

PETRA KRAUSE

PETRA KRAUSE, the left-wing Italian militant whose case was described in the June 21st and October 11th 1975 issues of FREEDOM is still awaiting trial after 17 months' imprisonment in Zurich, Switzerland. On 19th June this year, together with another prisoner, Verena Schob, she began a second hunger strike in protest against the conditions in Swiss jails. Her first hunger strike from September 17th to October 4th last year failed to win any concessions from the prison authorities. At a recent press conference by the Committee Against Solitary Confinement (Komitee gegen die Isolationshaft), Petra Krause's own lawyer, RA Bernard Rambert said: "This is the last weapon that our clients can use now their many protests have been rejected".

Verena Schob was arrested on October 20th last year on an explosives charge shortly after her return from India and, like Petra Krause, her already precarious state of health has been aggravated by the harsh conditions in the Zurich prison. Petra Krause is facing charges of arson, and weapon stealing and is a suspected member of NAP, a group of left-wing activists in Italy. For many years she has been involved in social work and was a member of the pacifist anti-bomb group, Anti-H. Both women have been kept in solitary confinement since arrest with all the physical and psychological consequences that this involves. From March 13th 1975 at least 13 people have died in Swiss prisons, many after hanging themselves while being kept in isolation (though for many countries this is by means a large number). Petra Krause is suffering from an eye disease and from small tumours in various parts of the body and may not survive unless she receives proper medical treatment. Her lawyer has tried to obtain permission for specialists to visit her in prison, but the request has been refused on the usual security grounds.

The demands made by the two women when beginning their hunger strike are modest enough - abolition of solitary confinement, permission to take one hour's exercise in the fresh air and to be treated by a doctor of their own choice, and withdrawal of the blinds from their prison windows. In a joint statement they also showed their concern for other prisoners, especially foreigners who speak no German and have no money. They cited examples of a Columbian who, after 5 months' imprisonment, received a copy of her indictment in German. Not only could she not understand it, she had no lawyer or money to obtain a translation. A Turk, also without money or lawyer was unable to inform her family of her imprisonment because she could not pay for the cost of translating the letter from Turkish into German for the benefit of the censor!

The Committee Against Solitary Confinement has been trying to gather support for reform of the prison system in Switzerland, where conditions are said to be worse than in West Germany, Solitary confinement in Zurich appears to be the rule rather than the exception. The Committee attacks the "absolutely indefensible conditions" of both the district prisons and the police barrack cells (where prisoners are initially held). Under these conditions the prisoners can only enjoy one half hour in the open air four times a week, and on holidays the cell

doors may stay shut for five days at a time. Then all they see of the outside world are the hands of the warden pushing food through the hatch. The prison group of the women's liberation movement in Zurich points out that not one common cell for women exists in the whole canton and in Winterthur and Bulach prisons it is not even permitted to go for a walk.

The address of the prison where Petra Krause and Verena Schob are being held is, for letters, Bezirksgefängnis, 8026 Zurich, Postfach 762; for parcels, 8004 Zurich, Kanzleistr. 48. The prison governor is Herr Ruegg (Gefängnisverwaltung des Bezirksgefängnisses Zurich, Kanzleistr. 8004 Zurich).

POHLE

RALF POHLE, an alleged member of the Red Army Fraction, being hunted by West German police was arrested recently in Athens, and the West German government are trying to have him extradited. A Committee for the Liberation of Ralf Pohle (87a Benaki Street, Athens 145, Greece; telephone Athens 636 896) has been formed, and they held a demonstration on Friday July 30th at which the Greek police made many arrests.

Rumours have been spread that many members of the Red Army Fraction are in Greece. It is not known whether this is true or not, but the police are using it to harass members of the anarchist movement who are taking part in the Committee. A law was passed a few days before the demonstration rendering supporters of "terrorists" liable to a charge of complicity, with a penalty of ten years imprisonment. The police are trying to involve the whole anarchist movement in Greece in a terrorist conspiracy for the liberation of Ralf Pohle and the overthrow of the social order.

At the moment the Greek government is trying to get into West Germany's good books as they are making efforts to get into the Common Market and Germany is resisting for fear of being flooded with Greek immigrant labour in a time of falling employment. The Greek anarchist movement needs solidarity in all forms, particularly demonstrations outside Greek embassies

VALPREDI

EIGHT PEOPLE, including the former head of the Italian Ministry of Defence's counter-intelligence service, have been sent for trial in Rome on charges arising out of the bombing of a Milan bank in December 1968.

This is the bombing which killed sixteen and for which Pietro Valpreda was put on trial, and during investigations for which Pinelli fell or was pushed to his death. Valpreda and others are still only on provisional liberty awaiting trial.

It is alleged that the whole affair was part of a 'strategy of tension' when outrages were carried out by right-wingers, blaming the left, with some official connivance and backing. Officials allegedly provided a cover-up campaign preventing the judiciary from investigating the affair. General Vito Micelli, involved in these plots, is claiming parliamentary immunity.

LIFE ON EARTH?

Dateline: Planet Utopia

AFTER MINOR problems like preventing people exercising power over others, eliminating war and violence and seeing that all our people had enough food, clothing and shelter, we of Utopia decided to make an exploration of the planet Earth, not for any purpose of espionage, conquest or exploitation but just to satisfy our curiosity. As we sit and look at Earth glowing in the sky at night we have wondered if it was inhabited by thinking beings like ourselves.

We observed that the Earth was green with vegetation and there was a great deal of water so that food could not be a problem and there would be no problem provided their mental development was up to the level of ours.

Our more advanced philologists picked up messages from earth indicating in their strange tongue - they actually use speech produced by their mouths, lips and throats - that this food was blocked in its circulation by money, which seems to be a sort of metal (and sometimes paper) which in some cases effectively provides a barrier, stopping food getting to the people who need it.

It is, according to our philologists, unlikely that the inhabitants of earth are human in the sense that we understand it. It is possible they are a species of vermin without the purposefulness or capacity of vermin for co-operation. It is possible that they were parasites upon some human host who died of their venom, but there is evidence that they constantly make war on each other for the sake of differences of colour, say red and white, green and orange, black and white, and are perpetually ready to kill each other, unlike animals, for the sake of disagreements.

In the course of their long agitations they have succeeded in almost making the Planet uninhabitable with gaseous discharges which almost reach to this planet.

It was decided on the most careful research that there was no life, as we in Utopia know it, on the planet Earth and that therefore there was no purpose in visiting it.

Jack Spratt.

FISH IN THE WATER

"Many people think it impossible for guerillas to exist for long in the enemy's rear. Such a belief reveals lack of comprehension of the relationship that should exist between the people and the troops. The former may be likened to water and the latter to the fish who inhabit it. How may it be said that these two cannot exist together? It is only undisciplined troops who make the people their enemies and who, like the fish out of its native water, cannot live."

THIS, ONE OF the golden thoughts of Chairman Mao on guerilla warfare, has been echoed by other guerilla leaders like Guevara and Giap and been accepted almost as gospel by the revolutionary Left ever since. Apart from the fact that like all generalisations it is false there is one danger in accepting this gospel that is nearly always overlooked, and that is the fact that it has been used by governments in the past to introduce oppressive measures against innocent non-combatants under the guise of crushing insurgency. Guevara himself paid with his life for taking this fish-water analogy too literally but even long before his death it had been disproved in a situation much nearer home.

Following the establishment of the Irish Free State a war developed between the IRA and the Free State troops. At that time the IRA claimed, and with some justification, that they had widespread support throughout Ireland and using the Irish countryside as a base they launched a campaign of rural guerilla warfare against the Free State troops. The result of that campaign was that the IRA was crushed by regular forces directed by a government that was prepared to use ruthless methods. Yet if we are prepared to accept the ideas of another of our modern theorists of guerilla warfare, Marighella (a theorist much admired by the Provisionals), the opposite ought to have happened, i.e. the climate of repression introduced by the government ought to have guaranteed the survival of the IRA.

LETTERS

One significant cause of the failure of the IRA was that it often requisitioned transport or other necessities "in the name of the people" or forcibly billeted its irregular forces in farmhouses and cottages and expected the people, often poor enough themselves, to feed and bed the guerillas. (How often has this been done by regular forces in hostile territory in many theatres of war, and are we therefore to consider the inhabitants of such occupied territory as supporters of foreign troops?)

It is undeniable that republican and loyalist paramilitaries do have a measure of support in certain areas of Belfast at the present time but it is important to recognise that paramilitaries, more often than not, exist in a sea of apathy, and to attempt to analyse the nature of the support given which fluctuates in degree according to the circumstances of the moment, but which is mainly passive and not active.

There have been very many cases in Belfast where people living in loyalist or republican areas have been forced to store arms and explosives under the threat of execution. Houses have been taken over, the occupiers

been locked in a room, and the house used as a position for sniping or for the assembly of bombs. Men have had their cars hijacked and their wives and children held as hostages while a bomb has been placed in the car and the driver ordered to place the car in the vicinity of a selected target. Only after these orders have been carried out are the hostages released.

In the light of these facts it is nonsensical to assert that all of the ghetto areas in Belfast are terrorist havens. And who are loudest in such assertions? None other than Ian Paisley and his "final solution" followers who want the army to invade catholic areas and "flush out the IRA". The existence of loyalist terrorism (and it was loyalists and not republicans who introduced terrorist tactics into the present conflict even before 1969) is conveniently forgotten and the excuse offered is nothing more than a variation of the fish-water analogy of Chairman Mao.

The fish-water analogy can thus be seen to be a double edged weapon and even when it is used by the urban guerillas themselves it needs to be borne in mind that it can be used to conceal much more than it reveals. It is one of the many revolutionary illusions that libertarians can well dispense with and rely instead upon their customary practice of thinking for themselves.

H. B.

ISRAEL

The letter from Gabriel Javscas published in the last issue of FREEDOM (24th July) presumably refers to an article included in the issue of May 1st about the work undertaken by Merag in Arab-Israeli co-operation ("General Strike Against Zionism"). Mr Javscas berates FREEDOM, as an anarchist paper, for publishing such "cheap communist propaganda", but it is hard to detect the remotest understanding of anarchism in the criticisms and assertions he makes.

To begin with he sees Israel as a democratic, free state with "anarchic communes" and full rights for its ethnic minorities. Leaving aside the argument as to whether a state can really be democratic or can bestow any kind of real freedom, this is an extraordinarily naive picture. Moreover, it is simply untrue.

For one thing, there is a difference between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is racialism; anti-Zionism is opposition to Jewish nationalism which has turned a blind eye to the need for Israel to develop towards a fully multi-racial community. This will not be easy, but it is realistic, and in the long run it will be in the interests of the Jewish people as much as the Arabs. In the meantime, to deny discrimination is just dishonest.

During my own stay in Israel I was, in fact, not only made aware of discrimination against the Arab population but against the Sephardi Jews as well, whose origins and culture are closer to the Arabs than to the Ashkenazi Jews of northern Europe. Now the continuing expropriation of land farmed by the Arabs, especially in Galilee and the Negev, the riots in March and the sacking of many Arabs from their jobs is a strange sort of freedom; not can it be of much comfort to the Arabs concerned to know that Czechoslovakia is a totalitarian state!

One gets the feeling that Mr Javscas would

call anyone anti-semite who dared to criticise the policies of the Israeli government, and one can only regret that he has failed to learn anything from his reading of anarchist publications. To attack racialism in Israel is not to be anti-Jewish, any more than to attack racialism in America or Russia is to be anti-American or anti-Russian, or to attack certain Palestinian policies is to be anti-Palestinian.

Zionism began with Herzl as an understandable form of nationalism - the longing for a homeland for a persecuted people, who returned to Palestine with high ideals and great courage. But the Zionist state has repaid injustice with injustice, and the tragic diaspora of the Palestinians was never inevitable. If Mr Javscas can find no sympathy for the joint initiative being taken by a few Jews and Arabs in fighting, as Merag puts it, for "equal distribution of available resources and equality of human, civil and political rights to all individuals and all communities", then that is his problem and not ours.

G.F.

F.P.

