. W. 20p; TOKYO: E. M. £16; WIGAN: E. H. 35p; MADRID: M. H. 90p; COVENTRY: J. E. £1; FLOURTOWN, Penn.: W. C. H. £3.24; BRIDGEWATER, Mass.: R. P. H. £3.20; LINCOLN: G. J. E. 50p; GOLD MEECE Staffs: S. G. 35p; LONDON W. 5.: M. M. 50p; LONDON E. 16: G. I. £2.85; In shop: Anons 35p.

TOTAL: £ 34.73

PREVIOUSLY ACKNOWLED: £ 605.94

TOTAL TO DATE : £ 640.67

## GROUPS

ABERDEEN c/o S. Blake, 167 King Street Aberdeen

BATH anarchists and non-violent activists contact Banana, c/o Students Union, Claverton Down, Bath (term-times).

BIRMINGHAM Black & Red Group, Bob Prew, 40x Trafalgar Road, Moseley, Birmingham 13

BOLTON anarchists contact 6 Stockley Ave., Harwood, Bolton (tel. 387516)

BURNLEY. Michael Sweeney, 165 Rosehill Road, Burnley, Lancs. BB11 2QX

CAMBRIDGE c/o Peter Silcock, 51 City Rd.

CORBRY anarchist write 7 Cresswell Walk, Corby, Northants NN1 2LL

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

DUNDEE Alistair Dempster, c/o Students' Union Airlie Place, Dundee.

DURHAM - term time

EDINBURGH Bob Gibson, 7 Union Street, Edinburgh

FIFE - see West Fife

GLASGOW. Jim McFarlane, c/o Charlie Baird, 122 Berneray St. Milton, Glasgow G22 8AY

NEXT DESPATCHING date for FREEDOM is Thursday 22 July. Come and help from 2 pm onwards. You are welcome each Thursday afternoon to early evening for informal get-together and folding session.

GLASGOW Libertarian Socialist Group, 90 John St. Glasgow C1 or tel Dave 339-4236 for details of weekly meetings.

LEEDS c/o Cahal McLaughlin, 12 Winston Gardens, Leeds 6

LEICESTER. Peter & Jean Miller, 41 Norman Street, Leicester, tel. 549652

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

PORTSMOUTH Carolin Cahm, 2 Chadderton Gardens, Pembroke Park, Old Portsmouth

ST. ANDREWS c/o Haggis, Students Union University of St. Andrews

WEST FIFE write John Deming, 164 Apin Crescent, Dunfermline.

Proposed Yorkshire Federations - interested individuals or groups please contact Leeds group

## OVERSEAS

### AUSTRALIA

Canberra Anarchist Group, 32/4 Condomine Court, Turner, ACT 2601

Melbourne Martin Giles Peters, c/o Dept. of Philosophy, Monash University, Melbourne. New South Wales P. Stones, P.O. Box 25, Warrawong, NSW 2502

Sydney F.A.A. and "Rising Free" monthly, Box 92, Broadway, 2007 Australia.

### NEW ZEALAND

Write to the movement c/o Anarchy, P.O. Box 22-607, Christchurch.

## PEOPLE/ORGANIZATIONS/PUBLICATIONS

if KATE SNELLING, or anyone who can tell her, sees this, Liam Bouch would like to hear from her at: c/o Dunn, 1414 London Road, Norbury, London S.E. 16.

We regret our previous issue was incorrectly numbered Vol. 37 No. 12, 26 June 1976. No. 12 was published on 12 June. We hope our library subscribers did not all throw away the 26 June issue on receipt. Will those who did kindly claim replacement immediately.

EDUCATION. Wanted, full- or part-time teachers from September at an independent school supported by the A.S. Neill Trust Assn. Write P. A. Dacre, 12 Harborough Road, Polygon, Southampton, Hants.

ANARCHIST TRANSPORT Workers --an attempt to organise. Contact Adam 01-247 4829

MERSEYSIDE PEOPLE'S HISTORY. The groups need people with a view to taping their memories of local events, Interested in the following 1911 Strike and 'Bloody Sunday'

1919 Police Strike : 1919 the Rhyl mutinies; 1926 General Strike, &c. Memories of people involved in the political and other movements, shop stewards movement, syndicalist-anarchist-IWW-feminist and the political parties of the 'left'. More details from 25 Tumilty Avenue, Bootle, L20 9HU (tel. 051 5763).

WANTED 1st edn. Underground Graphics by Graham Keen and Michel La Rue, Academy Editions. Offer to Mick Cropper, 2 Foshers St. Nuncargate, Kirby-in-Ashfield, Notts.

INTERNATIONAL CAMP, Germany. From 23rd to 26th of July, the Anarchistischen Badischen Federation (Anarchist Federation of Baden) is holding a summer meeting and camp. All interested comrades are invited to contact: Walter Keller, Postfach 12, 6831 Neulusheim, West Germany.

WE WELCOME news, reviews, letters, articles. Latest date for receipt of copy for next Review is Monday 12 July and for inclusion in news section date is Monday 19 July (and receipt by Thurs. 15th is more helpful).

## PRISONERS

DUBLIN ANARCHISTS Bob Cullen, Des Keane and Columba Longmore: Military Detention Centre, Curragh Camp, Co. Kildate, Eire.

MARIE MURRAY and NOEL MURRAY - watch news pages, but protest letters to the Minister for Justice, 72-76 St. Stephen's Green, Dublin 2; the Irish Ambassador, 17 Grosvenor Place, London SW1X 7HR

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

# subscribe

SEND THIS FORM with payment to FREEDOM PRESS, 84B Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX

12 months (26 issues) £ 4.30 (\$10.00)  
6 months (13 issues) £ 2.15 (\$5.00)  
3 months (7 issues) £ 1.16 (\$2.50)

Please send FREEDOM for ... mos. to

.....

address.....

.....

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

## 200 YEARS OF VIOLENCE

THIS YEAR there is being celebrated, with a sickening over-emphasis, the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of America from Britain and consequently the founding of America as a government, state and world power.

The founding fathers of the United States started with less States and more Indians than the present U. S. possesses. In the present welter of patriotism the Americans are apt to forget that the subsequent history of the 'independent' United States was just as bloody, intolerant, acquisitive, civically disruptive, industrially repressive, and racially and minoritally repressive as it would have been had the British retained control.

When the first settlers came to America they found it inhabited, but thinly, by the Indians who were, in the main, a hunting nomadic people subsisting upon the buffalo. As the whites moved westward, the Indians formed little pockets surrounded by white habitations or merged into the general white population. The separation led to hatred and fear which led to the cowboy versus indian mythology which bestrode Hollywood like a colossus. If the Indians lived in White communities they were despised although they were Good Injuns.

The sole temporary exceptions to this relationship to the true 'owners' of America was the Quaker William Penn who established friendly relationships with the Indian tribes in and about Philadelphia and the territory later known as Pennsylvania. However the man of prayer and good works was succeeded (as usual) by the man of business with his dubious treaties.

