

PRISONS

THE RECENT DEMONSTRATION by the prisoners of what was "Hull top security prison" was reported in the national media as simply a protest against the beating-up of a prisoner by prison guards. Ted Ward of PROP in London pointed out to us that the "development at Hull has shown that people have learned from past experience. That the only way in which people in these institutions can get anything done, after they have exhausted all the legal processes they can go through, is to do it themselves."

If a prisoner has a complaint to make, the impossible bureaucratic tangle into which every man, woman or child (let's not forget that prisoners also include women and children) has to get themselves involved in virtually ensures that at all the odds are against the prisoner. Ted Ward outlined the grossly unfair legal procedure:

BUREAUCRATIC TANGLE

"In the morning when the cell is unlocked the prisoner will see the landing officer and apply to see the Wing PO. The Wing PO will decide whether the matter raised in the complaint needs to be dealt with and whether he himself is capable of dealing with it, or the governor, or whatever. However, if the PO finds that the complaint is against a member of his staff he will do everything in his power to stop the complaint getting any further."

The prisoner then has to put his complaint in writing and that must be done through the landing officer, which invariably means that the staff concerned will see a copy of the complaint.

"In my experience I've found that once the complaint is in writing the prisoner will be able to see the appropriate person, such as the prison governor. But the prisoner is warned that if the complaint is found to be groundless disciplinary proceedings will take place."

"JUST A TROUBLEMAKER"

So, if that person gets to see the governor and the governor says, "there are no grounds for your complaint - you're just a troublemaker" the prisoner can apply to see the visiting magistrate or appeal to the board of visitors. But, before he can do that he must first go back to his cell, see the landing officer in the morning who will then see the Wing PO, put his complaint in writing, and so on.

PETITION TO HOME SECRETARY

After the prisoner has seen the board of visitors and they then find his complaint to be groundless the prisoner can petition the Home Secretary. But first, he has to go back to his cell, see the landing officer in the morning, put his complaint in writing to the Wing PO, apply to the governor, apply to the board of visitors. Now the prisoner's complaint will be put into the procedure book and the petition sent off (theoretically to the Home Secretary but in reality to the Home Office.).

Several months later, he or she will receive a letter from the Home Office saying that the complaint has been investigated and found to be groundless.

~ Self Help the only answer

PERMISSION TO WRITE TO M.P.

The prisoner must now seek permission to write to his local MP. He does this by seeing his landing officer, who will then contact the PO, put his complaint in writing, and so on right the way through the same procedure. He must again petition the Home Secretary for permission to write to his MP, and the petition must contain virtually everything he is going to say to his MP, before permission is eventually given. Petitions are never sent off direct by the prisoner, but are to be handed to the landing officer from whom it travels through the same bureaucratic procedure. The result is that the authorities at all levels will know what the prisoner is complaining about to his MP.

CATCH 22

"On paper the Home Office will show you a procedure which is laid down, which, quite frankly, looks very democratic - if I can use that word - you can't have anything more democratic. But of course, it's like the supplementary benefits commission and so on... it just doesn't bloody work - everything's discretionary."

"A lot of people that were at Hull were the same people that had been doing that for a period of years, and then, when they found that they had exhausted all those avenues they got their relatives and friends outside to start protesting for them."

Jesus Christ!

JENS Jorgen Thorsen's pornographic film which will apparently show Jesus making love to Mary Magdalene, John the Baptist and a modern Palestinian girl, will probably not be made in Britain after all. The full weight of the British state in the distinctly unerotic form of James Callaghan has now been added to the shrill chorus of protest from archbishops, sikhs (believe it or not), festival of light militants and other spiritual terrorists, threatening to make Thorsen's life and that of his supporters "intolerable" if he is allowed into Britain.

The film exists as yet only in his mind and no doubt in a script, yet already these above-mentioned hope to use both the Blasphemy Act (last applied in 1922 to someone aptly enough called Gott) and Treaty of Rome clause on undesirable aliens disrupting "public order" to prevent him setting foot on the chaste soil of England.