PUBLICATIONS

- COLLECTIVES IN THE SPANISH REVOLUTION
Gaston Leval, 368pp. Cloth £ 4 (48p) \$10
Paper £ 2 (42p) \$5
- LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION
Vernon Richards 240pp. Cl. £ 1.50(48p) \$4
Paper £ 0.75(42p) \$2
- ABC OF ANARCHISM, Alexander Berkman
32pp 25p (11p) 75c
- ABOUT ANARCHISM, Nicolas Walter 32pp
15p (6p) 40c
- ANARCHISM AND ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM, Rudolf Rocker. 48pp 20p (9p) 65c
- ANARCHY, Errico Malatesta, 54pp
25p (9p) 75c
- BAKUNIN & NECHAEV, Paul Avrich, 32pp
20p (9p) 65c
- THE STATE, ITS HISTORIC ROLE, Peter Kropotkin, 56pp. 20p (11p) 65c
- NEITHER EAST NOR WEST, sel. writings 1939-48 M. L. Berneri 192pp. 35p (16p) \$1



"WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, IS THAT I SHOULD WORK HARDER, EAT LESS AND HELP THE COUNTRY BY SACKING MYSELF."

FROM THE BEGINNING, the Chinese Communist Party was a bourgeois organization. The party was structured along hierarchical lines. It was a miniature state. It assimilated all the forms, techniques and mentality of bureaucracy. Its membership was schooled in obedience and was taught to revere the leadership. The party's leadership, in turn, was schooled in habits born of command, authority, manipulation and egomania. At the same time, the party was the spineless follower of the Comintern directed by Moscow.

The rigid dogma adopted by the Chinese Communist Party was that of Leninism-Stalinism, an ideology which had led to the consolidation of a system of state-capitalism in Russia. Not by deviating from but by following Lenin's ideas, a new dominating and exploiting class came into power over the working masses.

China was an economically backward country in which the old ruling classes were incapable of carrying out industrialisation. The young native bourgeoisie had neither the strength nor the courage to revolutionise the old social structure in the way that a genuine modernization would require. The "bourgeois tasks" were to be solved by a bureaucracy.

In pursuing the strategy of encircling the cities for the countryside in its attempt to seize state power, the Chinese Communist Party built up a peasant army. But such an army, organized by a bourgeois party, became a tool of the party and therefore a capitalist machine.

The so-called 1949 revolution had nothing in common with a genuine socialist revolution. It was simply a violent takeover of the state by a bureaucracy better placed to manage the national capital than the old ruling clique. Having won control of the state machine, the only way to move forward for the Maoist bureaucracy was to impose a regime of ruthless exploitation and austerity on the working masses.

The bureaucracy began to carry out the task of primitive accumulation. Because of the lack of capital-intensive industry, economic development depended on the most primitive methods of surplus-value: in the countryside, mobilizing millions of peasants and semi-proletarians around the construction of public works and irrigation projects, built almost barehanded by the rural masses; in the cities, forcing the workers to work long hours for extremely low wages, banning strikes, putting restrictions on the choice of employment and so on.

The new bureaucratic capitalist class in China did not emerge because of the development of new modes of production. It was, on the contrary, the bureaucracy which brought the new modes of production in to existence. The Chinese bureaucracy did not originate from the industrialization of the country. Industrialization was the result of the bureaucracy's accession to power. Soon after that accession, intraparty feuds occurred. Such feuds originated out of two different conceptions of how China was to modernize in agriculture, industry, science and technology.

The Maoist-radical faction (led today by Chiang Ching, Wang Hung-wen, Chang Chun-chiao and Yao Wen-yuan) advocated self reliance, the active mobilization of the "popular masses" behind the state and the economy to promote production by ideological rather than material incentives, "redness" over "expertness", the "infallibility" of the thoughts of Mao Tse-tung, hostility towards the Soviet Union, "revolutionising arts and literature" to serve the single purpose of propagating the official ideology, the need for endless mass movements and struggle because "in the long historical period of socialism, the principal internal contradiction is the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie." (1)

The so-called capitalist roaders (Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, and others) favoured the retention of wage differentials and the extension of material incentives for increased productivity. They also stood for a more efficient technological apparatus, rapprochement with the Soviet "revisionists", liberalisation of policies in relation to the arts, rejection of the personal cult of Mao, the priority of national construction over endless "class struggles".

Both lines represented different strategies designed by the different factions of the bureaucratic capitalist class for attacking the working masses, for intensifying their exploitation. The Maoist-radical road was leading to a "feudalistic social-fascist dictatorship". The road of the "capitalist roaders" would bring a "destalinised Russian type of society" like today's Russia.

Mao's way to develop and to modernise the Chinese economy had the opportunities to be tried out fully in 1958. From "top to bottom", the Party announced its policy of the "Three Red Banners. The first "red banner" was the "general policy of socialist construction". The second "red banner" was the "great leap forward". The third "red banner" was the formation of "people's communes". As a result China experienced three years of economic difficulties.

The Great Leap Forward failed dismally and the intra-Party conflicts of the two lines grew into sharp political struggles. Mao's influence was

reduced in December 1958 when he resigned the State Chairmanship, though retaining the Chairmanship of the Party. Mao said, "I was extremely discontented with that decision, but I could do nothing about it." With Mao's weakened control over the country, the "capitalist roaders" adopted a series of policies to minimize the economic crisis — in part created by the Great Leap Forward and in part created by natural disasters of various sorts. The "capitalist roaders" proceeded to develop and to modernize the economy according to their own perceptions.

Mao initiated the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in 1966. It was a power struggle between the two factions of the bureaucratic capitalist class and also an attempt to mould the Chinese people and their thoughts according to the cast of Mao. The immediate and tumultuous response of the masses to Mao's call for rebellion pointed up the extreme discontent with the policies of the "capitalist roaders" and the system set up since 1949. The masses ended up opposed to, not just the "capitalist roaders" but to the bureaucracy. A pseudo-revolution had turned into a real revolution.

"Ninety per cent. of the senior cadres (of the Party) were made to stand aside. In Hunan, Chang P'ing-hua, Chang Po-shen, Hua Kuó-feng and the like had their power reduced to zero. At the Centre (Peking), power seizure (by representatives of the Cultural Revolution) took place in the Ministry of Finance, the Radio Broadcasting Administration Bureau and other departments; and the power of people like Li Hsien-nien, Ch'en Yi, T'an Chen-lin, as well as that of Chou En-lai who represented

THOUGHTS ON THE

them, was greatly diminished. Into whose hands did the assets go at that time? They went into the hands of the people, who were full of boundless enthusiasm, and who were organised to take over the urban administrations and the Party, government, financial and cultural powers in industry, commerce, communications and so forth." (2)

The masses had risen to take hold of their own destiny. Mao ignited the revolution but couldn't control it. With the aid of Lin Piao and the military, Mao suppressed the revolutionary masses. The bureaucracy, now temporarily controlled by Mao Tse-tung, led China further drifting down the road of "feudalistic social-fascist dictatorship."

Some phenomena under this "feudalistic social-fascist dictatorship" include "giving prominence to (empty) politics" which rewarded the lazy and punished the diligent, the "daily reading (of Mao's works and quotations)" which resembled the incantation of spells, the "discussion-application (of Mao's works and thoughts)" which became more and more hypocritical, the "revolution erupts from the depths of the soul" which became more absurd, the "manifestations of loyalty" which encouraged political speculation, the grotesque "loyalty dance", and the excruciatingly multitudinous rituals of showing loyalty — morning prayers, evening penitences, rallies, falling in, reporting for and quitting work and doing duty shifts, buying and selling things, writing letters, making phone calls, even taking meals — which were inevitably painted with violent religious colours and shrouded in such an atmosphere. In short, loyalty occupied one hundred per cent. of the time and one hundred per cent. of the space. The movements of this "good" and that "good" were, in fact, competitions of "left! left! and more left!" and contests for "the most...the most...and the most." The innumerable "meetings of representatives of active elements" were, in fact expositions of hypocritical, evil, ugly behaviour and a gambling house which offered "10,000 times profit for one unit of capital"; "the formula 'preaching' of class struggle, and the 'scum hole' type of cow pens (meaning detention camps) which were more so and no less (inhuman) than the massacres in such historic incidents as 'March 18', 'April 12', 'May 30' and 'June 23' because in Kwangtung Province alone nearly 40,000 revolutionary masses and cadres were massacred and more than a million revolutionary cadres and masses were imprisoned, put under control, and struggled against." (3)

Lin Piao, officially designated Mao's heir apparent and the closest comrade in arms of Mao, became the "arch traitor, renegade, political swindler and double dealer". "On September 12, 1971, Mao was returning to Peking from Shanghai by train. Lin had arranged to blow up the train somewhere north of Nanking." And when the plan was thwarted, Lin fled on a plane which "ran out of fuel and crashed in Mongolia, killing everyone who was still alive by the time it crashed." (4)

Once again, the bureaucrats manoeuvred above the heads of the masses who were not informed of the "Lin Piao affair" until months later.

By 1973 Teng Hsiao Ping, the capitalist roader during the Cultural Revolution, was re-instated and became one of the most powerful men in the Chinese Communist Party hierarchy. Closely aligned to Chou En-lai, Teng

was soon seen as the person to succeed Chou, who was Premier and first Vice Chairman of the Party, one of the most efficient bureaucrats to have administered China. Chou also richly personified the most opportunistic elements that genuine revolutionaries despised - with little principles, Chou always sided with the faction commanding a position of greater strength.

However, Chou seemed to be the target of the Movement of Going Against the Tide and the Anti-Confucius movement waged by the Maoist radical faction of the bureaucrats, but skilfully Chou "adopted the soft, supple Taoist strategy of non-interference and non-resistance: like a judoka, he never opposes the adversary's impact, he yields - and then manipulates the switches so as to send the enemy rushing under his own steam onto a side track leading nowhere." (5) Chou managed to divert, control, distort and neutralise the movement aimed at him by identifying the "erroneous current" as the Lin Piao current. The movement was circumscribed by the innocuous denunciation of an already discredited corpse. Thus, the Anti-Confucius movement was successively designated by three names, first, "criticising Confucius" (pi Kung), then "criticising Confucius and Lin Piao" (pi Kung pi Lin) and finally "criticising Lin Piao and Confucius" (pi Lin pi Kung). Unlike Liu Shao-chi and Lin Piao, Chou En-lai managed to die as a member of the Chinese Communist Party.

The masses were unenthusiastic about the "criticising Confucius and Lin Piao" movement, because "China is no longer the China of yore, and the people are no longer wrapped in sheer ignorance." (6) The "criticis-

CHINESE REVOLUTION

ing Confucius and Lin Piao movement", the movement of "Going Against the Tide", the "Study of Proletarian Dictatorship Campaign", the attack on the 14th century classic *Water Margin*, the movement "to counter-attack the Right Deviationist Attempt to Reverse Correct Verdicts" are only struggles between the different factions of the ruling class. The masses understand that such mobilizations are to ensure their own servitude and to promote production, i.e. intensifying their exploitation.

THE TIEN AN MEN SQUARE INCIDENT

According to the "Renmin Ribao" (People's Daily), "Early April, a handful of class enemies, under the guise of commemorating the late Premier Chou during the Ching Ming Festival, engineered an organised, premeditated and planned counter-revolutionary rampage, they brazenly clamoured that "the era of Chin Shih Huang is gone." Openly hoisting the ensign of supporting Teng Hsiao-ping, they frenziedly directed their spearhead at our great leader Chairman Mao, attempted to split the Party Central Committee headed by Chairman Mao, tried to change the general orientation of the current struggle to criticise Teng Hsiao-ping and counter-attack the Right Deviationist attempt to reverse correct verdicts, and engaged in counter-revolutionary activities."

"The counter-revolutionary activities culminated on April 5. At about 8 am, a loudspeaker car of the municipal Public Security Bureau was overturned, the body of the car and its loudspeakers smashed. After 9 am, more than 10,000 people gathered in front of the Great Hall of the People. At its maximum the crowd at Tien An Men Square numbered about 100,000 people."