Arnold and Caroline Rose in America Divided state:

As the Indians were defeated in military combat or subdued peacefully, they were more and more frequently restricted to reservations and aided economically in return for the forced cession of most of the land they once inhabited. The wars between whites and Indians kept up to the end of the nineteenth century, and the process of placing Indians on smaller and smaller enclosures of land continued well into this century. Between 1825 and 1840 Indians throughout the Eastern half of the United States were forced against bitter opposition [from them] and under brutal condition to move to what is now Arkansas and Oklahoma. One-fourth of the Cherokees sent out under military escort died on the way. When the survivors arrived, they were not left alone in peaceful possession of their land, but whites began to invade almost immediately.

By 1940 the Indian population of the U. S. was about 334,000 or 0.25% of the population.

The Pilgrim Fathers, founders of America, were refugees from the intolerance in England and Europe. Settling in America, they instituted their own intolerances and reaffirmed their old superstitions in a series of witchcraft trials in Massachusetts in the 1690s. These trials, mainly of old unpopular women at the denunciation of hysterical children, were taken seriously by the American public, as indeed by much of England and Europe. (England had just completed a cycle of witchcraft trials of its own.)

The credulity of the American mind in its belief in these trials (and they are not alone. Remember the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and the Moscow trials) repeats itself throughout American history in the form of Red Scares and Communist witch-hunts which from time to time recur like

an epidemic. It would seem that with the Americans' belief in their own excellence, any failures or disasters must be put down to supernatural or at least supranational plots.

The institution of slavery was that upon which much of the agricultural prosperity of the United States was founded. This was accepted by the colonists and the founding fathers -- even in the original constitution it was agreed that the slave trade should not be abolished before 1808. By 1850 they were still bargaining and compromising on slavery to the extent that runaway slaves could be returned home. It was not until late in the civil war - ostensibly fought to free the slaves - that the act was repealed (in 1864).

There were slave revolts in 1691, 1712, 1831 in Virginia (Nat Turner's rebellion). In 1829 in Cincinnati whites burnt down 'Little Africa' - the negro quarter - and drove the negroes out of town.

Other revolts in the rising new republic included Daniel Shay's rebellion of the late 1770s when landless farmers impoverished by moneylenders revolted in Massachusetts and started a rebellion which "almost overturned the government of the state and was put down only by very strong measures" (C. A. Beard).

\*

It has sometimes been thought by Americans that they were not as other nations and were free of the taint of imperialism and had no ambitions outside their own boundaries. Not for them the disgraceful European brawls over colonies H. G. Wells described America (and Woodrow Wilson's viewpoint) on the 1914-18 war as "combining the attitude of Pontius Pilate with that of John the Baptist".

Someone coined the phrase 'Manifest Destiny' for America's half-unconscious programme of imperialist expansion. In 1836 Texas "joined" the United States by means of a fifth-column operation Franco would have been proud of. A war with Mexico in 1846 over the boundaries of Texas. The victorious Americans took over California, Arizona, New Mexico for which they paid fifteen million dollars cash. In 1848 gold was discovered in California (for 1848 and 1849 only the total output of gold was \$45 million). In 1850 California was admitted as a state of the Union.

\*

The 'peculiar institution' of slavery was by no means the sole prerogative of the South, although the South, being preponderately agricultural with cash crops of cotton and tobacco, used more manual, female and juvenile labour to which the institution of slavery was particularly useful. There were many voices raised against slavery, Wendell Phillips' and William Lloyd Garrison's being particularly notable. A whole underground network to aid Negro slaves to flee from the South was instituted and the now odious expression 'nigger in the woodpile' was a description of an actual hiding-place for fugitive slaves. Meanwhile the Constitution which had originally enshrined "life, liberty and property" (later changed to "the pursuit of happiness") sanctioned the ownership of slaves as property and the law (often against public opinion) returned runaway slaves to their owners.

William Lloyd Garrison deplored counsels of moderation and in the late 1850s a young abolitionist, John Brown, returned to Kansas from Virginia. He started a campaign to resist slavery. He fought pro-slavery elements and border-troops. He smuggled slaves over to Canada, travelling 1100 miles in 82 days. He moved South to Maryland and seized

the U.S. Armoury at Harper's Ferry. He killed civilians and took hostages. U.S. Marines counter-attacked under Robert E. Lee (later notorious as a Southern commander) and Brown was captured, tried for treason and hanged with five others at Charleston, Virginia. Lincoln deplored John Brown's 'rash act' and not until 1861 did Civil War (to preserve the Union) break out, but the Fugitive Slave Act remained on the Statute book till 1864. Ironically, "John Brown's body" commemorating the hot-headed Brown became a patriotic marching-song.

The causes of the American Civil War (or the war between the States) were very complex and the simplistic explanation that it was fought to end slavery and succeeded in this is incorrect. The Union forces were backed by superior industrial power (which had no need of chattel slavery since it worked by wage-slavery), they also had a larger population. Nevertheless the war dragged on for four years and cost half a million lives. It was notable for new tactics and improved weapons. It produced a panzer-type blitzkrieg against the South (with cavalry) which concentrated on wrecking railway communications, raw-material and foodstuffs stores, and, consequently, involved civilian deaths as a normal by-product of war. Sherman the general in charge of this blitzkrieg uttered the not very original comment, "War is Hell" -- and it was.

After the end of the war there occurred one of the many mysterious assassinations which have bedevilled and enriched American history. Abraham Lincoln was assassinated at the theatre by a third-rate actor, John Wilkes Booth, who jumped from the box on to the stage, delivering (inaudibly) the line "Sic semper tyrannis!" (So end all tyrants!) and injured his ankle. He fled southwards but was captured and shot twelve days after, in a barn, before he could be brought to trial. At the same time attacks were made on the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of State.

Accusations were made of links in the conspiracy with riots at Vermont, fires in New York - including Barnum's museum - and even of a charge that a doctor had tried to produce plague in Northern cities by means of infected clothing. The trial of the conspirators was before a military commission - since the President is by custom Commander-in-Chief. Four conspirators were hanged, including a woman boarding-house keeper who kept the house where the conspirators met. A Dr. Mudd was given life imprisonment for setting Booth's broken ankle. Subsequently he and others in the Dry Tortugas were pardoned after two years for their services in a Yellow Fever outbreak.

However, it is probable that there was some connivance from the President's supporters, notably the Secretary of War, in not impeding - if not facilitating - the assassination which opened the way for a more punitive peace with the South. Parallels with the Kennedy assassination are obvious.

\*

If there is a second pre-eminent folk-figure in American life and literature, it is the private detective or 'private eye' as he has latterly become known. Its re-incarnation as a folk hero has obscured the factual beginning as an 'extra legal police agent' to supply armed men and under-cover agents to large industries; for strike-breaking and other anti-union activity. Robert A. Pinkerton commenced activities in 1866 and the firm has continued in business ever since. The detective as provocateur has run like a scarlet thread through the Molly Maguires affair; the Homestead Strike; the Harry Orchard-Tom Mooney case, the Pullman strike and many more occasions (see Hunter: Violence and the Labour Movement, c.1920).