What do their overheated brains imagine? The streets filling with murderous Christians in hot pursuit of the hirsute Dane; pious Christians suddenly reverting, from shock, to multi-sexual orgies and revolution a la Roszak; a last invasion of the ragged remnants of Christendom by the barbarian hordes of Scandinavia; a spiritual depression that will cause the film-going electorate to abandon the polls; a new theological schism that will make Lefebvre's tridentine mass rebellion look like a seminarist's prank?

MISSING FREEDOM

We regret that owing to the NGA dispute FREEDOM could not be printed and distributed last week. We hope to be able to maintain a regular schedule again from now on - Freedom Collective.

"GHOSTING" OF PRISONERS

"A thing which is not commonly known and needs to be spelt out - the vast majority of men that are in prison if they have wives and children - they are on supplementary benefit." So the way that the bastards get back at them is that without any warning whatsoever the prison authorities "ghost" the prisoners (i.e. the prisoner is taken down to reception at any time of the day or night and transferred to an unknown destination). The prisoner will already have a visiting order out for his wife and children but the authorities will then make it very difficult for the wives and relatives to find out where the prisoner has been sent to. Eventually after much toing and froing between the Home Office and the prison governor, and the trouble which the prisoner's relatives invariably have to cause, they will be informed where the prisoner has been transferred to.

HULL AND OTHERS

"Eventually they do tell you where they are, and invariably over the last few years it's been Hull - Hull or Albany. In the main it's been Hull, Albany or Wandsworth they transfer people to."

Tony Ward gave as an example of the authorities' going against the Home Office's established rules the case of Peter Chappel. Peter Chappel is London-born and bred, lived in London all his life, helped to organise the campaign in London, and then the bastards sent him down to Liverpool.

(continued on p. 2)

Whatever it may be, and however good or bad the film, the combined forces of Church and State are assembling to ensure that we will not be able to find out for ourselves.

Personally, though I think bisexuality to have been quite possible in someone who made up his own mind which laws to follow and which to ignore, though I believe it to be quite natural in any case, the idea of a speculative sex life of Jesus leaves me cold - and incidentally, has Thorsen not got the wrong John for the part? But, of course, that is hardly the point any longer. Very clumsily, the issue has become one of civil liberties. T.G.



ARTHUR MOYSE

"DID I HEAR THAT SOMEONE WANTS TO MAKE A PORN FILM?"

A.F.L.—

DOCUMENTATION of extensive ties between the CIA and the leadership of the AFL-CIO has been confirmed by one of the founders of the CIO and a veteran of 40 years in the national and international programmes of the American labour movement.

Victor Reuther, brother of United Auto Workers (UAW) President Walter Reuther, has just completed a book wherein he documents an extensive and lengthy history of CIA and labour "solidarity of subversion" that sometimes used tactics designed to entrap prominent US Labour officials into situations that would enable the CIA to buy their cooperation and silence. The substance of Reuther's charges, contained in his new book, *The Brothers Reuther*, is that subversion in many US labour programmes outweighed the solidarity angles.

Reuther was in an unusually good position to judge the effect of the use of US labour programmes overseas on the part of the CIA. As director of the UAW International Affairs Department for many years he was able to observe the actions of representatives of other unions, the AFL and the world-wide apparatus of the merged AFL and CIO that was run by former leftists and Communists under the direction of the AFL-CIO international director Jay Lovestone. According to Reuther, Lovestone played an important role in attempts to split the infant UAW and cooperate with auto companies as early as the mid 1930s. Lovestone was made director of international affairs of the AFL-CIO over the protests of the UAW and Walter and Victor Reuther in the 1950s.

PRISONS

SPREAD OF PROTEST

Since the 1970 disturbances the Home Office policy has been to scatter those prisoners regarded as "troublemakers". As far as PROP is concerned that is the best thing that can happen since this "spreads solidarity throughout the prisons in the country."