The "Renmin Ribao" also reported that people broke into the barracks of the People's Liberation Army and occupied it. They overturned cars and set them on fire. Windows and doors at the barracks were smashed. Then they set the barracks on fire. Members of the fire brigade and policemen were beaten up. Several hundred worker-militiamen who went up the flight of steps leading to the Great Hall of the People to stand guard were broken up into several sections. More than 100 Peking worker-militiamen were injured, a dozen of them seriously wounded. The riot continued. At 6.30 pm, Wu Teh, the chairman of the Peking Revolutionary Committee made a broadcast speech at Tien An Men Square. "Most of the onlookers and the masses who had been taken in quickly dispersed. But a handful of counter-revolutionaries continued their desperate resistance and again posted some reactionary poems around the monument to the People's Heroes. Three hours later, on receiving an order from the Peking Municipal Revolutionary Committee, tens of thousands of worker-militiamen, in co-ordination with the people's police and P.L.A. guards took resolute measures and enforced proletarian dictatorship." (7)

On the 7th April, 1976, the Central Committee of the Communist Party

of China announced that "on the proposal of our great leader Chairman Mao, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China unanimously agrees to appoint Comrade Hua Kuo-feng First Vice-Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and Premier of the State Council of the People's Republic of China", and that "having discussed the counter-revolutionary incident which took place at Tien An Men Square and Teng Hsiao-ping's latest behaviour, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China holds that the nature of the Teng Hsiao-ping problem has turned into one of antagonistic contradiction. On the proposal of our great leader Chairman Mao, the Political Bureau unanimously agrees to dismiss Teng Hsiao-ping from all posts both inside and outside the Party while allowing him to keep his Party membership so as to see how he will behave in the future." (8) The acts of appointing Hua Kuo-feng and the dismissal of Teng Hsiao-ping are transparent contraventions of the provisions of the constitution of the People's Republic of China.

Contrary to the pronouncement of the official New China News Agency the demonstration and riots were clearly not "organised, premeditated and planned". All other eye witnesses accounts pointed to the opposite.

The "Renmin Ribao" refused to admit that the direct and immediate cause of the riots was the premature removal of the Ching Ming wreaths for Chou En-lai. It was in fact a spontaneous mass demonstration with the participation of the majority of the 100,000 people at Tien An Men Square. If it were an action of a minority, how could the several hundred worker-militiamen standing guard at the Great Hall of the People be broken up into several sections? How could the riot last through the whole day? And why was there need to send in "tens of thousands of worker-militiamen" in addition to the people's police and the P.L.A. guards?

The "Renmin Ribao" report said that the rioters were "openly hoisting the ensign supporting Teng Hsiao-ping", but eye-witnesses said that they neither heard nor saw any direct references to Teng. And what gains would be made by Teng and the "capitalist roaders" by organising a mass demonstration without corresponding actions to attempt to seize power?

The spontaneous demonstration of the 100,000 at Tien An Men Square (and similar demonstrations reported to have occurred at Chengchow, Kunming) signified that the Chinese masses are formulating their answers to the question "Whither China?", that they have intense hatred for the existing system and the ruling class, that they want to control their own destiny, that they want an end to "Chin Shih Huang's feudal society." For the first time since the Cultural Revolution, the masses asserted themselves on a large scale. Were the masses supporting the "capitalist road"? No! The masses had passed their verdict during the Cultural Revolution. When the masses paid their homage to Chou, they were making their protests in a round about way. This was necessitated by the extremely repressive nature of the existing system of rule.

In face of self-actions of the masses, the bureaucracy acted swiftly. Reaching a compromise to sack Teng Hsiao-ping (but keeping him as a party member), the Maoist-radical faction joined hands with the "capitalist roaders" in suppressing the masses. Ignoring the violations of the constitution of the state, the ruling class shows nakedly that it will stop at nothing to perpetuate its continued rule. The bureaucrats, Mao, capitalist roaders and all, trembled at the self-action of the masses.

The socialist revolution is a long and tortuous road, but the end of the barbaric era of Mao Tse-tung is in sight.

Lee Ya See & Wu Che (Two Chinese anarchists).

- (1) Quotation by Mao Tse-tung.
- (2) "Whither China", by Sheng Wu-lien; reproduced in full in a forthcoming publication by the 70s Biweekly, "The Revolution is Dead, Long live the Revolution!"
- (3) Li I Che's Big Character Poster - "Concerning Socialist Democracy and Legal System", reproduced in full in "The Revolution is Dead, Long live the Revolution!"
- (4) For details of the Lin Piao plot, see the famous article by Wilfred Burchett, published in August 1973 in the American Maoist paper, the Guardian Weekly. The same article was also carried in the August 20th issue of the Far Eastern Economic Review.
- (5) "The Grand Master's Checkmate" by Simon Leys, anarchistic author of "Les Habit Neufs du President Mao" (Champ Libre, Paris 1971) in the December 3rd, 1973 issue of the Far Eastern Economic Review.
- (6) Poem at Tien An Men Square Incident, April 5th, 1976.
- (7) For the full text of the "Counter-revolutionary Political Incident at Tien An Men Square", refer to Peking Review 15, April 9th, 1976
- (8) Refer to Peking Review 15, April 9th, 1976.

The above article is taken from the May 1976 issue of "Minus 8", a magazine edited by members and friends of the 70s Front, a libertarian socialist group in Hong Kong.

SURELY THE NUCLEAR Rally organised at Windscale in April by Friends of the Earth was doomed to oblivion from the beginning. Confusing respectability with respectfulness, anxious not to offend the nuclear establishment exponents, or to incur their scorn, the ecological party paid £5 per head for a jolly train ride to Windscale, Cumbria, took part in a polite "public debate" without a local inhabitant in sight, and went home again. The event got a few seconds' coverage on ITV News (but not on the BBC) and was mentioned in the national press. The next day it was almost certainly forgotten by most people.

Now, a change of plan on the British nuclear power programme may be recommended by the British Atomic Energy Authority. But from what has so far been reported, the reasons have not the remotest link with the "social, ethical and political implications of nuclear power" stressed by FOE. Obviously, the furthest the AEA would go would be to advise the transfer from the "steamer" or steam generating heavy water reactors favoured by government and unions (the "steamer" programme is a large one that could involve plenty of new jobs) to other models - light water or "advanced" gas-

cooled reactors as part of a smaller and more gradual process. The considerations would be purely financial. For instance, an immediate and quick expansion of heavy water nuclear power is put in question by the present no-growth forecasts of the electricity industry. Despite the early disappointments with gas-cooled reactors, the plant equipment already exists and output is growing. While nuclear power costs have generally risen considerably across the world from 60-115 per cent, the "steamer" reactor's costs would be particularly high.

However, the cost argument (let alone that of safety and environmental damage) is not decisive. The chairman of the AEA, (Sir) John Hill, said last week: "I have never proposed a cancellation of the nuclear power programme... I can't think of any more stupid conclusion than to cancel everything." All his work and that of his colleagues would be lost.

The nuclear question has been a public issue in this country since the first days of CND. The fundamental problems of safety have been strongly underlined by the opponents of nuclear power, yet, despite the anxiety of many people and its direct relevance to the lives of everyone, no public consultation has taken place -- unless one cares to count the ecological rallies, or Benn's formal show-pieces, designed, like the public enquiry system, to instil the sense rather than the substance of democratic procedure. In addition the traditionally anti-nuclear groups on the left and in the "libertarian" and anarchist movements have probably tired of a subject which is older than many of their members. Yet now more than ever it, and the questions raised by hard technology in general, throw into particularly clear and cold relief the characteristics of the political and economic system we live under.

Unending reports on the application of technological know-how to political-military aims belie both the notion of scientific "neutrality" and the argument that there is a plain distinction between what can be used for peace and what for war. (After India, does the French government really think that the new nuclear toys it is selling Libya can only be used for peaceful purposes? Does Lord Rothschild really believe that the ability to produce identical human beings will only be applied to cancer research or the more natural forms of reproductive biology?) Moreover, the widespread belief that "bad" technology can become "good" simply through a government policy change, is to ignore the real function and purposes of governmental power. Righteous protests about crop destruction, radioactive effects on the brain, alteration of rainfall the government ungratefully disobeyed, Szilard turned in disgust - to biology ... Nowadays there can be no excuse for ingenuousness. There is no lack of physicists who have had

levels, diversion of oceans, selective piercing of the ozone layer emanate from the very planners and perpetrators of the crimes, just as the promise to impose controls on environmental pollution come from those companies who are themselves still responsible for it.

Where the scientist is concerned political innocence may once have served as an excuse, though it is hard to believe. The story goes that the physicist Leo Szilard first thought of the atomic chain reaction when walking down Southampton Row in London. He got Einstein to write to the American federal government informing them that they could make bombs from splitting atoms, and urging them not to. When second thoughts, or of those who now believe that atomic peace may be little better than atomic war. (In the words of the British physicist Dr. Frank Barnaby, "The risks resulting from peaceful uses of nuclear energy and spread of nuclear technology on balance now outweigh the benefits.") But the politicians, businessmen, technocrats and union leaders who make up the ruling class must give their first attention to the defence of the regime in which they prosper, and to the means by which they will survive in the technological, military and economic race.

PLUTONOCRACY

From the point of view of the "ordinary" citizen the result of competition in nuclear power is not only that of safety - the failures of the emergency cooling system, the production of biological poisons - but of politico-military control. In his essay "On the Road to Repression and Control" (Encounter, July 1976) the economist, E. J. Mishan comments that "the extent of the vigilance required by the planned expansion of the nuclear energy programme will entail an unprecedented extension of the internal and international security systems. Among other measures, this will involve armed protection of the transport network along which move containers of atomic materials, a vast increase in internal surveillance and, inevitably, the surrender to the police or, possibly, to specially trained forces of extraordinary powers of entry, arrest, detention and interrogation, ..." After looking into similar results in other areas - consumerism, medicine, data banks, multi-nationals, corporatism - Mishan ends on a consciously dismal note. The people's desire for preservation from the ever growing perils of technological innovation "will prompt them to cede to governments far greater powers of surveillance, control and repression than are compatible with our contemporary notions of personal liberty". In other words, the people will look for security to the very agents who have deprived them of it.

The anarchist conference on technology at Keele in March this year, recognised the need for a revolution in technology, and it was felt essential to prevent the total "recuperation" by the Establishment of the ecological movement. (The work of FOE has been of much value, but their methods and outlook seem, so far, to have lacked awareness that a different application of technology can only properly succeed under a new social and economic system, and not by picnic lunches at the gates of Windscale, nor by offering one's free services to an all-too-welcoming local council.)

One of the anarchists' first tasks is to help break down the "middle class conservationist" image that is used to exploit and trivialise the real issues of modern technology, encourages the union member to support the "right to work" in whatever dangerous and unhealthy surroundings, and blandly ignores the plight of those many workers whose livelihood and health have already been destroyed by industrial pollution. We must break free, whether by legal or illegal actions, from the "Eco-establishment" which sponges up, and defuses, all possible threats to its survival and exploits the ecological argument to justify ever greater control over the population at large.

The need for scientific literacy has never been greater where the anarchist movement is concerned.

the question of the said District Justice Carroll, sitting as a member of the court, was raised by the Murrays on the morning of the 21st day of the trial, especially in view of the fact that the Murrays were being tried on a charge carrying the death penalty, the Special Criminal Court should have discharged itself and declined to proceed further with the trial; (8) that having convicted the Murrays of capital murder, no sentences should have been imposed on them on other counts; (9) that the Murrays should have been present in the dock of the courthouse when the death sentences were pronounced; (10) that by reason of the aforesaid matters the trial was rendered unsatisfactory.

The three days were occupied with technical legal argumentation about these grounds of appeal, with the judges showing noticeable hostility to the Murrays' counsel. After taking a day to consider the appeal, the Chief Justice and his colleagues dismissed the appeal on all grounds, but said that ground no. 2, which raised questions with regard to the construction of the Criminal Justice Act, 1964, had caused the court considerable anxiety. The court accordingly confirmed the conviction and sentence and fixed August 17th as the day for the execution, but the court also said that it felt that its decision necessarily involved a point of law of exceptional public importance and that it was desirable, in the public interest, that an appeal should be taken to the Supreme Court. Later in the same day the Supreme Court sat, and Mr. Sorahan, representing the Murrays, applied for a stay of execution pending the hearing of the appeal. This was granted, and November 1st was fixed as the date for the hearing of the appeal. If this appeal fails, the Murrays will have to appeal to the President of the Irish Republic for clemency. In reality, the decision will be taken by the Irish Cabinet, which is very divided about the issue of capital punishment, but which must be under considerable pressure at present to pursue a "hard line" since the upswing in IRA opposition to the government and the killing of the British Ambassador in Dublin.

RONAN STENSON

Ronan Stenson, who collapsed in court during his trial with the Murrays for the murder of Garda Reynolds, and has been under psychiatric surveillance at the Curragh military detention camp ever since, appeared in the Special Criminal Court in Dublin, handcuffed to a military policeman, on the same morning (30th July) as the Murrays' appeal was dismissed.

He has been given a separate trial, and it has been agreed by the State prosecutor and the defence that the case should be put back until the next Irish law term, which begins in October. Dr. Henry O'Shea, chief medical officer at the Curragh camp, and Dr. Liam Daly, consultant psychiatrist with the Eastern Irish Health Board, had agreed that Stenson was not yet fit to stand trial, and that they would like further opportunities to examine him.