The Molly Maguires were a secret society of Irish miners who protected their working conditions by terrorist activities in the Pennsylvania coalfields from 1850 to 1877. There were 142 unsolved homicides and 212 felonious assaults in Schuylkill County. Many of the victims were mine superintendents, foremen or colliery supervisors. Arthur H. Lewis in his book on the Molly Maguires writes: "There never was any doubt that the operators of coal mines drove the hardest possible bargain, miners worked long hours,

lived in squalor, died hungry, and their children lived without hope."

Lewis theorizes that the Maguires went beyond the permissible class conflict of workers v. bosses but later incidents in class warfare in the U.S. establish that the newly-risen capitalists of the U.S., victorious in a war between the states exercised their powers to the brutal conclusion, as witness Homestead, Pullman, Chicago, Ludlow, Centralia which wrote their names in blood in American labour history.

Nevertheless the United States is also the birthplace of labour racketeering whereby unionism is just another capitalistic property marketed for 'protection'. (See Adamic's Dynamite and the career of the pro-Trotskyite Jimmy Hoffa). The Molly Maguires may have been the precursors.

The Molly Maguires were broken up by the infiltration of a Pinkerton agent and no less than twenty alleged members of the Molly Maguires were executed. It is always open to question in such cases whether the outrages committed are increased in number and scope by the presence of secret agents eager to provide evidence and incidents to justify repression. The later case of Harry Orchard, employee of the Mine Owners' Association in Colorado, illustrates this amply. (English readers may be interested to know that the Pennsylvania case forms the substance of Doyle's Valley of Fear, a Sherlock Holmes story, Moriarty being named as the master-mind behind it all!)

America has always, dubiously, prided itself upon being a refuge for the politically persecuted -- "the land of the free and the home of the brave". Many of the emigres of the late nineteenth century were anarchists fleeing from Czarist, Prussian and general European governmental persecution. Anarchist history in the US has been enriched by their diversity and steadfastness in the cause of liberty.

Among those who came in 1882 was Johann Most who, according to Hunter, "was perhaps the most fiery personality that appeared in the ranks of the anarchists after the death of Bakunin. A cruel stepmother, a pitiless employer, a long sickness and an operation which left his face deformed forever are some of the incidents of his unhappy childhood." He was elected to the German Reichstag as a social-democrat in 1874. He was forced to leave Germany by Bismarck's anti-socialist laws and established the paper Die Freiheit (then social democratic) in London from where it was smuggled into Germany and Austro-Hungary. He was expelled from the German socialists in 1880 for violent and anarchist ideas. He continued Die Freiheit from London as an anarchist publication in which he published a justification of the assassination of Czar Alexander II (1881). For this, he was imprisoned for sixteen months; after which he emigrated to America.

Most became more and more an advocate of violence. He wrote a rare pamphlet, Revolutionaire Kriegwissenschaft or The Art of Revolutionary Warfare. Like the American Anarchist Cookbook of the 1960s one wonders if it was written by a police agent or a lunatic.

In 1883 Most was active in founding The International Working People's Association which met at Pittsburgh. This congress was libertarian socialist in outlook - the Socialist Labour Party declined to send official delegates but Albert Parsons and August Spies (later executed for the Haymarket bombing) attended. It issued a 'Proclamation' as follows:

By force our ancestors liberated themselves from political oppression, by force their children will have to liberate themselves from economic bondage. 'It is therefore your right, it is your duty' says Jefferson, 'to arm!' What we would achieve is, therefore, plainly and simply:--

- First--Destruction of the existing class rule, by all means, ie by energetic, relentless, revolutionary and international action.
- Second--Establishment of a free society based upon co-operative organisation of production.
- Third--Free exchange of equivalent products by and between the productive organisations without commerce and profit-mongery.
- Fourth--Organisation of education on a secular scienti-

fic and equal basis for both sexes.

Fifth--Equal rights for all without distinction to sex or race.

Sixth--Regulation of all public affairs by free contracts between the autonomous (independent) communes and associations, resting on a federalistic basis.

Most was denounced by Benjamin Tucker, the individualist, for his violence and advocacy of expropriation. Later Tucker was denounced for his compromise and reformism. Hunter, quoting Bebel, gives Most's excesses as "all due to the anti-socialist laws, laws which drove him and many others from the country. Had he remained under the influence of the men who were able to guide him and restrain his passionate temper, the party [Bebel was a socialist] would have possessed in him a most zealous, self sacrificing, and indeed indefatigable fighter."

J.R.  
[To be continued]

# ANIMAL LIBERATION

ANIMAL LIBERATION, Peter Singer (Jonathan Cape, £4.95)

"I argue that there can be no reason - except the selfish desire to preserve the privileges of the exploiting group - for refusing to extend the basic principle of equality of consideration to members of other species. I ask you to recognize that your attitudes to members of other species are a form of prejudice no less objectionable than prejudice about a person's race or sex."

--Peter Singer.

THE RADICAL new social groups and liberation movements of the sixties and the waves of student rebellion through America and Europe were silent on only one (vast) field of oppression -- the abuse and exploitation of other living species. The baby baboon, given injections of lead till, for several weeks before death, he is too weak and blind to grasp a segment of orange or to see properly what is offered him; the raw red broiler bird dropped from his tiny cage to the conveyor belt and suction pipe for "processing", were virtually forgotten. The reason why is the subject of Animal Liberation, written by a young Australian philosopher who had made something of a stir with his article of the same title in the New York Review. In this extension of the article, he puts forward possibly the most clearly thought out argument for animal rights yet written in any language.

The origins of what Richard Ryder, the ex-animal experimenter, first called "speciesism", lie very much in the same place as the origins of "sexism" -- in the Garden of Eden and in that portion of Greek thought which the so-called Christian fathers inherited, and which Descartes brought to its logical conclusion when encouraging the crucifixion of dogs for anatomical study. Of course, the "crankish" counter views were always there - Pythagorus, Montaigne, da Vinci, Voltaire, Bentham etc., and the humanitarian reformers whose animal welfare campaigning led also to the first child welfare societies (the then radical RSPCA formed the NSPCC in Britain after the American animal campaigners had set up the first society for children in New York). But Darwin's theory, though it knocked Man off his pedestal, did not end speciesism, and his writings on sentience in animals did not stop him eating them. Today speciesism is still an integral part of our life style. Orthodox medicine is still firmly based on the (formal) church view that human life is sacred, and human life alone. From egg and bacon to the most extravagant psychological experimentation into physical agony, solitary confinement, parental deprivation and recalcitrant behaviour, speciesism, or discrimination against other living species remains fundamental to our society -- the substance of much of our diet and clothing, our cosmetics and sport; even our war weapons.