The people gathered at Hull were virtually all people who had been through these lengthy channels and as a result found themselves transferred to Hull. These men found that with all their other channels exhausted the impetus was to get together, organise and fight.

So for the first time, almost, with the exception of Albany, Parkhurst in 1969, and possibly going back even further to the Dartmoor protests in the 30's, these prisoners came together on a specific point and it confronted them all and they made their protest.

Obviously as time goes on these protests will spread because the men who have been transferred from the ex-prison of Hull will, although they will be punished, spread their discontent, which is common to all prisoners in the other institutions. PROP (preservation of the rights of prisoners) is, to our mind, the ideal type of organisation to help the prisoners organise their resistance. "We work as autonomous groups. We have no bureaucratic structures." The initiative, of course, comes from the prisoners themselves, and PROP was established and is run by ex-prisoners.

(the above was prepared from an interview with Tony Ward of PROP London)
Nino Staffa

C.I.A.

In 1951 Victor Reuther was released from his UAW duties in the US and was sent on a long tour through Europe to assess the state of European trade unionism. At that time he already had extensive experience in the international aspects of trade unionism and was able to utilize his experiences and contacts gained during a trip through Europe to the Soviet Union in the early 1930s. Both Victor and Walter Reuther worked in a Soviet auto plant (established by Henry Ford) for almost two years before their involvement and activity in the UAW.

Reuther says that after this 1951 trip CIO President Phil Murray asked him to assume the directorship of a European office of the CIO that might, in part, help to counter the more conservative policies of the AFL office there that was under the direction of Lovestone and Irving Brown.

Reuther says that he found that Irving Brown and the AFL were receiving "incredibly large funds from some US government sources in an effort to get European trade unions in his pocket and dictate the foreign policy of both European and African countries." He says that his investigations showed that "the hysterical fear of Communism that produced McCarthyism in America was being spread, by means of CIA money, first by the AFL and later by the merged AFL-CIO under Meany's autocratic rule."

CIA funding, according to Reuther, "was heaviest in Italy, France, North Africa and Greece." In each case the policy of Brown, Lovestone and Meany was to split the national trade union centres. In the case of Italy and France they are split to this day - making coordinated efforts against US and European multinational corporations extremely difficult. Although it is not mentioned in Reuther's book, Irving Brown was again appointed as AFL-CIO representative in 1975 and is using his Paris office to influence elections and labour affairs in Italy, France and Portugal. Documentation of Brown's efforts on behalf of the CIA in recent years has been provided by Philip Agee and many other writers.

Other legacies of the 1950s CIA and AFL programme in Europe were cited, including links to the Corsican Mafia under Ferri Pisani. Reuther and others have noted that the remnants of Pisani's Mafia organization are heavily involved in international drug dealing to this day - utilizing connections they obtained at that time.

Reuther also charges that national columnist and prominent Democrat, Tom Braden, tried to embroil him in CIA programmes in Europe at that time but that he turned the offers down. However, in 1967 Braden boasted that he had conduited \$50,000 through the UAW for work in Europe. At that time the UAW international programme was financed by the interest on the UAW strike fund - a mounting to millions every year - and Reuther admits that the UAW was involved but without knowing of the full implications.

Other charges and details provided in *The Brothers Reuther* include:

1) The fact that the American Institute for Free Labour Development has used hundreds of millions of overt and covert CIA and AID funding to disrupt and colonize the labour movements of Latin America.

2) The Communications Workers of America, AFSCME, and other unions (including the Newspaper Guild) accepted large amounts of CIA funding and direction in their overseas programmes. Both the CWA and the Guild accepted "subcontracts" from the AIFLD.

3) The AFL-CIO's African-American Labour Centre and the Asian-American Free Labour Institute have followed the pattern of AIFLD in government funding. The AALC was founded by Irving Brown and the AAFLI is run by Morris Paladino, identified as a CIA agent by Philip Agee and others.

4) The CIA attempted, and apparently succeeded, in sabotaging a reparations programme for Cuban exiles captured at the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion. The CIA's motives were to exacerbate US-Cuban relations.