RURITANIA A MENACE

RECENTLY ONE was perturbed to hear that a prominent French comrade (of the CNT) was advocating that Russia was a greater menace than the United States, and consequently, one assumes, he would fall for the Kropotkin error of supporting the lesser evil. One has even heard comrades of a different stripe who believed that the United States was the world menace.

It is understandable that Margaret Thatcher, the Tory Opposition leader, denounced Russia as the world menace at Dorking last Saturday - particularly understandable that it should be at Dorking. Without much discernible difference between the practical policies of the Conservative and Labour parties, Maggie must find it tough sledding to find an issue which will summon up the blue blood of Dorking. Even Reggie Maudling, the somnolent substantial shadow of a Foreign Secretary, has deplored Maggie's plugging of this Red menace theme -- we have heard it all before, and we shall hear it again. It is seldom wise for parties out of power to harp on some single theme -- the situation could change and enemies of today could be allies of tomorrow; as indeed Churchill found with the USSR on which he opined in 1940 that Communism rots the soul of a nation and makes it abject and servile.

When it comes to looking for enemies of democracy (right-wing dictatorships naturally exempted) Mrs. Thatcher could curdle Dorking blood with China, which seems to be infinitely more stable, more self-sufficient, more sure of itself and with a not yet discredited brand of Communism which has its appeal to idealistic and cause-seeking youth. The Yellow peril and the concept of the never-ending march of the Chinese are old horror stories. If Mrs. Thatcher is looking for an 'enemy' the Soviet Union is old hat.

China's performance regarding the Olympics (where she did nothing except see her rival barred) and her earthquakes, where she has loftily refused all aid - and information - sets her in a special class. Even if the rather simple minds of Mrs. Thatcher and the Dorking Tories were capable of launching it, a policy of setting China against Russia by alternating friendship with each (as practised by Kissinger) would pay off better.

The old chestnut that the Labour government has left us naked to our enemies is a futile one too. Since nobody knows which way to the battlefield it is doubtful whether we have done much except slow down upon the increase in the rate of arms expenditure. Since in the 'thirties we did the same thing and our 'disarmament' consisted in choosing the wrong kind of weapons and laying out large sums on weaponry suitable for the previous (1914-18) style of warfare, we were obviously doomed to failure. The army estimates for 1935-6 calculated that the amount to

be spent on forage for cavalry should be raised from £44,000 to £400,000; at the same time the amount for motor duel was raised from £12,000 to £121,000. The expansion of the Tank Corps was vetoed and a Conservative M.P., Brigadier Making, stated: "There must be no tinkering with the Cavalry." It is possible that were the military a rational and business-like institution, 'bull' and ceremonial could be cut down to such an extent as to combine economy and efficiency. Hore-Belisha was the last war minister to try it, and he was dismissed by pressure from the Service chiefs.

Finally, and it may be finally too, what on earth are we expected to do against the Americans/the Russians/the Chinese/or the Ruritaniens? If the Ruritaniens, to take one example, have inter-continental ballistic missiles with which they can wipe us out in our role of unsinkable aircraft-carrier, is our own function to be ready to wipe them out first? If so, when do we do it? If our threat to do it doesn't work do we do it in case they do it first? Do we go on training conventional troops (including cavalry) for holding action against the Ruritaniens until our (and their) allies bring in the big stuff and wipe us all out from the security of their far away ICBM bases?

Whatever one may feel about the Ruritaniens, the Chinese or the Russians or the Americans, was is, more obviously than ever, no solution to the problem of those who wish to dominate. Such power can only be resisted where it begins, at home, and it is the task of every citizen to resist in whatever way he can the inroads and invasions of his own government. Only then will he be in a position to inspire and seduce those who are in a more difficult position regarding their rulers. War merely intensifies those primitive nationalistic loyalties and ensures cooperation in the health of the state.

Only by disobedience can war be averted.

Jack Robinson.

subscribe

Fill 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 ") £ 2.15 (\$5.00)
3 months (7 ") £ 1.16 (\$2.50)

(Airmail rates on request - above are surface mail to all countries including UK)

Please send FREEDOM for months to

.....
address.....

PEOPLE OF THE AFFLUENT ABYSS

Love makes good propaganda. William J. Fishman, a lecturer at Queen Mary's College in our East End, and author of "East End Jewish Radicals" continues to inform audiences (even if small) of the existence and personality of Rudolf Rocker and his work in the East End and its immigrant Jewish population, at the turn of the century at the bottom of the oppressed mass of the proletariat. And when Bill Fishman tells of the East London whose history he has brought alive and of Rudolf Rocker's part in it his love of the man astounds his hearers that they never heard of him before.

As good propagandists will, he slanted his words to the place and the occasion, in this case, to a lunchtime lecture in the church of St. Botolph, Aldgate, marvelling that the German Roman Catholic became the champion of the Jewish population, spoke their language and edited the Yiddish paper, and equating Rocker's dedication and service to Christian saintliness.

In the quiet, comfortable, well-furnished church he spoke about the "people of the abyss" and those such as Rocker and William Booth who helped them then, and one realised from the dates on the stained glass windows that this building was then as it is now, when the children of Rocker's people of the abyss are, Fishman remarked, among the comfortable and even rich living in more salubrious parts. (The people of the abyss are now fewer in number but they are still here, sleeping and dying

in the alleys such as ours, and the present-day St. Botolph's, I believe, gives refuge and food in its crypt.)

Bill Fishman made the point that throughout Rocker's organizing of the struggle for better conditions and the setting up of the Jubilee St. Club for self-help and mutual aid the aim was always to further the anarchist/libertarian socialist ideas.

In the very brief time for discussion one of the three contributions drew attention to this, concluding that those workers of the beginning of the century had got what they wanted and hadn't been interested in changing society.

There seems to be a place around our own doorsteps to make propaganda for the ideas among the people who are now not so deep in the abyss.

M.C.

BOOKSHOP OPENING HOURS

Normal hours are:

Tuesday - Friday 2 - 6 pm
(with extension Thursdays until about 8 pm)
Saturdays 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

During summer holidays the bookshop will be closed
Tuesdays 10 and 17 August
Friday 10 September.

LONDON 21 & 22 August. BWNIC national meeting of supporters at the Pax Christi Centre, Blackfriars Hall, Southampton Rd. N.W.5. (near Chalk Farm tube stn., on bus routes 24 & 45). Starts 2pm Sat. Details from BWNIC (London Group) c/o 5 Caledonian Rd. London N1 9DX. (send SAE). Creche, crashpads available
HYDE PARK Speakers Corner (Marble Arch). Anarchist Forum alternate Sundays at 1 pm. Speakers, listeners, hecklers welcomed.

ITALY 24-26 Sept. An international conference of Bakunin studies will take place in Venice. 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

NEXT DESPATCHING date for FREEDOM is Thursday 18 August. Come and help from 2pm onwards. You are welcome each Thursday afternoon to early evening for informal get-together and folding session.

ate in/be present at the conference are invited to get into touch with Nico Berti, C.P. 541, 35100 PADUA, Italy.

LONDON Tues. 7 Sept. BWNIC London Grp monthly mtg. 7.30 pm at 6 Endsleigh St. London WC1

EAST LONDON Libertarian Group holds fortnightly mtgs at 123 Lathom Rd. E.6. Phone Ken 552 3985

SOUTH-EAST London Libertarian Group meets Wednesdays. Contact Georgina 460 1833

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

COLCHESTER anarchists/libertarians interested in local group contact Hilary Lester, 22 Well-lesley Rd. Colchester for mtgs. details.

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

GLASGOW Libertarian Socialist Group 50 John St., Glasgow C1 or tel. Dave 339-4236 for details of weekly meetings

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.

INTERNATIONAL CAMP France. Jul.15-Aug 15 at St. Mitre les Ramparts (on Highway D50 between Istres and Marigues, 50km west of Marseilles).

GROUPS

ABERDEEN c/o S. Blake, 167 King Street

BATH - during vac. write c/o Freedom

BIRMINGHAM Black & Red Group, Bob Prew

40c 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

CONTACT

CAMBRIDGE Ron. Stephan, Botany School Field Station, 34c Storey's Way, Cambridge tel. 52896.

CORBY anarchists write 7 Cresswell Walk, Corby, Northants NN1 2LL

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

DUNDEE - term time

DURHAM Martin Spence, 11 Front Street, Sherburn Village, Durham

EDINBURGH - term time

FIFE - see West Fife

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

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

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

OXFORD c/o Jude, 38 Hurst Street, Oxford

PORTSMOUTH Caroline Cahm, 2 Chedderton Gardens, Pembroke Park, Old Portsmouth

ST. ANDREWS - term time

WEST FIFE write John Deming, 164 Apin Crescent, Dunfermline

PRESS FUND

15 - 28 JULY

STIRLING: N.S. 55p; COASHAM: S.B. 9p; LONDON SW18: A.H. 34p; CHICAGO: S.C. £ 2.80; WOLVERHAMPTON: J.L. £ 1; J.K. J.K.W. 10p; LONDON SW11: M.S. £ 2.85; OTTAWA: R.A.L. £ 1.11; COLCHESTER/CHAPPEL: Anon £ 1; LEEDS: G.H.L. 39p; LANCASTER: B.W. 85p; Anon 27p; SAN FRANCISCO: S.P. 60p; SCHEVERINGEN: W.P. 70p.

Total : £ 12.65
Previously acknowledged : 706.36
TOTAL to DATE : £ 719.01

A CORRECTION

In "Contraries", Review section this issue, p.16, concluded on p.15, we regret two errors in the lay-out. From the last line on p.16, read on to the second column on p.15 as far as the last two lines, which should come at the end of the first column. Apologies, John and readers.

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

Proposed Yorkshire Federation - 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, Warrarong, NSW 2502

Sydney Fed. of Aust. Anarchists and "Rising Free" Box 92, Broadway, 2007 Australia.

NEW ZEALAND

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

WE WELCOME news, reviews, letters, articles. Latest date for receipt of copy for next Review is Monday 9 August and for news section is Monday 16 August (and receipt by Thursday 12th is more helpful)

PEOPLE/ORGANIZATIONS/PUBLICATIONS

NORTHANTS. A. S. Neill Association group now forming. Contact Susan and Terry Phillips 7 Cresswell Walk, Corby.

ANARCHIST TRANSPORT WORKERS - an attempt to organize. Contact Adam 01-347 4829

PEOPLE WITH A DISABILITY Liberation Front Box 1976 c/o Rising Free, 142 Drummond St., London, NW1

BACK ISSUES of foreign anarchist/syndicalist papers available. Contact Box CA1 Freedom.

PRISONERS

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

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

THE STOKE NEWINGTON FIVE Welfare mittee still needs funds for books, etc. Box 252 240 Camden High Street, London N.W.1.

WORKSHOP POLITICS

--SYNDICALIST WORKERS' CONTROL OR SOCIALIST STATE CONTROL ?

THE FRONTIER OF CONTROL, a study in British workshop politics, by Carter L. Goodrich, with new foreword by Richard Hyman. Pluto Press, £2.95.

WHEN HE came to distinguish between socialism and syndicalism G. D. H. Cole¹ wrote that "Whereas the socialist demands ownership by the state and its dependent organs such as the municipalities, the syndicalist demand was for direct workers' ownership and control, acting through organisations of their own creation -- the trade unions and federations of unions. State organisation and control of industry are, in the syndicalist view, incompatible with true working-class emancipation."

Since Cole made this distinction many of the parties and groupings committed to state socialism have struggled to incorporate some elements of the concept of 'industrial democracy' into their programmes, while remaining faithful to their basic doctrines of a state managed economy. Equally, management theorists now look to 'participation' and limited worker involvement in management as a solution to the current problems of British industry. One valuable side effect of the interest now being shown on the left has been the republication by Pluto Press of a number of useful original documents and texts relating to matters of particular concern to syndicalists and those anarchists who seek to base their anarchism upon a grasp of everyday life.

Particularly welcome has been Carter L. Goodrich's study, first published in 1920, for its investigation of workers' control as an ongoing accomplishment of shopfloor workers and trade unionists. In Goodrich's book we see workers' control studied not simply as an aspect of some sectarian doctrine, but rather as something concrete emerging within the practical activities of working people. This approach of observing and explaining workers' control as and when it arises in real life situations as a result of human action, is vital to our understanding of the nature of industrial life in Britain today, but also it offers the only approach within which a theory of syndicalism on people's practical accomplishments and everyday actions could be developed. In other words, it is through forming an intuitive understanding of people's methods and interpretive practices about their daily affairs, then articulating it, that the syndicalist critique of authoritarian society develops, together with the possibility of viable and alternative forms of organisation and control.