Though Singer tends to describe animal research in Swift-like terms of human arrogance (with the difference that the

curing of colic is no longer needed as an excuse for blowing up an animal with a pair of bellows or whatever...) he is careful to avoid the absolutist argument against it, while adding that he wouldn't use it against the use of humans either. His claim is that scientists don't look for alternatives to animal research not because there are none, but simply because they do not care enough about the animals they are using. Yet, as factory farming could be brought to an end by vegetarian boycott and world hunger largely appeased by releasing for human consumption the grain that is now used for livestock, an end to speciesist practices in medicine would involve a transfer to human tissue culture, computer models, gas chromatography, mass spectrometry, more use of films and so on (as well, one might add, as more unorthodox treatment of illness such as that now being used by the nature cure clinics)\*.

\* Peter Singer quotes Lester Brown of the Overseas Development Council as estimating that "if Americans were to reduce their meat consumption by only 10 percent for one year, it would free at least 12 million tons of grain for human consumption - or enough to feed 60 million people, which would be more than enough to save those threatened in India and Bangladesh".

In opposing animal research in medicine as well as in commerce (and they are linked) one has, of course, to face the full weight of argument in favour of "scientific freedom" (who knows when those cucumbers will start producing sunbeams?) But this in no way detracts from Singer's argument for animal rights, based on Jeremy Bentham's reply to Kant: "The question is not, Can they reason? nor Can they talk? but Can they suffer?" Once it is established that they can (as Descartes and the Jansenist experimenters would not accept, for they interpreted the cries of the crucified animals as the noise of so many little clockwork springs uncoiling) the argument against speciesism joins the arguments against racism, sexism and ageism, and has to be considered seriously by those who oppose these other forms of oppression.

Much of the material for Animal Liberation is taken from the scientific and farming journals themselves - the horror stories are those of the experimenters and businessmen alone - and the cool and clear reasoning is rare, and perhaps the greatest virtue of the book. Many of the points are not new, and Singer pays tribute to the valuable work of Harrison, Ryder and others. But his emphasis on constitutional and legal remedies (despite their singular lack of success so far separates him from the "unconstitutional" groups, not only in their acts but in their intellectual approach.

One suspects nonetheless that the illegal actions and the views of militants who are dismissed by Singer and by most of the animal welfare organisations as "rebels or terrorists" will contribute more than their share to the debate, while the sort of work on society and animals undertaken by anarchist study groups like that described in the Italian review Volontà no 4 (July-August 1975) has an evident and important part to play in forming an overall picture of "institutionalised violence". (Here scientific practice is seen as devoting itself to curing symptoms rather than causes, the commercial system is seen as thriving on illness and pain, and the conventional Baconian notion of progress is condemned as forsaking a balanced development in tune with the surrounding environment, for the mastery of man, on man's behalf, over all other forms of life and natural phenomena. Thus exploitation of other species is not a mere malfunction, but has a precise role.)

Though Singer is fully aware of the connection between industry and science and of the political significance of animal liberation, his solutions do not transcend the bounds of parliamentary committees, lobbies and boycotts and his analysis of speciesism does not go further than a study of (western) cultural tradition and prejudice. In this respect, therefore, his approach is fairly limited, but the book is no less valuable for that. And Singer, no doubt, would agree with the conclusion to the anarchists' report: "No liberation of man is thinkable without the parallel redemption of a world which, like the animals' concerns him so closely."

G. F.

THE SECOND and most important half of Woodcock's double thesis is that the revived anarchism of the 1960s and 1970s is not the same as the traditional anarchism which existed until the 1940s, that the new anarchists are essentially different from the old. To reinforce his point he uses the term "neo-anarchism", and he repeats in several ways that the "neo-anarchists" are in various ways not really anarchists at all.

He says that this new form of anarchism had "double roots" -- the American civil rights campaign, and the British nuclear disarmament campaign (which is to take a very restricted geographical and ideological view of the subject). As I mentioned before, he says little about America, but quite a lot about Britain; unfortunately the details he gives reveal his ignorance of what actually happened in this country. Woodcock believes that "some of the anarchist intellectuals and activists of the 1940s, like Herbert Read, Alex Comfort and Laurie Hislam, provided links between classic anarchism and the younger people" in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the Committee of 100; but the three individuals he names (who happen to be old friends of his) did not in fact perform the function he attributes to them.

Herbert Read played no part in the anarchist movement after he accepted a knighthood in 1953, and I doubt whether a single young person was impelled in a libertarian direction by his example during the period in question, though his earlier writings still had some influence. He gave little more than his name to the nuclear disarmament movement, and he used his position not to encourage anarchism at all but to discourage militancy of any kind -- although he did join the Committee of 100 and went on two of its early sit-downs, he resigned at the end of 1961 when it was decided to demonstrate directly against military bases, publicly protesting that it was abandoning non-violence! In 1962 he took the opportunity of being able to give a lecture on anarchism in Buenos Aires to advocate Gandhian pacifism rather than activist anarchism (see the two English versions of the text, in Irving Louis Horowitz's anthology The Anarchists and in the Oxford little magazine Underground). In 1968, just before his death, he contributed an essay on "My Anarchism" to Encounter (of all magazines), confirming that his was a thoroughly philosophical anarchism and emphasising Jung more than any recognised anarchist writer (the essay was reprinted in the new edition of Anarchy and Order in 1974).

Alex Comfort was certainly more clearly anarchist than Read, but in the nuclear disarmament movement he played an ambiguous part alongside the Labour Left, and his more specifically libertarian work in the Committee of 100 was so surreptitious that it had no visible influence. His anarchism was expressed much more through his highly effective work for sexual liberation, which has subsequently made him world-famous -- the novel Come Out to Play (1961) being followed by the textbook The Joy of Sex (1972). The special issue of Anarchy on Comfort rightly treated him as a source of ideas rather than a personal presence (Anarchy 33, November 1963), and his contribution to the developments of the 1960s had already been made in his writings of the 1940s.

As for Laurie Hislam, he may still have been an anarchist at that time, but he preferred to be known as a Christian pacifist, and in any case his influence was negligible.

There were indeed "links between classic anarchism and the young people" in the nuclear disarmament movement, but they were provided not by the kind of people Woodcock imagines but by people he didn't know -- activists not of the 1940s but of the 1950s, who had themselves adopted anarchism before direct action became a mass phenomenon. Some of them were involved in the "formal" anarchist movement, and some of them were inimical to it (see the interview with Alan Lovell in New Left Review 8, March-April 1961, and the comment in Anarchy 3, May 1961); but the point is that, whatever differences there may have been among them, they were active in the nuclear disarmament movement from its beginnings, if not before. Moreover, the "formal" anarchist movement itself provided links through both its personnel and its publications.

Woodcock says that "within the Committee of One Hundred ... there was a spontaneous surge of anti-state feeling -- i.e.

anarchist feeling still unnamed -- and of arguments for the direct action methods favoured by the anarchists"; he either doesn't know or doesn't want to say that this tendency existed well before the Committee of 100 began its activity in 1961 (in the Pacifist Youth Action Group, for example, and the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War), that it was not entirely spontaneous, that it was repeatedly named as being anarchist (by non-anarchists and anti-anarchists as well as anarchists), and that the direct action methods were not just abstractly favoured by the anarchists but were frequently advocated in the anarchist press (see FREEDOM at the time of every demonstration, or Anarchy 13-14, March-April 1962).