5) The CIA itself leaked stories alleging connections between them and Victor Reuther in an attempt to disrupt a proposed opening towards left-wing alternatives to the support of Christian Democrats in Italy during the 1960s. It has since been revealed by sources other than Reuther that the CIA gave many millions to the Italian Christian Democrats. However, it has also been revealed that the CIA or CIA contact in one case gave money to local groups supporting coalitions with the Communists.

Victor Reuther has much to say about the current efforts to promote coordinated world programmes to deal with the anti-union policies of multinational corporations and governments. As one of the founders of the International Metalworkers Federation in the postwar period the UAW has been actively involved in this. He notes that other international trade secretariats and groups are also involved with these efforts and he details the splits that occurred when the AFL-CIO left the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in 1969. At that time the ICFTU was promoting expanded international labour solidarity.

However, the CIA seems to be still involved. At the present time Brown is in Europe and is still, according to prominent European labour leaders, involved in disrupting such programmes. And, according to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the CIA and others have been intercepting and reading Victor Reuther's mail.

Victor Reuther recently retired from the UAW but continues to involve himself in trade union affairs. His most recent effort was to become a sponsor of the national "Union Committee for An All-Labour AIFLD" which is promoting discussions and publishing material about government and corporate subversion of labour organisations.

People's News Service
(Rodney Larson and Research Associates
International, USA)

HELP!

COMRADES OF THE C.N.T. in Zaragoza need financial aid to set up a food co-operative. Last year a libertarian agrarian commune was set up in a small town in Aragon, but a boycott by the State has meant that their products cannot be sold in the normal markets. The Zaragoza comrades have decided, therefore, to sell the produce themselves at half price, but to do so they need a lot of money to get a shop, a truck and a large freezer.

The Spanish comrades are mounting a campaign to raise funds, and any amount that we can send them would be of great use. Any donations can be passed on via Freedom Bookshop.

PLASTIC PEOPLE

WHEN Khrushchev, the one time Soviet leader, visited this country he said that if he lived here he would be a Conservative. This wasn't just a compliment for his hosts, but a statement of his own political viewpoint. The Communist parties who are in power are the Conservatives of their respective countries.

An illustration of this is the visit of Cliff Richard, a pop star idol of the late fifties, to the Soviet Union. Now he is being officially praised by the Soviet authorities as a representative of contemporary music. It has taken something like eighteen years for this official recognition. In that time the same Cliff Richard has changed and has become a "Christian" and a figure of reaction alongside Mary Whitehouse and Malcolm Muggeridge. No doubt these three would find much to praise in the ordered society of the Soviet Union. They would also agree with a lot of the censorship which crushes so much free expression.

Indeed while Cliff is welcomed in the Soviet Union the Czech authorities are persecuting and have arrested two groups of rock musicians for "arousing public disturbances and nuisance in an organised manner." I like the "organised manner" bit, but they are serious charges which could get them imprisoned for up to three years.

Their arrest is part of a continual suppression of free expression, which was quickly crushed when the Soviet tanks rolled into Prague. Amnesty International has said that "all the information indicates that the Czech authorities have been seeking for a number of years to destroy the work of the two rock bands because of their non-compliance with arbitrary official limitations on artistic expression." Amnesty also says that if they are sentenced they will become prisoners of conscience.

Among those arrested is Ivan Jirous who was connected with psychedelic music in Prague in the 1960s. As artistic director of the Plastic People of the Universe, they gained a large following during 1968. The other group, DG 307 was formed after the events of that year. Both groups suffered from the activities of the authorities in 1971. Since that period the state has tried to prevent all expressions in the arts which fall outside accepted modes; both groups were prevented from playing before the public. They still continued to play in their own style, but could only do this at private functions and concerts. It was at one of these concerts, a wedding, that the groups were arrested. The police searched their homes and many of their friends and supporters were questioned. Their equipment was also confiscated.