THE EVERYDAY PRACTICE OF WORKERS' CONTROL

It follows, then, that the demand for workers' control is not the unified expression of some single impulse but rather, as Goodrich has it, "the elements of the demand must be hunted for in the whole jungle of the reactions of workers to the industrial situation". Goodrich sees workers' control in Britain as rooted in workplace situations and developing both out of the tradition 'custom and practice' of craftsmen, with their demand for workshop autonomy and a say in the detailed organisation of their jobs at the point of production, and what he, in 1919, saw as the kind of 'conscious' demand for workers' control developing in response to new technology and inhuman 'scientific' management techniques. Examples of this demand for 'conscious' workers' control could be found, he argued, among mainly unskilled and semi-skilled who were joining the industrial unions, and in the development of the shop stewards' movement. Consequently, Goodrich was able to refer to two more or less dis-

tinct demands for workers' control, one stemming from the essentially conservative and negative considerations of small groups of craftsmen, and the new 'revolutionary and propagandist' demands of the mainly unskilled members of the trade unions which were growing in influence. In practice, however, both these approaches interacted upon each other then, as they continue to do today.

It is acknowledged by Goodrich that "bits of what would now be called control have long been fought for and often won by the trade unions". On the basis of this it could be argued that the craftsmen of an earlier period did in fact pursue workers' control as a conscious objective, and in their book British Working Class Movements G. D. H. Cole and A. W. Filson did claim that: "In general the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union found its strongest backing among Trade Clubs of skilled craftsmen in trades not yet greatly affected by the Industrial Revolution." The 'Grand National' in 1834 embodied the spirit of the idea of a workers' take-over of industry and anticipated much of what we now call syndicalism, even if it represented, as the quote from Cole and Filson seems to suggest, an attempt to accommodate the new industrial era to the ideals of a pre-industrial people. In the same way as millions of peasants repeatedly demand control of the land for themselves, so industrial workers continue to formulate and reformulate their own demands for control of the factories. The fact that workers are not always self-consciously aware of the full implications of what they are doing when they operate or demand control does not detract from its significance, just as when most of us operate the 'rules' of syntax we are not conscious of what we are about. This is why we would argue it is best to see syndicalism and workers' control as part of an ongoing process within social life which is constantly being articulated and rephrased to meet each particular situation as it crops up and this is why current research and theories about human social action stemming from Harold Garfinkel² and the language analysts on the one side, and Noam Chomsky and the Constitutive analysts on the other, may reinforce the syndicalist approach.

WORKERS' ARTFUL PRACTICES

Restrictive practice by workers is also considered by Goodrich for its relevance to workers' control. He discusses the issues but decides that "restriction of output is more a method of warfare than a form of control". In other words, for Goodrich 'restriction of output', the 'stay-in strike' and the 'go-slow' are all means of winning control rather than forms of control in their own right. This view of workers' restrictive practices as being mere 'shirking' or a facet of industrial conflict has not been confirmed by more recent studies.

Donald Ray³, in his direct observations of workshop practices as a participant, discovered that "the blanket term 'restriction' was found to cloak all-important contrarities of work behaviour. Machine operatives not only hold back effort; sometimes they worked hard. The very common failure to note such contrarities has tended, of course, to impede the progress of research by checking considerations of the specific conditions under which differences in behaviour occur". Also, more money was not found to be the only attraction of piecework: workers operating under piecework systems often have more control over how they organise their jobs and working day. Much evidence is now available of 'goldbricking' and 'crossbooking' methods, whereby workers save up completed jobs so that they can have an easy day later. Roy went on to make observations about the possible

implications of the mentality of the shopfloor 'syndicates' in the manipulation of work situations :

"Does it not appear that operatives and their allies resisted managerial 'logics' of efficiency' because application of these 'logics' tended to produce something considerably less than 'efficiency'?"

Did not worker groups connive to circumvent managerial instructions in order to 'get the work out'?

Were not rules broken to keep the work flowing?

"May not the common query of industrial workers, 'What the hell are they trying to do up there?' be not merely a reflective of faulty communication but also based on real management inadequacy quite apart from failure in 'explanation'?"

"May it not be assumed that managerial inefficiency is and has been for some time a serious problem to those who labour?"

Elsewhere David Silverman⁴ has argued that the artful practices of workers in employing 'fiddles' to control production "may usefully be regarded as a defensive strategy which increases job security, prevents competitive conflicts between workers and by increasing the unpredictability of their actions to management, enlarges workers' control over their environment".

HOW MUCH WORKERS' CONTROL ?

In considering the extent of workers' control in Great Britain, Goodrich tries to tackle the problem of how control is achieved. At one extreme there was Whitleyism or the form of workers' control offered to workers through their participation on Works Councils, and then there is what we would call syndicalism, that is control seized by a trade union or workers' organisation. All this boils down to is whether the administration of workers' control is to be achieved through what Goodrich calls 'admission' or 'invasion'.

This distinction in a way represents the essential difference at present prevailing in the approaches to industrial administration by the West German and British workers respectively. Under the West Germany system, workers in theory have the 'right' to participate in general management decisions at Board level but in consequence have little influence over how detailed management business is carried out on the shopfloor. In Britain, while we have less obvious worker involvement at Board level we do have much more direct control over specific managerial procedures at the point of production. However, as Goodrich so clearly shows, the distinction is not always so clearly defined and workers' committees often find themselves discussing, for example, "such matters as the reason why on a given morning there was no work ready for the pieceworkers".

THE SYNDICALIST TRADITION

Some aspects of workers' control in this country stem, as Goodrich demonstrates, from traditional craft control and have a conservative bias. In the view of Huw Beynon⁵, the practice of workers' control in this country has been adhered to most strongly by skilled workers, and in Britain was at its most developed in the "shop stewards movement that occurred during and after World War One".

Today part of the problem of our industrial relations is considered by Fox and Flanders⁶ among others, to be connected with the fact that "craftsmen had always aspired to extend their own unilateral regulation... to cover many of the details of job organisation and behaviour -- to cover, in other words, managerial norms relating to organisation and deployment of the labour force. Now their example began to be followed by non-craft work groups whose shop-floor power awakened new aspirations". This means that the freedom which, however inadequate, has characterized the unionism of skilled workers on the shopfloor for over a century, and which according to Beynon has found its political expression in syndicalism, has now begun to spread to other groups of workers.

It has been observed⁷ that the success of anarchism in Spain was related to the way it could easily be reconciled in the minds of most Spaniards to the deeper practical real-

ity of the Municipios Libres, free Municipalities, of an earlier historical period, and which as a tradition has never completely disappeared. In the same way, to our minds, the phenomena of syndicalism is an ongoing feature of British industrial life, and represents, with all its imperfections, the only continuous radical tradition capable of capturing the imagination of the English working people and generating the structures necessary to administer workers' control of industry. As a historical movement, we would argue, it has roots deep in our historical past, and as a practical phenomenon syndicalism is discoverable in the often unreflecting artful practices of shopfloor workers, and continues an ongoing dialogue with the authoritarian institutions and structures of our society.

*

Goodrich's book is in essence a documentation of shopfloor syndicalism and its practical accomplishments in the second decade of this century. While he does not observe the shopfloor situations at first hand, as have Roy and others since, the second hand nature of the accounts he uses doesn't prevent him from getting beyond the documents and statistics to allow those involved to speak for themselves. In doing this he both retains the integrity of the phenomenon he is studying and avoids the trap of treating industrial man as a 'cultural and judgemental dope', as the marxists, most sociologists and some anarchists have tended to do since The Frontier of Control was written.

Now one slightly modified version of the marxist position on workers' control is provided by Richard Hyman in the foreword to the current book. He sees the phenomenon of workers' control as operating "in the context of a number of higher levels of decision-making authority". And he goes on to state that "Inevitably control at each lower level [of] this hierarchy is limited by higher-level structures and policies." Ultimately then, Hyman, though he does his best to disguise it, looks to a 'high-level structure- or State as being all-embracing and capable of determining relationships throughout a society. Which is of course the fancy way an academic would wrap up the crude authoritarian concept of a society controlled from the top down.

For the marxist, the main outline of his explanation of human action is contained in a basic formula which governs the possibilities of human conduct, and all that is required of him is to put-in social work to fit every human activity and situation into the general marxist framework. The syndicalist, on the other hand, must, if we accept F. F. Ridley's interpretation⁸, continue to make his story relevant to the practical problems at hand in each given situation. In other words, the syndicalist approach is context bound; the starting point is not the abstract model of human relations, presented by the marxists, but the concrete human situation on which he shapes his concepts about everyday life.

According to Ridley, "Syndicalism differed from marxism and anarchism in that it never existed in isolation. It was not the product of disinterested speculation." It is not with the marxist laws of history nor utopian blueprints that the labour movement is concerned, but with the problems facing it. Which means that syndicalists are, in Ridley's terms, "much less concerned with elaborating a closed social philosophy, an internally consistent doctrine, even a programme consistent over time, than with solutions to the immediate, practical questions facing them in their everyday struggle against employers and the state -- questions of strategy and tactics".

In this way, then, syndicalism sets itself apart from the 'scientific' pretensions of marxism, as well as from the kind of dead-end anarchism produced by those anarchists who would seek to legislate for human action through static sets of principles*, in that it generates principles relevant to practical situations and, therefore, endows human action with an integrity denied it by the more dogmatic versions of marxism or anarchism. Consequently, it is a mistake to regard syndicalism as some kind of poor relation of anarchism, the more so because, as Goodrich amply demonstrates, syndicalism is a genuine force in our English way of life which upholds traditions which are both libertarian and radical. On the other hand, in the English context, the achievements of anarchism are, as yet, much less easy to identify.

Nor is it a serious defect of syndicalism that many of its shopfloor activists, as Goodrich shows, are not politically aware of the full consequences of the actions they produce or the structures they create in society, for it is clearly within the real of social action, of concrete experience, and of practical accomplishments that syndicalism is discoverable as an ongoing phenomenon. Previous generations of marxists and anarchists have failed to focus on the everyday activities of workers, and have consequently failed to make the artful practices of workers meaningful.

Syndicalism, then, accomplishes workers' control and formulates principles in the midst of social life, applying itself to each specific practical situation in turn, and avoids attempting to impose structures from above or outside the context in which workers find themselves. State socialism, for its part, still seeks general solutions to social problems through 'high-level structures', and in so doing renders genuine workers' control impossible. While Goodrich fails to handle this aspect of the problem, the republication of his study provides us with a perspective on an area of human affairs, that of shopfloor syndicalism, which has been neglected by several generations of marxists and anarchists.

B. B. & I. S.

* The concern about the 'totalitarian tendency' which underlies the more absolutist brands of anarchism, has already been adequately expressed by several writers (George Orwell, *The Collected Essays* Vol. 4, "Politics vs. Literature", George Woodcock, *Anarchism*). It seems to us, however,

that a solution to this problem at both the theoretical and practical level may eventually emerge out of what we would call the 'anarchism, for all practical purposes' approach, which in this country has perhaps been best typified in the work of Colin Ward (e. g. *Anarchy in Action* by Colin Ward, 1973).

B. B. & I. S.

References :

1. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 1956 : G. D. H. Cole, "Syndicalism".
2. H. Garfinkel: *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (1967)
3. D. Roy : "Making Out : A Workers' Counter-System of Work Situation and Relationships", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 50 (1955) or *Industrial Man*, ed. Tom Burns; "Quota Restriction and Goldbricking in a Machine Shop", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 57 (1952) "Work Satisfaction and Social Reward in Quota Achievement : an analysis of piecework incentive", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 18 (1943).
4. David Silverman: *The Theory of Organisations* (1970).
5. Huw Beynon: *Working for Ford* (1973).
6. Fox and Flanders : *Collective Bargaining* : From Donovan to Durkheim (1969).
7. Rudolf Rocker: *Nationalism and Culture* Gerald Brenan: *The Spanish Labyrinth*
8. F. F. Ridley: *Revolutionary Syndicalism in France* : The Direct Action of its Time (1970).

NAIVE REVOLUTIONARIES

THE FORTIETH anniversary of the Spanish Revolution has produced several programmes on radio and television which at least have given some indication that there was a powerful anarchist dimension in the conflict.