Woodcock says that "as a result, small groups of young people began to spring up all over Britain, without much consciousness of the traditions of the historic anarchist movement, and to ally themselves with its veterans who were still running Freedom"; again, he either doesn't know or doesn't want to say that the new groups were set up by young (and not so young) people who were perfectly conscious of their own anarchism and of the traditions of the historic anarchist movement, and that by that time there were newcomers helping to run FREEDOM, including people who had themselves been involved in this process.

Woodcock has given away his ignorance about the process -- but not in the postscript to the new edition of his book. His article in the American magazine Commentary (August 1968), which is reprinted in his book The Rejection of Politics (1972), includes the following revealing passage:

I first became aware of this trend in 1963, when newspaper accounts began to reach me describing the Easter

# HAS ANARCHISM

(Previous instalments of this article appeared in ...)

demonstrations in London, following on the annual Aldermaston march against nuclear armament. I read that behind the banners of the London anarchists five hundred young men and women marched twenty abreast. "The London anarchists came ringleted and bearded and pre-Raphaelite," enthused one reporter. "It was a frieze of non-conformists enviable in their youth and gaiety and personal freedom." ... The new anarchists who marched ringleted and pre-Raphaelite had forgotten Spain and had no use for the old romanticism of the dynamitero and the petroleuse. They were militant pacifists. They represented a trend which had appeared from outside Old Anarchism...

We all know that kind of newspaper reporting, since we have suffered it after every single public appearance for twenty years or more; but Woodcock should have known enough to distrust it, even if he didn't know enough to correct it -- and for that he only needed to read the anarchist newspapers. It is a pity to spoil a good story, but it should be recorded that out of all the thousands of demonstrators in London on Easter Monday 1963 only a small proportion were anarchists, even among those who followed the anarchist banners (which had, incidentally, appeared on the Aldermaston march in 1962); that some did indeed have beards, but few were ringleted and none were pre-Raphaelite in any significant sense; that those who were anarchists had not forgotten Spain (and if they ever did, the anarchist press frequently jogged their memories), and some of them had plenty of use for the old romanticism (thus Stuart Christie, who was arrested in Spain in 1964, had belonged to the Scottish Committee of 100 as well as the Syndicalist Workers Federation; and that few of them were pacifists in the strict sense.

To put it bluntly, Woodcock is just wrong about the people who were the first he heard of the New Anarchism. They did not come out of thin air, but had been on Committee of 100 sit-downs since 1961, on CND marches since 1958, and on all sorts of other demonstrations for years before 1963 -- or 1960-1961, when he wrote his book -- and a large proportion of them had been anarchists for as long as they had been active. They were in fact part of the original New Left -- the

mutual failure of either Communism or Social Democracy to maintain their traditional hegemony of the left during the late 1950s, and the revival of libertarian practice and theory (in that order) in the growing gap.

Woodcock does refer in passing to the New Left, but he fails to recognise the relevance to the anarchist revival of the "old" New Left well before the 1960s on both sides of the Channel and indeed of the Atlantic. To take the British example again, Universities & Left Review and its successor New Left Review frequently contained references to libertarian and indeed anarchist tendencies in current developments. Thus Ralph Samuel noted "a growing conviction that socialism imposed from above ... is false socialism (ULR 2, Summer 1957); Alan Lovell noted in the radical wing of the nuclear disarmament movement "a new attitude to political action ... one that has grown out of the anarchist and libertarian socialist traditions" (ULR 6, Spring 1959), and its tendency towards "a kind of gradual revolution" in which "you take direct action, yet you never actually capture power or anything like that" (NLR 8, March-April 1961); the editors referred to "the 'anarchism' of young New Lefters" (NLR 2, March-April 1960) and described "that anarchism and libertarianism" as "a most fertile element" in the nuclear disarmament campaign (NLR 6, November-December 1960).

It is true that the New Leftists did not understand what they observed -- thus "the anarchist case" was said to be "weak largely because it has not been put" (ibid.); but the old anarchists quickly put them right -- as Colin Ward said, "the anarchist case has been put, for anyone who cared to read it. The point is that it does not appear to have been taken"

# ISM CHANGED

(issues of 17 April, 1 May, and 26 June 1976.)

(Anarchy 3, May 1961). He continued: "The most interesting characteristic of the trend we call the New Left today is the way in which some of its adherents have been groping towards an anarchist approach" (ibid.). And I added: "In fact 'formal' anarchists have been playing a private game with the New Left and the new pacifist movement, finding in their articles and discussions dozens of ideas straight out of anarchism which have been dressed up as new departures in socialism and/or pacifism" (NLR 13/14, January-April 1962).

In fact, the New Left wasn't really all that "new" so far as anarchists were concerned; and the same is true of the New Anarchism which Woodcock is forced to postulate because of his insistence on the death of the Old Anarchism. After all, many of the "veterans" of FREEDOM and other foci of the British anarchist movement appeared on the demonstrations together with the "newcomers", and there was never a clear break between old and new of the kind which Woodcock's thesis demands. Thus Woodcock says that the revived movement later ranged from Anarchy to the Angry Brigade. Yet Anarchy was edited for ten years by Colin Ward, who had been saying the same things in the anarchist press since the 1940s and is still saying the same things in the 1970s -- the difference being that he is now able to say them much more widely than before; and the Angry Brigade, so far as it was anarchist rather than situationist and syndicalist, certainly belonged to the Old rather than the New Anarchism, and should be seen in the context of the international development which is completely ignored by Woodcock but is described, for example, in Albert Meltzer's recent compilation The International Revolutionary Solidarity Movement (Cienfuegos Press, £1.35). It would be quite plausible to propose a counter-thesis to Woodcock, and postulate that both Anarchy and the Angry Brigade could easily be imagined co-existing in the 1880s and 1890s as much as in the 1960s and 1970s.

I have already mentioned Woodcock's extraordinary idea that "the principal mediating figure" in the revival appeal of anarchism was Aldous Huxley, because of his anticipation of the counter-culture which emerged after his death in 1963. If we have to name a single figure in this way, it would surely be Paul Goodman, who had been an active anarchist since the

1940s (see Colin Ward's article in the Goodman double number of the American magazine New Letters earlier this year, as well as Anarchy 11 and 24) as well as being a forerunner of the counter-culture (see the relevant chapter in Theodore Roszak's book The Making of a Counter Culture), and who was one of the most obvious influences on Anarchy. It seems absurd to say that "the British neo-anarchists" through Anarchy "acquired a new generation of sympathetic writers, such as Alan Sillitoe, Colin MacInnes and Maurice Cranston", when one remembers the very few articles by such fellow-travellers and the very many articles, including some by Goodman, Comfort and other figures from the past, which attempted not to establish "neo-anarchism" but to re-establish anarchism.