It seems that while the Soviet Union is moving towards a more tolerant attitude, allowing the sale of Beatle records, the music and life styles of the Plastic People and DG 307 are still regarded as examples of "western decadence." This means that they set the texts of underground poets to music and are influenced by people like Andy Warhol and the music of Frank Zappa and the Mothers of Invention.

A far cry from the accepted Cliff Richard, and certainly music that has very much of a minority and cult following in the West, but in itself hardly a threat to the Czech state. But like all authorities, the Czech state cannot tolerate people who will not conform. Such

intolerance takes different forms at different times, but even here freedom of artistic expression is under attack by the friends of Cliff.

At the moment the Czech government seems to be playing its actions down because they have released on bail all but four of the fourteen rock musicians arrested. Their trial has also been postponed, perhaps because of the government foreign minister's visit to this country on September 13 - 16. This visit will give us an opportunity to protest and show solidarity with those arrested.

P.T.

POLAND Only words but ...

THIS paper has been among the critics of a so-called "intelligentsia" which, too often and too easily, cuts itself off from the struggles of those who do not express themselves in "intellectual" terms. But "the intelligentsia" is a dubious label which can be interpreted in many ways and it is only fair to note the solidarity that has been expressed for the workers imprisoned after the recent riots in Poland by such people as the historian, Jacek Kuron, the well-known author of Ashes and Diamonds, Jerzy Andrzejewski and many others in that country.



Jacek Kuron is a left-wing dissident who was expelled from the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP) in 1964 and imprisoned in 1965 after writing an "Open Letter to the Party" attacking what he called the "centralised political bureaucracy." Later he was very active in the student agitation of 1968. He openly blamed the centralised political bureaucracy for what happened at Radom and Ursus and having, no doubt - from Warsaw - a somewhat glamourised idea of the Italian Communist Party, he wrote asking its leader, Berlinguer, to protest against the jailing of the Polish workers. (This Berlinguer did). Now Kuron has been packed off for three months' military service. In a letter to the minister of Defence, Kuron's wife, Elzbieta Boeuckla-Kuron has expressed her fear that his life is in danger because of his serious state of health (heart trouble, hypertension) and total medical unfitness for military service. The newly-formed "underground" civil liberties group, Polish Youth Committee for the Implementation of the Helsinki Agreements, has now said that Jacek Kuron is in a security unit in the interior, isolated from the soldiers on active service and sleeps in a room apart with two security guards. He does not have to take part in military exercises but his situation amounts to imprisonment in all but name.

Apart from Ashes and Diamonds published 3 in 1947, Jerzy Andrzejewski has written The Inquisitors, a story about the Spanish Inquisition with Torquemada as a Stalinist figure, a satire called The Agent about an ordinary citizen who is put in a mental hospital because he thinks everyone he meets is a Party agent, and Pulp (1970) which he considers his life's work, but which has not yet been published. Now Andrzejewski has published a letter declaring complete solidarity with the workers in prison and promising that he and his fellow writers will not cease in their efforts for their release. In his letter he writes:

"I realise that, compared with the heavy prison terms, the violations of your rights, the physical violence you have suffered, the humiliations that have been inflicted on you, the helplessness that is your daily bread ... the deterioration of your means of material existence on account of the massive number of sackings, my words are only words and their weight is incommensurably small in relation to your sufferings. But these words are the only way in which I can express my solidarity with you, my compassion and my indignation." He goes on to say that he sees the persecuted workers as the "artisans of a just cause" and of a free socialism and demands an amnesty and rehabilitation of all those who have lost their jobs and means of support.

Meanwhile many "intellectuals" have been added to the State's blacklist. Passports have been withdrawn, teachers sacked from schools and universities, dissidents like Kuron despatched to the army, singers like Wojciech Mlynarski (or like their counterparts in Czechoslovakia) banned from appearing in public. Police interrogations have been stepped up and physical force is known to have been used against those interrogated.