For those of us who were politically aware at the time it was a time of enthusiasm, anguish and conflict. Many of the radical left like myself had a pacifist background but there was a strong magnetic force which wanted to overrule those pacifist convictions. Those of us who were members of the libertarian socialist ILP had already resisted propaganda by the CP and understood how they used their more naive allies. The full perfidy of the Russian dominated CP came to be understood with the making of the German-Soviet pact. The use of CP dominated arms in the political struggle in Spain was never understood by the liberals and social democrats who were misled by their propaganda and those that died in International Brigades.

Anarchist attitudes were clearly set out in Herbert Read's "A Song for Spanish Anarchists" :

The golden lemon is not made
but grows on a green tree;
A strong man with his crystal eyes
is a man born free.

The oxen pass under the yoke
and the blind are led at will:
But a man born free has a path of
his own
and a house on the hill.

And men are men who till the soil
and women are women who weave :
Fifty men own the lemon grove
and no man is a slave.

The political aims of the CP are indicated by their propaganda and in the name of military efficiency they attacked the foundation of social revolution that initially halted the Franco rebellion. William Rust in his book *Britons in Spain* makes no reference to the power and the role of anarchist thought. He makes no reference to those of other groups that went there: he says on page 18 :

The achievement of the International Brigade did much to prove the necessity for ending the militia system, whereby each battalion belonged to a particular party or trade union from which it took its orders. So long as they lacked a unified command and military discipline, the militiamen could often be swept aside by the experienced troops of the enemy, but they finally created a regular army capable of resisting the troops commanded by the German and Italian General Staffs. And it is an historical fact that the example of the International Brigade hastened the formation of that great People's Army, now one million strong, which continues to fight so heroically. [January 1939]

Of the assorted politicians, journalists and priests who fellow-travelled during the whole tragic episode only those, like Brockway, members of ILP and connected with POUM, who were menaced

along with the CNT/FAI by Communist chicanery in Spain, realised what the Communists were about. On a programme on the subject at 10 p. m. on Saturday, July 17th, "The Witness", Brockway said that the war in Spain made him abandon a pacifist position and reject Russian type communism. Eventually, of course, Lord Brockway accepted gentle social democratic privilege and became an established critic of the system.

For me the logic of the situation was to become an anarchist and the logic for the pacifist, of course, is that no privileged society can be a peaceful society. Moreover in fact anarchism cannot by its nature be imposed. These are the conflicts, and sometimes the natural instincts of self-preservation may dictate actions which will not in themselves procure an anarchist society.

The Spanish Civil War destroyed many of the bravest and most talented members of the anarchist movement, known and unknown. The Catholic Church with its background of the Inquisition also by its absolute support of Franco started to cut its superstitious stranglehold. The CP also started a suspicion about its role as a revolutionary party. For better or worse for anarchism, Spain has become more industrialised and we will see whether the Spain of Ferrer will survive to carry on for people and not politics.

Many of the recent programmes, as never before, have to a small degree put the anarchist concepts of revolution.

As Philip Toynbee indicates in the *Observer Review* of 18th July, he is no longer a revolutionary but he is still naive in thinking that social democracy with its gentle privilege will always remain gentle or its privilege unchallenged.

Alan Albon.

200 YEARS OF VIOLENCE

PART TWO (continued from Vol. 37 No. 15)

The war against Spain; in which more Americans died from tropical fevers and contaminated bully beef than from Spanish bullets; was the first overt overseas aggression by a rising imperialistic capitalism. It was the era of Boss Tweed and Tammany which bought and 'delivered' voters as slaves had previously been bartered. The rise of the popular press created figures like William Randolph Hearst (Citizen Kane and Patty's grandfather) who gave the immortal reply to his war photographers in Cuba regarding the impending war with Spain: "You supply the pictures, I'll supply the war". Hearst and his contemporaries played a game of trust-busting, muck-raking and reform. As the cynical Mr. Dooley put it, "It's a great mistake to think that anyone really wants reform. You never heard of a man reforming himself. He'll reform other people gladly. He likes to do it. But a healthy man'll never reform while he has the strength. A man doesn't reform till his will has been impaired so he hasn't power to resist what the papers call the blandishments of the tempter. And that's truer in politics than anywhere else."

W. R. Hearst was a great one for 'reform' but when he was backing candidates for the governorship and mayoralty of New York he utilized the Tammany leaders he had formerly denounced. McKinley the president at this time believed that government should not interfere in business. The real powers behind the Republican party believed in "the alliance between government and business for the benefit of business" (William Allen White). Bribery and corruption were rampant.

The assassination of McKinley at the Buffalo Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo in September 1901 by Leon Czolgosz was an instinctive response to this manifestly corrupt government. Emma Goldman had met Czolgosz and found him so wild in his attitude that she had thought he might be a police spy. He is reported to have said "I belong to nobody and I suffer".

Czolgosz's reaction was tragic and understandable but one feels its inadequacy, not merely in the face of the repression which followed, but in subsequent American history. McKinley was just as much a figurehead as any other American president. The trust-busting Teddy Roosevelt who followed McKinley was just as symbolic a 'reformer', and capitalist-imperialism thrived as before.

In the forefront of the continuing struggle against an expanding and ruthless capitalism were, as ever, the miners. In Colorado the Western Federation of Miners was accused of a series of outrages, but rarely did a jury do anything but acquit union members. At the same time a series of outrages was proved to have been committed by detectives employed by the Mine Owners' Association, notably by an agent provocateur named Harry Orchard.

One agent was promised \$500 for wrecking a train; other members of the W. F. M. were decoyed into the plot. In 1904 a railway station was blown up where 25 'scabs' were waiting for a train. The W. F. M. were accused but it is stated by Hunter that bloodhounds on the trail went back to the home of a Mine Owners' Association detective. This explosion took place when the president of the W. F. M. (Myers) was on trial and it prejudiced his case.

Desperate diseases seemed to require desperate remedies. "Dynamite was the stuff" -- and if the case of the Western Federation was proved to be permeated by agents the Mac Namara Brothers of the Ironworkers International Union were certainly guilty of blowing up the Los Angeles Times building in 1910. That twenty died was a consequence they did not foresee; the inflammable printing ink was a further contributory cause. Clarence Darrow earned some radical opprobrium by urging the brothers to plead 'guilty' and accept the consequences, a dilemma which has perplexed idealistic radical activists to this day.

However whilst radicals and anarchists slew their hundreds the capitalists, industrialists and militarists prepared to slay their millions.

In 1913-14 continuing strikes in the Rockefeller company mining towns in Colorado culminated in violent clashes and workers and marshals were killed. The militia co-operated with company guards and after two quiet months the striking miners encamped at Ludlow were attacked, their tents burned down by coal oil. At one pit, eleven children and two women were burned to death. Strikers from the whole area converged on the scene and on April 22nd President Wilson called in Federal troops to put down the occupation of the mines. Cavalry was employed and thirty deaths resulted. In August 1914 with befitting historical irony civilians were tried for fighting against the militia. 163 indictments were returned. All militia officers who were court-martialled were acquitted with the exception of one who received demotion.

The Industrial Workers of the World (founded in 1905) was nurtured and weaned on such struggles. Its existence summarized in the title of one of its own histories: The Bloodstained Trail. The textile strikes in Paterson in 1912 and in Lawrence in 1913 were bitter and savage. The IWW believed, and still believes in direct action, the strike, sabotage and free speech fights. They won the Lawrence strike by their methods and Ettor and Giovannitti were acquitted on a murder charge.

Stegner, a not conspicuously sympathetic writer, says of the IWW: "It represented the very dissidence of dissent, the rebelliousness of rebellion, and it lived an increasingly violent life, battered at by all the power of industry and industry's local laws, from 1905 to the series of anti-syndicalist trials that broke its back in the twenties."

Joe Hill was an outstanding figure in the IWW, a talented composer of songs and organiser of the migrant workers among whom the IWW gained its temporary strength before the rise of organized labour and Bolshevist-Communism.

He was shot in Utah by the Mormon state authorities for the alleged murder of a shopkeeper in the course of robbery. Expropriation of the expropriators is not unknown or unjustified in revolutionary circles so it is no criticism of Joe Hill to say, as many have, that it is possible that he was guilty. However, the unpopularity of IWW doctrines with the authorities made it possible that it was just another of the frame-ups frequently occurring within a vengeance masquerading as justice.

This campaign of authority against the IWW often dispensed with the legalistic framework and culminated in the type of brutal lynching the victim of which was generally a negro who had transgressed against the white man's law. (In the 1880s there were 100 lynchings a year, in 1900 115, 1901 130; by the 1940s they were down to four a year, one in 1945, six in 1946) Occasionally a white man was lynched to show that prejudice was not solely racial. Wesley Ewert on Armistice Day (1918) was beaten, castrated, lynched and pumped full of bullets. Frank Little, IWW organiser, was lynched at Butte (Montana) Bridge.

In September 1919 the police force of Boston went on strike. The governor of Massachusetts, Calvin Coolidge, made the sententious statement that there was "no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time". This made him a 'national hero' (according to F. L. Allen) and there was a successful movement to put him forward as President on a campaign of "back to normalcy" (his word); there was no such word and no such thing either.

"Normalcy" encompassed the Great Steel Strike led by William Z. Foster (then a syndicalist), the Palmer raids and the Soviet Ark; the Wall Street bomb and the Sacco and Vanzetti Case. A. Mitchell Palmer, a quaker, was Attorney

General, appointed by Woodrow Wilson, advocate of the "New Freedom". The steel strike was followed by a coal strike, Palmer used a wartime act to prohibit the leaders of the coal strike from furthering it. The New York World said at the time there was "no Bolshevik menace in the United States and no I.W.W. menace that an ordinarily capable police force is not competent to deal with".

Emboldened by the success of his injunction, Palmer directed a series of raids in which Communists and others fulfilled the reactionary demand of 'going back to Russia' in the S. S. Burford, the "Soviet Ark". Alex Berkman and Emma Goldman were among those deported, and made good use of the free trip by denouncing the growing Soviet totalitarianism. On New Year's Day 1920 an extensive further series of raids took place. By then government agents had permeated the infant Communist movement; one had become a leader in his district. One hundred people were rounded up in Detroit and herded into a bull-pen 24 feet by 30 feet, for a week. "In the end," according to Morison and Commager, "only a few hundred were deported, the vast majority of those arrested were found to be harmless."

The election swept Calvin Coolidge into office (on the strength of his Boston police-strike action) as vice president to the undoubtedly corrupt Warren G. Harding, who died mysteriously in office. Mitchell Palmer, being a Democrat, never regained the power he had so zealously used.

On 16 September 1920, a horse-drawn cart loaded with TNT exploded in Wall Street and killed thirty people and injured hundreds. The perpetrators were never discovered but were suspected to be (according to F. L. Allen) "an anarchist gang". Nevertheless, Wall Street prices continued to rise.

As if the threatened lawlessness of anarchism, jazz, bobbed hair and Bolshevism were not enough to rack the U.S. constitution, the American government counfounded its own confusion by making an Eighteenth Amendment prohibiting the "manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors" or the import or export thereof! This came into force on 29 January 1919 and instituted a reign of absolute chaos, murder, lawlessness, corruption and alcoholism (lasting till 1933) which contained not a drop of the political philosophies of anarchism or Bolshevism but was founded on law-making.

Bootlegging grew by what it fed upon and the general appetite for free-enterprise business expanded the conglomerate empire of racketeering to include extortion, kidnapping and labour 'protection' rackets with the use of union apparatus to extort from workers and employers. This aspect of 'business unionism' has not yet departed from the American scene.

In the deportations delirium and Palmer raids of 1919-20, Andrea Salsedo a typesetter and Robert Elia a printer of anarchist literature in Brooklyn, New York were picked up by Justice agents in connection with a leaflet found on the site of a premature bombing of the Attorney General's home. They were detained from February. In April a meeting was held by an anarchist group in East Boston to consider what could be done to help. One member, Nicola Sacco, was sent to New York to enquire from the lawyer for Salsedo and Elia what could be done. The lawyer passed on a warning to radical groups to dispose of anarchist literature because of the possibility of further Department of Justice raids.

On the morning of May 3, the body of Salsedo was found crushed to a pulp on the pavement of Park Row, fourteen stories below the window of the Department of Justice building where Salsedo and Elia had been held, without charge, since February. (The fate of Pinelli in Italy provides a parallel). Spurred on by the threat implicit in this, Sacco, his friend Vanzetti and other Italian comrades set out on a journey to collect anarchist literature in anticipation of possible raids and likely detention and deportation. This mission formed the basis for the highly theoretical legal concept of 'consciousness of guilt' which was introduced into the case by the prosecution.