Woodcock is determined to deny the anarchist nature of as many of the "neo-anarchist" phenomena as he can. Thus he says that the "refusal to accept a definite theoretical line, expressed in a widespread antagonism towards structural thinking and in a tendency to reject not only historicism but also history" means that none of the new movements, such as those of the American, German, or Japanese students, "can in any complete sense be called anarchist"; but which of them have ever claimed to be anything of the kind, or have been claimed to be anything of the kind, or have been claimed to be anything of the kind by serious rather than sensational commentators? A similar absence of a definite theoretical line didn't prevent him from including in the anarchist pantheon such figures as Zapata in Mexico or Makhno in Russia -- but of course that was in the old days. He then says: "It is significant that none of these movements produced a single theoretical work in the field of anarchist thought that is comparable to those produced in earlier periods by Proudhon, Kropotkin or even Herbert Read." I don't know about Proudhon or Kropotkin, but surely theoretical work comparable to that of Read has been produced by Murray Bookchin and George Benello in North America and by Daniel and Gabriel Cohn-Bendit in Western Europe.

Woodcock continues as follows:

Such movements cannot in fact be called anarchist, since they do not fulfil the criteria we have already seen are necessary; those of presenting a consistent libertarian criticism of society as it is, a counter-vision of a possible just society, and a means to advance from one to another.

But they surely fulfil these criteria just as effectively as the movements which Woodcock does call anarchist -- such as the Provos and Kabouters of the Netherlands (who have been strong on criticisms and counter-visions but pretty weak on means, ending up with getting delegates elected on to municipal councils) or the Gandhians of India (who have indeed done wonderful things but who forgot the first enemy, the state). And Woodcock says (knows?) nothing about the many groups which have developed from non-anarchist Marxism towards near-anarchist socialism -- such as Solidarity in Britain or Socialisme ou Barbarie and I C O in France.

In the end, Woodcock's fundamental fallacy is his belief that "the crucial decade was the 1960s". He is so anxious to prove that he was right about the fall of the Old Anarchism that he has to postpone the rise of the New Anarchism to a date after he wrote his book, and then to exaggerate the difference between the two. Of course there have been changes in anarchism since the Second World War, just as there were after the First World War or after the Franco-Prussian War, but there was no sudden essential change in the early 1960s. If there was a "crucial decade" in the recent history of the anarchist movement, it was surely the 1950s. For Woodcock, that was when he left the movement and when for him it ceased to exist; but for thousands of people in this country and in many other countries, that was when they first noticed the existence of the movement and joined it. It is possible that Woodcock's double thesis about the disappearance of historical anarchism and the appearance of some kind of new anarchism has its origins not in political analysis but in personal autobiography, and that those who have had other experiences -- who have lived through the process which he attempts to describe in the postscript to the new edition of his book -- are best placed to evaluate his thesis. It is a pity that there has not been any serious work on the revival of anarchism during the past ten, twenty, or thirty years, and that Woodcock's thesis is likely to be accepted by many people who don't know any better.

N. W.

# RESURGENCE?

TIME RUNNING OUT? Best of Resurgence, Selected by Michael North & Introduction by Satish Kumar (Prism Press, paperback)

THESE SELECTIONS from Resurgence are so extensive that they make it difficult for the reviewer to make a short and adequate review. The subjects covered are industry, land, nutrition, morality, Third World economics, the E.E.C. and many other subjects, all treated from a social angle.

Michael North, who selected the items, says in his introduction:

Christopher Booker's The Neophilacs records the epidemic of mindless novelty-seeking that swept Britain in the mid-60s, spawning the "Swinging London" of David Frost, the Rolling Stones and others thankfully forgotten. It was at this time that the first issue of Resurgence appeared, the very name indicating an attempt to climb out of the abyss of febrile trendiness into which it seemed a whole society had fallen.

Whilst one must beware of lapsing into Puritanism, in the field of fun professionalism and consumerism encourage the non-participation of the mass of people. A free society would be full of fun and participation in all spheres of human life and experience.

It is significant that, as Michael North says, Resurgence came out of the disillusionment with the Peace Movement and the Committee of 100. It may be said that Pacifism is not enough. A peaceful society can only be a society without privilege.

The present editor of Resurgence, Satish Kumar, says

Resurgence is not exactly a magazine of ecology or of the peace movement although all of these ideas are very strongly represented in its pages. The problems of our society are caused by narrow, specialist analysis. Marxists see the solution in the removal of economic injustice, anarchists advocate the dissolution of the power of the state, educationists propose the radicalisation of teaching and learning and enlightened scientists urge alternative technology. Whilst some people attach greater importance to the rational, intellectual, scientific way to experience and reality, others take the path of feeling, emotion, belief and mysticism. These approaches are all valid and necessary but none of them is complete in itself.

It has to be said that the pacifist and ecological lobby tends to come from the privileged middle class which tends to balk at grasping the nettle of the problem of power, privilege and property -- the root of most of the problems that are dealt with in this compendium. It must be repeated that all of us who use more than our share of space, food and energy are to that extent among the privileged.

It could be argued that many anarchists are too narrow in their comprehension of the breadth of anarchist thought and maybe our contemporary Resurgence corrects that. However once cannot ignore the relevance of, say, Kropotkin's Fields, Factories and Workshops

The following quotation by the first editor of Resurgence (John Papworth) contains little that anarchists would disagree with.

The answers the Marxists have sought to provide here are unacceptable, if only on the grounds that a class analysis of these problems fails to provide any clues to their solution. The main threat of war stems not from capitalism but from power, and there is today

sufficient evidence to indicate that even nations from which capitalism has been formally abolished do not hesitate to raise huge armies, engage in the arms race, and embark on war when they feel it suits their purposes. Neither do they differ from capitalist governments in creating, or failing to solve, the other major problems looking upon us. The deliberate squandering of natural resources (posterity's heritage temporarily in our keeping) is not less marked in China than it is in the U. S. A., and the cruel tragedies of alienation not less evident in Moscow than they are in London.

\*

There are many articles by E. J. Schumacher ("Small is Beautiful") on economics, industry, progress, etc. Elsewhere he has said of contemporary economists and politicians "they are rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic". Here he points to the problems of industrialisation and urbanisation in developing countries, where economic pressures enforce the mass migration of peasants into centres of indescribable squalor serving a technology that is quite inappropriate, problems resolvable through intermediate technology. Working in London recently made me realise the increase in noise and the enormous waste and unproductive consumption of resources on unproductive activity by unproductive people. But, back to the underdeveloped and to Schumacher:

It must never be forgotten that modern technology is the product of countries which are "long" in capital and "short" in labour, and that its main purpose, abundantly demonstrated by the trend towards automation, is to substitute machines for men. How could this technology fit the conditions of countries which suffer from a surplus of labour and a shortage of machines?

Here it must be remembered that the West is "long in capital" largely because of the undervalued exploitation of primary producers. What goes back in largely unproductive aid is in effect poor return.

In his article on Buddhist economics, Schumacher uses Bertrand de Juvenal's characterisation of 'Western man' to point the contrast: "He tends to count nothing as an expenditure, other than human effort; he does not seem to mind how much mineral matter he wastes and, far worse, how much living matter he destroys. He does not seem to realise at all that human life is a dependent part of an ecosystem of many different forms of life. As the world is ruled from towns where men are cut off from any form of life other than human, the feeling of belonging to an ecosystem is not revived. This results in a harsh and improvident treatment of things upon which we ultimately depend, such as water and trees."