WEST GERMANY

IN the course of a police search of 14 "left-wing" bookshops on German federal territory recently, 27-year-old Thomas Michael Kram from Bochum was arrested. The prosecutor, Erwin Fischer, confirmed that Thomas Kram was charged with circulating "anarchist writings". He is also suspected of belonging to a "criminal association." Source: FAZ

MEXICO

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Mexican Anarchist Federation reports:

"Since the elections of last July, the repressive situation has continued. The Mexican government is mounting numerous attacks on the people's movement. The striking busdrivers of Flecha Roja and Autobuses Unidos have been savagely repressed by blacklegs and police, resulting in one striker being killed in the clashes.

Kidnappings, torture and assassination are common actions used against the people's movements in Mexico. On the 20th June 1976, the well-known peasant militant of the "Tierra y Libertad" camp, Eusebio Garcia Avales was killed. The Mexican Anarchist Federation has offered its active solidarity to this peasant organization which has strong characteristics of natural anarchism."

20th August 1976.

4 IT'S NO GO, SIR ROBERT!

POLICE PRESENCE CAUSES RIOT

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE is solely to blame for the anti-police riot and looting that spoiled the last hours of the two day Caribbean Carnival in Portobello Road, London W 10, as hundreds of coloured and white youths reacted violently against the oppressive presence of about 2000 uniformed policemen sent into this populous and deprived area in order politically to control the 250,000 strong multi-racial crowd participating in the Carnival festivities.

Having been unable to stop this year's carnival legally, the Metropolitan Police did its utmost to disrupt the colourful "happening" by splitting the proceedings strategically into controlled areas, sticking, against wiser counsel given by some of the organisers, to fixed routes and areas, imposed by a mobile police Command HQ set up in Portobello Road.

This decision by the police to treat the Carnival as a political demonstration (for hours a red police helicopter circled over the area, liaising by radio with the mobile police station) provoked the crowds, the steel band players, the floats and the participants, who just wanted as in previous years to move freely about after their own spontaneous choosing without being told by the police what to do and where to go.

This deliberate and crowd-provoking over-policing caused intended tension and agro that had, inevitably, to come to the surface. So, by 5 pm the troubles started. A group of youngsters firmly approached the police, wanting to know why was a black teenager being arrested and manhandled by a dozen or so uniformed policemen into a police van parked near Acklam Road.

This single incident, which had been preceded by a series of doubtful arrests, sparked off twelve hours of sporadic and spontaneous anti-police rioting and shop looting that spread all over the Ladbroke, Portobello and Westbourne Park Grove area in a manner that, had the British police been armed, could easily have developed into another Soweto.

Now, in the aftermath of the rioting, the right wing press, the TV, radio and particularly Sir Robert Mark, the police boss, are trying to blame alleged black muggers, thieves and hooligans, operating in bands of twenty in the midst of the crowds, for this anti-authority rioting.

More curious is the fact that two Fleet Street journalists (one from the Sun, of course, another from the Times...!) chose to corroborate the police allegations by claiming to have been mugged before and during the troubles. I personally was unable to observe any evidence or allegations of widespread or organized robbing and mugging in the area after having mingled with the crowds for several hours with no feelings of apprehension or fear, before and during the rioting. (I can only vouch for a single case of a girl - a tourist - having her necklace, watch and camera stolen while waiting for the 31 bus at 11 pm at Westbourne Park Station).

Bearing in mind the justifications used by the police to smash the Windsor Free Festival, it becomes obvious that the police in this country has set its mind and its repressive apparatus against working people having fun, free of racist prejudices and in a mood of communal solidarity and understanding.

The Notting Hill Carnival rioting proves that

years of prejudice, oppression and police brutalities against the coloured communities in this country cannot easily be erased from the minds of those who suffer the unreported beatings in police stations, frame-ups, and insults at the hands of semi-literate and racist coppers.

Now politicians, sociologists, would-be black leaders, journalists, etc. pretend to show human concern about the plight of "those unfortunate and deprived kids", victims of unemployment, rotten housing and cultural alienation. The British establishment message is clear and simple: "But of course capitalism is not at fault! Just bad luck, lads!". That is, I would like to add, until the next bloody riot! Or, revolutionaries might ask, until a bloody minded working class insurrection? History will tell...!