When Sacco and Vanzetti were first arrested they were not

told for some time what the charge was (subsequently it was revealed as two payroll robberies and murder; with one of which Vanzetti was charged). The 'consciousness of guilt' which made them lie about their movements was an endeavour to protect themselves and others from possible detention, deportation or the fate of Salsedo.

The case was long and complex, occupying the world stage with appeals, motions and commissions of enquiry for seven years. They were executed on 23 August 1927, after legally fighting every inch of the way.

As Morison and Commager say, "Hostility to radicals, antipathy to foreigners and jealousy for maintenance of the status quo were revealed" in the case.... "Although appearances were against them the actual evidence against them was slight and their alibis were sound." Nevertheless they died in the chair, victims of prejudice.

The other abiding American prejudice, against negroes, persisted in spite of slave liberation and laws. In 1931 a group of black hoboes clashed with white hoboes on a freight train in Alabama. They were arrested and taken to Scottsboro where an additional charge of rape of two white hobo girls was made. This was a trumped-up charge but it carried the death penalty. One of the girls later withdrew her charge. The agitation for release continued into 1939. In 1948 one escapes and writes his book Scottsboro Boy. Later recaptured, he died of cancer in prison in 1952. The irony of this case is that the most depressed and despised of mankind were divided and conquered by the accident of colour. Equally exploited and poverty-stricken, they fought amongst themselves.

By 1932 another bomb had hit Wall Street. The market had crashed and banks were closing. Ex-soldiers had conceived the desperate notion of marching on Washington and encamping there to establish their claim to a 'bonus'. Herbert Hoover, then President, ordered his Chief of Staff to evict the Bonus army from Anacostia Flats. With great panache, the Chief did so. He was Douglas MacArthur, and later in a libel action claimed he was 'only obeying orders'. He was aided in this brutal but no doubt distasteful task by one General Eisenhower.

The brutality and violence endemic in American life, since America is only capitalist-imperialist-militarism writ large, repeats itself throughout the latter years of the two hundred.

One last incident in 1937 highlights the consequence of police and industrialists in co-operation. In 1937 in Chicago, workers at Republic Steel were on strike. Dozens of strikers had been arrested, beaten and waylaid. Workers' property had been smashed and destroyed. A mass meeting was held followed by a march on the plant. About two hundred yards from the plant they were stopped by the police who drew their batons and flung gas grenades. The police panicked, faced by the oncoming marchers. They drew their guns and fired on the crowd. Police ran after fleeing men and shot them down. Seven died and more than a hundred were wounded. Newsreels of the scenes were suppressed voluntarily by Paramount News.

*

It would seem that this has been an exercise in Yankee-bashing, but we have been dazzled by romantic patriotic guff about 1776 and if 'a way to the better there be it entails a look at the worst'.

The worst of American history has been presented here, necessarily, but for every Judge Thayer there was a Sacco, for every Captain Schaak a Vanzetti. America had its Thoreau, its Tom Paine (and we did too!), its Whitman as well as its Al Capone, its Samuel Gompers, its Jimmy Hoffa. It had its Berkman and Goldman as well as its Warren Harding and Richard Nixon. There is no way of indicting a whole nation and much of the anti-Americanism of the left is pure envy but it is not in envy but in sadness that one recalls this bi-centennial of violence.

Jack Robinson.

THE SACRED SOWS

THE EUROPEAN middle class have an obsessional love-hate relationship with the working class. In times of social or industrial unrest the sons of the wealthy bureaucrats have been first in the field, wielding the baton instead of the bat, in restoring their order and when the bloodied heads are bowed in silent humility comes the youth clubs, soup for the hungry, free shoes for the children, a toleration of a trade union neighing like a spavined horse in gratitude for its earned hay and a place within a university for 50 out of every generation of 50,000,000 workpeople.

Tell me little comrade that in this age of working class affluence when a 50- and 60-hour week gives a take-home pay of £ 40.00 that these things no longer apply, but I still rise to go to work at five in the morning and these things happened in my working life. And I will point to the Spanish, the Irish or the Turkish workers and call upon them to bear witness to my rage that they happen now. But working class affluence with liver paté in every pot and a trade union hierarchy genuinely earning their seats in the House of Lords have dulled the sword of working-class militancy and the Town and his Fabian frau have a magnificent choice of exhibitions extolling revolutions caught by the balls. Mounted by the middle class and for the middle class, they can answer the question 'what did you do daddy when the class call came?'. In a revolutionary confrontation there is only one enemy and that is the middle class. For the ultra rich could or would only form a single battalion of militant millionaires and every revolution has been against an entrenched class who control the economy and the direction of the armed forces. In sporadic outbreaks of industrial violence there are those who are "traitors to their class", up or down, and whosoever's purpose it suits honours them for their patriotism or their conscience, but in the end every man must stand in judgement on his own actions for only he knows why he acted the way he did. At the National Portrait Gallery there is the exhibition of Young Writers of the Thirties and it is a truly memorable attempt to capture the spirit of the 1930s.

This was the age of Hitler and of Goering, of Mussolini and of the Hunger Marchers and of Spain; when the Fascist Blackshirts marched in every European capital and poison gas was dropped in Abyssinia and the Austrian workers defended their homes room by room to the death, and it was no time for the grand debate for in every country the working class was in retreat. It was an age when the middle-class intelligentsia controlled the production of the printed word merely as a matter of economics but they honoured their ward and the agony of the hour burnished their prose and gave a meaning to their slight verse.

The key to this exhibition is Samuel Hynes' book The Auden Generation and it makes good reading for those who wish to feed off the myths and facts of that dark age, and for Hynes the Auden generation are Isherwood, Spender, C. Day Lewis and MacNeice. Different critics have hinted at cliques and listed their own missing favourite sons but time, as in all things, will weed out the great and the small, placing each in his respective college cupboard. Isherwood was at the press day, with Spender, a slight man in a pale blue suit looking vaguely like the late President Atom Bomb Harry Truman, and drop a name or nay it was good to stand and listen to this man praise not only the Vietnam protestors but defend the work of the great lyrical poet Roy Campbell, a romantic rightwing clown who went to Spain for Franco but never fired a shot and has been damned ever since, and here within the NPG are the manifestoes of the dead in letter and in book from the Daily Worker to the poem and the printed leaflet.

Time and London Transport honoured the Victoria and Albert Museum with my presence for the exhibition of the graphic work of Honore Daumier. Here was an artist who produced literally thousands of lithographs, drawings and wood engravings yet despite his social stance some how his works fail to hold our attention. The key lies in the fact that too often he would do a set drawing and let someone else add a political caption, so that the drawn figures amuse but rarely anger. There is none of the contempt of Hogarth for his age, none of the frustrated rage of Goya recording man's inhumanity in defence of the higher ideals, only an amused smile and a giggle within the V & A.

Yet it is the British Museum who have mounted what one assumes should be one of the great crowd crawling exhibitions of the year with the life and times of Tolstoy. The centre piece is a mock-up of Tolstoy's studio, complete with genuine wellies, chairs, tables and various neo-historical oddments hired from the Old Times Furnishing Co. Tottenham Court Road. Here is Tolstoy the great sacred sow of

mysticism for the well-to-do, the man who loved the Russian peasants as long as the Russian peasants loved him and at a respectable D.D.T. distance and at the whack of a knout the Russian peasant masses automatically fell into cinematic groups even before Eisenstein arrived to honoured by the Russian State for his mystical pap based on Matthew 5:39. "That ye resist not evil" is the Tolstovatvo message in his work and in his advice to the singing serfs. The more one examines the man the more one must dislike him, this man who preached poverty but lived among the affluent, this mystic who kept the family loot in his wife's name had nothing to learn from Angus Ogilvy, 'Tiny' Rowland or My Lord Duncan-Sandys of the Lonrho pig trough. Here is the photograph of Tolstoy with his friend the painter Ilya Repin, the father of Socialist Realism idealising the Russian workers and peasants as long as they did not become counterrevolutionaries by striking for more wages or better working conditions. And stand within the British Museum and listen to the crackling recorded voice of Tolstoy against the literary naturalism of the day. Verlaine, Rimbaud, Mallarme or Keats called down the pedantic condemnation of Tolstoy with his "rejection of civilised man with all his reflective moralities and natural man unconscious of good and evil therefore beyond the reach of artificial and corrupt moralities".

Bernard Shaw was no man's fool and in a long review of Tolstoy's What is Art? in the September 10th 1898 Daily Chronicle Shaw took Tolstoy apart line by line, basing his argument on Tolstoy's "Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, not being popular among the Russian peasantry is not a true work of art!" Since Stalin and Truman this line of art criticism is not worth the dignity or time of pulling to boneless pieces but it was this idealisation of mass mediocracy, he it working class or middle class, comrade, to give an importance to one's own shallow opinions that makes all Tolstoy's advice and opinions suspect. And there within the British Museum the crackling voice of Tolstoy can still be heard crying to the empty corridors that the "Decadent Movement is a decline. Decline in art and decline in civilisation. Their poetry and art appeals only to a small circle WHICH IS ABNORMAL AS THEY THEMSELVES". We owe Tolstoy nothing, least of all our time, and those who wish to sup of Tolstoy's preachings can do not better or worse than to listen to his latter day disciple Malcolm Muggeridge, a man who arrives late at every revolution and only stays long enough to piss on the barricade and now in serene and wealthy old age rejects the pleasure of the flesh in the comfortable knowledge that he has a well stocked larder.

I like Muggeridge as a human but as Tolstoy's barker he dims the way to dusty death for mankind. Dickens may have produced a gallery of grotesques but he placed them within valid human situations. Shakespear marked man in all his humours a victim of good and evil, while Dostoyevsky may have acted out the great Slav myth that the Russian peasant is God's creature but in his life and in his art he acted out man's awful tragedy, for in Dvevnik Pisatleya he wrote that "It is clear that evil is buried more deeply in humanity than the cure-all socialists think, that evil cannot be avoided in any organisation of society, that a man's soul will remain the same". Shakespear, Dickens, and Dostoyevsky gave us their true versions of the baleful truth but Tolstoy handed out non-eatable candyfloss for the mindless mob. Shakespear gave us Iago, Dickens paternalistic managerial society in the plump smiling Mr Pickwick and Dostoyevsky Nechaev the amoral nihilist, and comrades, in 1976 they sit at your side and Tolstoy gave us Natasha the Great Earth Mother for commercial television soap opera.

And within the British Museum it/he is there for the viewing but one owes a debt so it is to the Ben Uri Gallery at 21 Dean Street, Soho and up in the lonely lift within this synagogue with the dreary hate swastika scraped on the lift wall to view the cartoons and drawings of Vicky (Victor Weisz). Vicky is dead for like his father he killed himself, O foolish Vicky, and here are the cartoons of an artist who could not tolerate the world he chose to mock. Born in Berlin the politicians made him a citizen of the world but like Daumier he did not have the killing instinct, for he could only strike but never wound and alone within the high floor of this synagogue we pay tribute to a very gentle man.

And for my pleasure it is the Duke of Edinburgh's paintings within the Royal Academy with their sense of space and debt to De Stael, Rhonda Whitehead's geometrical abstractions as an offshoot from Kinetic art at the ICA and a sad shake of the head for Warhol's pooches at the Mayor and de Kooning's abstracts at Gimpel's for with such banal paintings it is back to the numbered junior painting boards.

Arthur Moyse.

TERRORIST REPRESSION

"BETWEEN STATE REPRESSION & IDEOLOGICAL REPRESSION"

OF THE DEAD, it is a commonplace to remember only their best aspects. It is a convention that all like to respect: a convention practised by good people. This custom has also not been abandoned in the case of Ulrike Meinhof, the German revolutionary "found dead" in Stammheim prison. Progressive bourgeois elements and the left developed feelings of guilt and so shed their hypocritical tears on this "vanquished band of desperados".

When the Baader-Meinhof group was not yet a "victim of power" it was called a coven of lunatics or of provocateurs by the same people who today shed their little tear for the occasion.