Anarchists will agree with Schumacher that any activity that disregards mankind as the stem from which all things will flower is bound to have the results we see around us, and in "Industry and Morals" he points out the irrationalities of our leaders:

"We preach the virtues of hard work and restraint, while painting utopian pictures of unlimited consumption without either work or restraint."

## MORE THAN URBAN RENEWAL

There is a fable by Leopold Kohr which criticises contemporary attitudes of planning and architecture: "How to turn a teeming slum into a splendid little city through 'nuclear seeding' ", and in an interesting article on the economics of progress he quotes Aristotle who suggested "the best limit of the population of a state... the largest number which suffices for the purposes of life, and can be taken in at a single view".

As I have said elsewhere, we live in a bland atmosphere, eat bland food and consume bland entertainment. Michael Allaby writes on "the politics of nutrition". The production of food, its processing and distribution, is of course a political and economic process in which the nutritional function of food has become a minor consideration. Indeed, many of our food habits have created medical problems of their own.

John Papworth's article on "The Dangers of a United

Europe" follows largely anarchist criticism as he observes that the clamour for it came from the apex of society not the base of our society. Of these forces at the apex he says:

The relationship between these forces illustrates one of the more disquieting symptoms of the intellectual malaise of our time. During the past 100 years the minority forces of large scale profit and power questing have shown an increasing efficiency in fostering upon the community at large their own values and assumptions and then persuading the generality of people that they (i. e. the people) have arrived at them independently.

Leopold Kohr talks about "Critical Size", and many of us without the erudition of Professor Kohr have come to largely the same opinion from sheer experience. As he points out, one of the reasons for chronic economic troubles is that they are "a consequence of the inner instability of the overgrown". An anarchist would remark that this tendency is inherent in power-based society.

There is an article by pacifist-anarchist Ronald Sampson about disarmament. On the question of power over men he says

If therefore, I myself, by my own labour, by my own sweat and skill, produce none of those things which I must consume, no argument in the world can conceal the fact that whatever else I do, I am fundamentally parasitic, living off the toil of my fellow men.

Stated baldly like that, it may seem harsh or doctrinaire. But it is necessary to recognize that this principle is impregnable. Departure from it is what makes possible the whole vast edifice of exploitation, which is itself a fundamental cause not only of poverty but also of war.

Talking about the use of land, Schumacher says, "Man cannot beggar the land without beggaring himself and there is ample evidence that today he is doing just this," and quotes a Nigerian chief who said, "I conceive that land belongs to a vast family of which many are dead, few are living, and

countless members are still unborn."

Talking about land there is a conversation between Satish Kumar and Vinoba Bhave, and Geoffrey Ostergaard's article on "The Significance of Gramdan".

In an article on "The Politics of Pollution" John Papworth points out how difficult it is for our society to react to the threats to human existence. A rubric inserted in his article quotes from a review by Angus Maude in *The Spectator* (20 Sept. 1969) of E. J. Mishan's *Growth: The Price We Pay*

... the area of personal choice may be actually contracting. As individuals, for example, we have less and less choice about whether to accept aircraft noise, petrol fumes, pollution, traffic chaos and many other 'disamenities'. . . That we should still be trying, at immense cost and loss of amenity, to distort our environment to suit the design decisions of automobile manufacturers is a reversal of common sense which will no doubt seem incredible to our descendants.

There is an interesting article by Geoffrey Ashe on the early Kibbutzim, and an article by Vinoba Bhave on education is illustrated with a quote from Thomas Hodgkin in 1823:

Men had better be without education than be educated by their rulers; for this education is but the mere breaking in of the steer to the yoke; the mere discipline of the hunting dog, which by dint of severity is made to forego the strongest impulse of his nature, and instead of devouring his prey, to hasten with it to the feet of his master.

On the whole I can thoroughly recommend this to FREEDOM readers and am inclined to endorse another quote used: "People who talk about revolution and class struggle without referring explicitly to everyday life, without understanding what is subversive about love, and what is positive in the refusal of constraints, such people have a corpse in their mouth."

Alan Albon.

# REVOLUTIONARY POET

TORMENTO, Virgilia D'Andrea (Galzerano editore, 84040 Casalvelino Scalo (Salerno) Italy.

THERE IS something touching in Giuseppe Galzerano re-rinting Virgilia D'Andrea's book of poems *Tormento*. It shows a face of anarchism one does not frequently come across these days, and one hopes is not disappearing, that of loyalties and affections. As he states it himself, Galzerano fell in love with Virgilia's lyricism, feelings and words. In her poems the natural beauty of the Italian language meets with ardent aspirations to a world of brotherhood, with a strong sense of injustice, deep indignation and incitements to revolt. We cannot be far wrong in guessing that Galzerano saw in them his own feelings, and found them heightened and transmuted by the magic of rhythm and rhyme into a constantly renewable enthusiasm. We cannot be far wrong, either, in guessing that Galzerano sees the proper function of poetry in denouncing the oppressors and calling the oppressed to break their chains. This, too, is touching. It stands for an innocence and a candour one would have thought impossible in our day and age. But then we have another anarchist poet, the Bulgarian Alexandre Christov, who feels in the same way and writes verses not unlike those of *Tormento*. I say verses, and not poetry, because Virgilia D'Andrea is too easily and too often carried away by the besetting sin of much Italian poetry, rhetorical emphasis. She also wrote

with a purpose.

Not content with expressing her feelings, she wrote to make others feel the same as she did. That is fatal to poetry, for it turns language, and even the poet's feelings, into a means to an end. Adjectives are the words whose emotionally laden intention is most apparent, and adjectives in Virgilia D'Andrea's poems are particularly abundant. The same adjectives have also a tendency to recur, and can be grouped in two sets, one of praise and the other of condemnation. It is all too predictable to which lot of people each set will apply. Given the title of a poem, one knows what words, even what imagery to expect, and much that is said in one poem could fit quite well in another. This predictability runs counter to the creativeness of the poetic act. A question of sincerity comes into it, too, though not of sincerity as usually understood. An actor can play his part most sincerely; he plays a part nevertheless. So Virgilia D'Andrea may have been most sincere in her vocation as a revolutionary poetess, but the impression cannot be avoided that she is too often and too consciously fulfilling a role. It is painful to read poems like the one on the occupation and surrender of factories (1920) or the one about the rough blows dealt by the Fascists to the working class ("Rovine", 1922) because of the incongruousness of her exalting the heroism of the workers while reproaching them for not being rebellious enough, and of her painting victory in glowing colours while acknowledging bitter defeat. She is at her best when she forgets her role and strikes a more personal note, for example in her very first poem about her childhood and adolescence. Also whenever she talks of women, her verse vibrates with an existential note, be it one of compassion for the poor or of hatred, perhaps mixed with envy, for the rich. Virgilia D'Andrea had a striking personality; she suffered poverty, imprisonment and exile; she played her role of revolutionary poetess in real life; and that is why, detached from the impact of her person, and from the situations that prompted them, her poems are not of the kind a poet falls in love with.