Claude.

NO GO AREAS

FOR SOME OBSCURE REASON better known to Robert Mark's crude propagandist brain the events at Notting Hill were followed by statements from the man himself saying how he will not tolerate "no-go areas".

"There is no question of abdicating our responsibility. There are not going to be any no-go areas in Metropolitan police districts. The Metropolitan Force will police every street in its district, and will uphold law... We are responsible for policing London and nobody else. We will decide how we will do it and no section of society will prevent us doing it."

Robert Mark implies that the nation's police force is actually capable of policing the country. The official reason given for the massive police presence, for instance, was to stop pick-pocketing and mugging. As far as we are aware pick pockets are usually surveyed and caught by plain clothes policemen. Muggers also have more intelligence than to carry out their trade in front of a mob of 1600 police. This police mob was gathered from all over London including the outer London boroughs. We know very well that manpower in the police force is a constant problem. So, who was "protecting the public" in the other areas?

The tendency in this country has been for the public to believe the ludicrous stories put about by the police. Even superficial consideration will reveal, however, that since the police cannot "protect the public" in the way they claim to do, their job is to protect the government, and private property from the public.

Black youths have suffered from "police protection" for long enough in areas like Notting Hill to realise that the uniformed mob gathered to disrupt the carnival was not a gathering of "nice bobbies" but a hostile authoritarian horde. When attacked by the police the young people at the carnival responded in an exemplary manner. Violence met with violence and Robert Mark pretended that his thugs had been confronting a demonstration of people wanting to set up "no-go" areas rather than street carnival.

Police training, as anyone who has been through it and come out with a sound mind will tell you, is very right wing in nature. It extols the virtue of "universal discipline" and, for some reason, "Communist" weapons used in Vietnam and the Middle East and their effects on the weapons' victims are discussed at great

lengths. Another feature of police training is a film and a talk designed to show how right the police were in "containing" the crowd at the 1968 Grosvenor Square anti-Vietnam war demonstration. Other horror stories abound.

The Notting Hill carnival was, of course, a carnival and not a popular attempt to set up no-go areas as Robert Mark would have us believe. However, when you consider that each year hundreds of formerly decent people are given that sort of training and let out onto the streets with wide-ranging powers to back their hooligan antics, we believe that "no-go areas" are essential for the protection of the public.

N.S.

INTERROGATIONS

international review of anarchist research, in four languages, September 1976 issue now out, featuring articles on:

Italian state schools
Latin American churches
Workers' conditions in E. Germany
Contemporary U.S. anarchism.
A non-totalitarian socialism?
etc.,

Available from Freedom Bookshop - £1.10.

Just what we need~Another Election

EVERY FOUR years, the United States endures another political circus that leaves politicians and news commentators extolling the virtues of capitalism and the two-party system. This year is no exception. As I write this article, both the Democratic and Republican parties have selected their 1976 tickets. Meeting in New York City, a city that is on the brink of financial and structural collapse, the Democrats nominated the former Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter for president and Minnesota Senator Walter Mondale for vice president. Carter, who has raised political doubletalk and abstract moralizing to a new level of sophistication and deception, attempted to gloss over the problems of capitalism with moral pieties about "trust" and "honesty" in government.

The other half of the capitalist two-party ticket met in Kansas City. A strong challenge from the arch-reactionary forces of former California Governor Ronald Reagan was narrowly defeated and the Republican convention reluctantly nominated President Gerald Ford as their presidential candidate and Kansas Senator Robert Dale as their vice presidential candidate. In his acceptance speech, which the news media described as a "fighting speech", Ford was able to easily match Carter with generalities, half-truths, and distortions.

Having captured the nominations of their respective capitalist parties, both Ford and Carter will tune up their campaign organizations for eight weeks of evasion, side-stepping, image-making, and empty-headed moralizing. The problems of an arms race, destruction of the natural environment, collapse of the cities, erosion of civil rights; and the utter inability of capitalism and the State to do anything about these problems except to make them worse will be ignored by both candidates as they go

through the motions of sparring a few rounds this fall.