Many, too many, people have accepted this state of affairs for convenience. Many, too many, continue to define as provocateurs those who choose armed struggle in the Europe of the seventies. But can we realistically talk only of provocateurs in these instances? We do not think so. The strategy of the Rote Armee Fraktion was born out of an analysis of the socio-political conditions of the European working masses with particular reference to Germany, of the development of "social-democratic neo-capitalism" and out of what they saw as the necessity to create immediately the conditions for armed revolution. Their programme is neither lacking in sincerity nor contradictions, but still retains its validity and its own logic. They propose a model for struggle which descends directly from the teachings of Lenin, Mao and Castro. Their book, *Der Bewaffnete Kampf in Westeuropa* ("The Armed Struggle in West Europe") abounds in quotations from these fathers of marxist--eninism, and these are not merely random quotations used to support their arguments, but form part of a totally organic discussion which sees "the armed struggle as the highest form of class struggle in conjunction with the fact that the ruling classes have succeeded in securing a universally recognised control over the levers of power and also a monopoly over the discriminating instruments of power and violence -- the police and the army".

Whilst we can disagree with this point of view we cannot dismiss it with the convenient formula of provocation. Above all it must be remembered that the Marxist-Leninist groups raced each other to attack the R. A. F. because they wished to avoid the danger of sharing the same repression, and because the strategy of the R. A. F., which also defined itself as Marxist-Leninist, called into question their "legalistic strategy" in the revolutionary process. The absurd thing in all this affair, is that we anarchists have had to defend Marxist-Leninists from the attacks of other Marxist-Leninists.

Why? First of all because we hold that the use of slander is inadmissible even when directed against revolutionaries with tendencies different from if not opposed to our own. Secondly because we believe that nobody should impede others from following their own road in the struggle against power. Nobody can claim the right to pretend that his/her strategy is the only right one and that therefore all the others must be liquidated.

In this manner the violent repression practised by the State has been supported by the 'ideological' repression of the left. This should horrify all those with a minimum of commonsense, but this rarely comes about. The systematic use of Stalinist methodology has contaminated nearly all the forces of the revolutionary left, including those that do not recognise themselves as Stalinist. The parallel case in Italy is that of the Brigade Rosse who whilst singing the praises of Stalin are attacked strongly by all the Marxist-Leninists and by the Stalinists in particular.

Attacks of repression together with ideological attacks have produced their own results. The "armed groups" have entered into a crisis with the arrests, the shoot-outs with the police and the campaign of denigration having dealt hard blows on these organisations. Furthermore, those in power here expertly made use of these episodes to bring into being new liberticidal legislation with-

out encountering any serious opposition. The witch-hunt climate (most evident in Germany but also present in Italy) has acted in favour of the repressive apparatus whilst the myopia of the revolutionary groups has done the rest. The shameful silence with which the State has been allowed to persecute these "armed revolutionaries" even after their arrest is a stain which many will not be able to wash off.

It is not a question of being in agreement with the strategy of the B.R. or the R.A.F., since we ourselves clearly disagree with it and politically we stand a thousand miles apart, but it is a question of recognising the right, of whoever it may be, to "say no" to power in a violent manner according to the methods and forms which they themselves have chosen. The significance of this "no" today is of great importance since everybody accepts the rules of the game imposed on them by power, because legality constitutes an acceptance of these rules, and because yes is said also with the electoral farce. Today everybody says yes. The space for real dissent is being frighteningly restricted and the physical possibility of effectively saying no is lacking. Dissent and revolutionary opposition do not live off compromises, and neither should they seek easy consent. If at this moment in time the masses are mystified by reformist and pseudo-revolutionary propaganda the courage must be shown to go against the current to create the space, even by example, to be able to say the organized mass "no".

L. L.

(Translated from *A Rivista Anarchica*
June/July 1976.)

CONTRARIES

[Cont. from P. 16]

politics are concerned. I've put Col's name in too, as he'll find out when he reads tomorrow's papers. People like you and Col have to be press-ganged!"

And they were. The whole project was preposterous and if Stuart had had any political experience he would have insisted on a public disclaimer. It was enough for him that his friends knew where he stood. This was a mistake. The literary 'left' lumped him in with the Spartacists and was after his blood.

When Stuart's play was put on at the Royal Court, Christopher Logue and Kenneth Tynan made a scene, the poet making a noisy exit, the critic shouting "Rubbish!" Colin shouted from the back, "Shut up, Christopher Logue!" and told Tynan: "We'll get you. We'll stamp you out, Tynan." To which Tynan replied, "Stay out of my life, Wilson." Etcetera.

The next day Stuart left town. In this book he has tried to take the curse off himself and he has succeeded brilliantly. I haven't seen any mention of his book anywhere. Perhaps this might untie a few tongues. Were these the 'fifties his book would be discussed

though the events read like fiction all this has happened. Difficult to say who gets the best lines. Some of Colin's (Wilson) and Bill's utterances were outrageous in content and intent, but you did not have to weigh everything they said by the epigram.

There was instant success and lionising for Stuart. The press called him an Angry Young Man (together with such unangry old men as Amis, Braine, and many others who were not even writers (like Lindsay Anderson).

But he came into a rather treacherous political crowd and clearly, then, he was not equipped for it. His politics were mild anarchism and Ban-the-Bomb and of saying No! (to tyranny, hypocrisy, prejudice, fear).

It is both instructive and upsetting how he was trapped and his literary career ruined within months. Without his permission or knowledge he was made member of a political grouping (the Spartacists). When he complained to Bill the ebullient mischief-maker said: "(If I had consulted you) you might not have agreed. Writers are inclined to be so pussyfooting where and debated at all literary camp-fires and (ahem) coffee houses.

John Rety.

CONTRARIES

Contraries by Stuart Holroyd (Bodley Head, £2.95)

HERE IS a book that was enjoyable to read; and now enjoyable to think about. Perhaps Stuart Holroyd is an exemplary writer, or I am an exemplary reader.

I no longer have the book by me, Susan returned it to the library whilst I was in hospital, and all I have here are a few notes that I jotted down on reading the book. Nevertheless my intention in wanting to talk about the book has become clearer. It is something I miss, something I would like to have around, an account which sounded true to my ears then and now to my memory of a period, of a group of people, of conversations, heated discussions, my second childhood, perhaps the only time I ever felt hopeful about the world, I was young and nothing frightened me. Stuart was somewhere in this world, talking to the same people, never to me, part of the boiling cauldron. Alliances, misalliances, and all that time it did not occur to me, as it never occurred to him, that we might be com-

As I have dealt in previous "Notes" with both Anarchism in Russia and in Spain, I thought that this time, at the risk of accusations of chauvinism, I'd take a brief look at what I might term the English (pace Celts) Libertarian Tradition.

Its earliest, and in some ways most interesting phase - apart, that is, from the Peasants' Revolt - concerns the movements arising out of the English Revolution of 1649. Pride of place must go here to George H. Sabine's monumental and fascinating "Works of Gerrard Winstanley" (£10 + 70p. post.), which contains every known work of G.W. together with a number of Digger tracts in whose composition Winstanley almost certainly had a hand. Altogether it is a fine combination of scholarship and commitment - it is a pity that the two do not, more often, go together.

If that is slightly too expensive for your taste, there is Christopher Hill's recent edition in Penguins of Winstanley's "The Law of Freedom and other writings" (£0.75 + 17p. post.); of parallel interest there is Hill's own book, also a recent Penguin, "The World turned upside down: Radical ideas during the English revolution." (£1 + 17p. post.).

I confess I find the Levellers (i.e. the Lilburne "faction") of less interest than the Diggers, and certainly of less relevance to modern problems, however G.E. Aylmer's recent "The Levellers in the English Revolution" (£1.95 + 23p. post.) presents a useful collection of their pamphlets and tracts by such as Lilburne himself, also Walwyn, Overton and many anonymous pamphleteers. This book is also nicely illustrated.

Moving on we come to E.P. Thompson's vast and authoritative "The Making of the English Working Class" (£2 + 47p. post.). 958 pages covering the period 1780 to the first Reform Act of 1832. Thompson is at his best and most valuable when rescuing from obscurity a considerable army of itinerant pamphleteers, radicals and revolutionaries who more than anyone else were responsible for what improvements were achiev-

rades; our anarchism defined by others, he under the influence of Alfred Reynolds' "gentle anarchism" (Colin Wilson's barb), I under the accusing basilisk eyes of John Pilgrim who told me darkly that people avoided me less for my socks than because they thought I was an anarchist.

The title "Contraries" is a clue to the book. There is a passage in Robinson Crusoe that has some bearing on Stuart's book.

Robinson built himself a boat in order to escape his dreadful island but the currents are too strong and he is afraid. He now wishes to return to the security of his miserable existence. The relevant passage is: "What he would give to be on shore again! Thus we never see the true state of our condition; till it is illustrated to us by its contraries."

The resemblance does not stop there. It is also a book about achievement, although Stuart (the writer) would hardly be pleased with what Robinson considers as great triumphs (baking bread!) or worried about failures (not being able to make a wheel-barrow!).

Where Stuart is at is thoughts, logic, the will. He was dreadfully knocked about in the 'fifties and has been pretty

silent since. It is great to hear his voice again. The curse is off, his tongue is no longer bound.

This has been a difficult book for Stuart to write; most of that generation is mute today, to remember their voices is difficult enough but to define purpose is almost impossible. What he has achieved is an exceptionally honest book, written with great passion. I doubt that the conversations that Stuart recalls could take place today; the ideas, the ideals, even the phraseology has changed. There is much humour on the way and it curiously reminds me of yet another favourite: Jerome K. Jerome's Three Men in a Boat (not forgetting the dog). Here the men are not boating on the Thames, but are splashing about in literature and although there is a dog too, in Stuart's life it is the women one should not forget about.

He was warned well in advance by a fellow writer (Bill Hopkins) after Stuart confessed he was in love:

An absurd and undignified condition. It results in impairment of judgment, loss of drive, criminal squandering of time and energy. To be in love is to confess to being a mediocrity!

This sounds like a real quote. Al-
[Cont. on P. 15]

BOOKSHOP NOTES

ed in those repressive times; yet few of them are at all well known today.

"Luddites, Poor Weavers, Artisans, Croppers and Stockingers", Cato Street Conspirators, The Martyrs of Peterloo, as well as Cobbett, Carlile and Owen - they are all here. It is a vast panoramic canvas.

From a similar period we have Brian Simon's "The Radical Tradition in Education in Britain" (£1 + 23p. post.); this includes extracts from William Godwin, Tom Paine, Robert Owen, Richard Carlile, William Lovett, and William Morris, and their writings on education.

Which brings me nicely on to William Morris. Lawrence and Wishart have published two nicely balanced collections of his writings, the first of "Three (Complete) Works - "News from Nowhere" (his most famous work of Utopian romance), "A Dream of John Ball", and "Pilgrims of Hope" (£1 + 26p. post.). The second, "Political Writings of William Morris" (edited by A.L. Morton) (£1 + 20p. post.) includes such important writings by Morris as "Useful work versus Useless Toil", "Art and Socialism", "How we live and How we might live", and "Socialism and Anarchism" and much more.

The most important collection of Herbert Read's work, "Anarchy and Order" (£1.50 + 23p. post.) has recently become available again, and includes amongst other things "The Philosophy of Anarchism" (1940), and "Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism" (1949), both originally published by Freedom Press. Also included are "Revolution and Reason" (1953), "Poetry and Anarchism" (1938), "The Paradox

of Anarchism" (1941), "Chains of Freedom" (1946-52) and "My Anarchism" (1966).

Which brings us on to today, two of the most important books by anarchists in this country in recent years, from considerably different standpoints are Colin Ward's "Anarchy in Action" (£1.75 + 17p. post.) a concise summation of Colin Ward's work not only as editor of Freedom Press's "Anarchy" monthly from 1961-1970, (the complete 118 issues of this dynamic magazine are still available in a 10 volume set for £45.00 including registered postage; many of the individual issues still available at 15p. + post.), but also as an editor and contributor to "Freedom" and many other journals for many years before that.

And secondly there is Stuart Christie and Albert Meltzer's "Floodgates of Anarchy" (£0.35 + 14p. post.) - still the most important statement of the contemporary revolutionary anarchist position to have come out of this country.

More recent still is Michael Taylor's "Anarchy and Co-operation", which I feel diffident about commenting upon as it seems to take a highly mathematical view of anarchism and I am no mathematician, but if you are or even if you'd like to be, this book may be of interest. (£5.95 + 47p. post.)

Lastly, there is Tony Bunyan's "History and Practice of the Political Police in Britain". (£4.95 + 47p. post.) This is the first - and long overdue - real analysis of the role of the Special Branch, MI5, Special Patrol Group and the rest of their ilk in the counterrevolutionary armoury of the state.

I have deliberately made no mention in these notes of the works of, and on, William Godwin, Percy Shelley and Mary Wollstonecraft, as they were, quite recently, the subject of "Bookshop Notes" on their own.