G. Baldelli.

# THROUGH THE ANARCHIST PRESS

## INTERROGATIONS

THE JUNE issue of Interrogations contains its usual wide range of articles. The one most out of line with the magazine's editorial aim of dealing with contemporary problems and issues is one on "Trotsky y la Revolucion española" by Ignacio Iglesias (in Spanish), in which he shows that Trotsky's "analysis" of the revolution was in fact an attempt to fit the reality of the Iberian situation to a model derived from the course of the Russian revolution of 1917.

Trotsky's emissaries relayed back to him exactly the "information" and the "analysis" which he wanted and in which he had instructed them before they left for Spain. Trotsky's main interest in the revolution was criticising the POUM for not acting as the Bolsheviks did in 1917. Iglesias, who was a militant in the Trotskyist Spanish Communist Opposition, and later held a leading position in the POUM, acknowledges and analyses the true mistakes of the latter organisation (mainly its attitude to the CNT) and points out that Trotsky called attention to none of them. His conclusion is: "Karl Marx, in his own time, pointed out the tendency of revolutionaries to imitate the prominent figures of past revolutions. Up to the last moments of his life, Trotsky strove to imitate himself."

Since present-day Trotskyist sects tend to base their analysis of their contemporary situation on whatever the Prophet wrote about their country (the WRP, for instance, seems to operate on the basis of his 1924 squib "Whither goes Britain?"), and since there exists a 446 page compilation of his writings on Spain 1931-39 in English (published by Pathfinder Press), this article is a useful piece of demystification.

Another article which appears out of place in Interrogations, at first sight, is one by Pierre Clastres on "La question du pouvoir dans les sociétés primitives" (On the question of power in primitive societies), in French. The author is an ethnologist, and the aim of his article is to defuse the conventional account of the "evolution" of society.

So-called "primitive" societies are supposed, in the theory which underlies most interpretations of the development of society (particularly, that of Engels) to be the starting point of a desirable evolution which is characterized by a separation between society and power with the State presenting itself as the agency responsible for assuring the well-being of all. According to Clastres, such a view is full of ideological prejudice. 'Primitive' society is not at the beginning of history, it is adult and refuses the division between the rulers and the ruled, rejects inequality, and protects itself against the danger of the State.

This too is useful demystification, a useful argument when people start em-

ploying the big words like 'society' and 'nature' to put down your anarchist views.

The other articles in Interrogations have a more direct contemporary relevance. Sam Dolgoff writes (in English) a description of the "Structure of Power in Cuba", using judiciously culled items from the official CP paper Granma to expose the construction of a new élite in Castro's island; Marie Martin writes (in French) of the inevitable bureaucracy of the international trade union organisations, of the gap between what they could do in the way of protecting workers, and what they do do because they are, in fact, staffed by professional bureaucrats (the only kind of people who will take such a job on); Vaclav Havel, the Czech playwright, writes an open letter to Husak, the general secretary of the Czech Communist party, on "Conformism by fear"; there are extracts from the new anarchist programme, approved by the Italian Gruppi Anarchici Federati at their Assembly in March this year (in Italian); a letter from Chile, commenting on the article by Santiago Parane in Interrogations no. 2; and an article on the Portuguese army, by Joëlle Kuntz (in French) demonstrating that its character has not been changed in any real way through the eighteen months of "revolutionary rapture".

All in all, yet another very useful issue (available from Freedom Bookshop for £1 + 9p post).

## Bolletino del Centro Documentazione Anarchica

The June issue is devoted to the "Portuguese experience". The issue is almost entirely taken up by a long article by Charles Reeve, translated from the French "leftist" "councillist" magazine Spartacus, on the context of, and the lessons to be learned from the abortive coup of November 25th 1975. There is also a round-up of articles about the Portuguese revolution which have appeared in the Italian anarchist press since April 1974.

The latest pamphlet publication of the "Centro Documentazione Anarchica" is, in fact, the complete text of the G.A.F. anarchist programme, together with an open letter from G.A.F. to the anarchist movement, and a republication of Amadeo Bertolo's article on "The Historic compromise and the fascist peril" which first appeared in Interrogations.

## A--RIVISTA ANARCHICA

The June issue of "A" (which is produced for the most part by members of G.A.F.) has articles on the "false choice" presented by the politicians in the Italian elections, on the need for counter information to combat the influence of the mass media, on sexual revolution, on social workers, and on the rights of children to freedom and happiness (a discussion of the ideas of A. S. Neill).

## ANARCHISMO

Of course, not all the anarchist magazines in the Italian peninsula are produced by G.A.F. From the toe of the boot, Sicily, comes the latest issue of Anarchismo (no. 8), edited by Alfredo Bonanno. This issue has articles on "Councils, self-management, and present developments of proletarian autonomy", "The reactionary bases of the Italian Communist Party" by Bonanno, "The revolt of the winegrowers in the French Midi" by Giordana Charuty, a translation of John Zerzan's "The revolt against work in the U.S.A.", and an article on "Ireland and national liberation struggle" by Dan Bennett. (All in Italian.)

## LANterne Noire

Away from Italy, the fifth number of La Lanterne Noire devotes its lead article to "The anarchist movement in Spain in 1976". Its author is Freddy, who also contributes to the F.I.J.L. monthly Frente Libertario. Other articles contain more information about GARI, several of whose militants are still in jail awaiting trial, about the student strikes at French universities, and book reviews.

## EQUALITY

The latest two issues of Equality (an A4 sheet issued by the Kropotkin Society, Evansville, Indiana) nos. 6 & 7 feature, respectively, an article on anarchism in America in the early 20th century by Irving Abrams, and on Robert Reitzel, a German anarchist who emigrated to the USA in 1820 at the age of 21. D. L. M.

## BOOKS FROM FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

BOOKSHOP open Tues.-Fri. 2 - 6 pm  
(Thursdays until 8.00 pm)  
Saturdays 10 am - 4 pm.  
(Aldgate East underground station,  
Whitechapel Art Gallery exit and turn  
right. Angel Alley next to Wimpy Bar)

When ordering by mail please add postage as in brackets.

Michael Taylor: Anarchy & Co-operation. £5.95 (32p)

People and their settlements - aspects of housing, transport and strategic planning in the U.K. Papers for a conference held in London, January 1976 as a contribution to the NGO Forum on Habitat, June 1976. Contributors include Colin Ward, John Turner. £1.00 (14p)  
Michael North (Ed.): Time Running Out? : The best of "Resurgence" £2.25 (47p)

\*Murray Bookchin: Our Synthetic Environment (revised edn.) £2.50 (32p)

\*Bill Henderson (Ed.): The Publish-it-yourself Handbook: Literary Tradition and How to. £2.50 (47p)

\*David Boadella: Wilhelm Reich : the evolution of his work. £2.95 (47p)

Roger Price : 1848 in France (Documents of Revolution ser.) £1.95 (23p)

\*denotes published in USA