All is not sweetness and light within the camps of the two capitalist parties. The Democrats are concerned about the "independent" presidential campaign of former Minnesota Senator Eugene McCarthy. The McCarthy campaign, which is a carbon-copy of the Carter effort, has secured ballot status in about 12 states so far. Carter supporters fear McCarthy might draw off votes that would otherwise go to Carter. On the Republican side, there is fear that some arch-reactionaries might defect and form a new political party, thus drawing off votes from Ford. However, these splinter efforts, if they do materialize, will merely act as strident defenders of the Statist and capitalist system.

Besides the two capitalist parties, a number of "left" political sects are also going to be playing the electoral shell game this fall. They are as follows:

- 1) The Communist Party. This pro-Moscow party offers its General-Secretary Gus Hall for president and Jarvis Tyner for vice president. In line with past CP campaigns, this one will combine a pro-Soviet foreign policy together with liberal reform demands not much different from those of the Democratic Party.
- 2) The Socialist Workers Party. This year the largest of the various Trotskyist sects will offer Peter Camejo for president and Willie Mae Reid for vice president. This campaign offers revolutionary rhetoric together with a laundry list of reforms billed as "A Bill of Rights for Working People".
- 3) The Socialist Labor Party. The largest of several DeLeonist sects is running Jules Levin for president and Connie Blomen for vice president. For those who like precise blueprints of social systems, the SLP ticket is just the thing. It advocates the ballot box as the sole vehicle for bringing about an industrial union government which they call "socialism". This "socialism" can, of course, only be brought about by electing SLP politicians to "represent" the workers.
- 4) Socialist Party. This social democratic party offers Frank Zeidler for president and Quinn Brisben for vice president. Abstract moralizing, liberal reforms, and State action are the sum total of this campaign effort which resembles the British Labour Party and Canadian New Democratic Party.
- 5) The Peoples Party. This populist party is running Margaret Wright for president and anti-war activist Dr. Benjamin Spock for vice president. Uncritical attitudes toward such states as China and Cuba together with a grab bag of liberal reforms make up the essence of this campaign.

§

Thrown together, all these "socialist" sects offer recipe programs and varying doses of revolutionary rhetoric in attempting to out-bid each other for popular support. They all see electoralism as the road and the State as the means of handing liberation to the workers. In the end they will end up fighting among themselves and talking to each other while the problems of capitalism continue unabated.

These sects of aspiring politicians do not seem to realize that it is not by changing elected officials that capitalism and the State will

be abolished. The problem is more complex than that. As anarchists in the United States, we do not intend to add our voice to those who delude the workers into thinking that their "leaders" will get them out of the present economic and social malaise. Instead we emphasize the following:

1. Governments, whether capitalist or "socialist", are instruments of oppression and workers must learn to do without them.
2. Political parties, whether "left" or "right" seek power for their own benefit—a small minority.

Effective emancipation can be achieved only by the direct and widespread action of workers themselves, grouped not under the banner of a political party, but in their own class and communal organizations on the basis of concrete action and self-management. This is the only way to freedom.

Mark Weber
The Kropotkin Society.

THE ANARCHIC SITUATION OF ANARCHISM IN SPAIN.

From London the situation in Spain does not appear too confused. But you have to be in the middle of the situation really to understand what is going on in Spain.

People ask whether there still are anarchists in Spain. It would be stupid to say, more than ever. James Joll, in his book, "The Anarchists" makes a division among the libertarian forces that were in action in Russia during the first two decades of this century. It should be possible to make a similar rapid run-down on the Spanish situation without going deeply into the subject.

1. The anarcho-syndicalists. The C.N.T. appears in the weekly magazines from time to time because of its attacks on the Workers' Commissions (Comisiones Obreras). The C.N.T. looks different from exile or from abroad (the myth, the libertarian halo) than from inside the country. It doesn't figure in the daily press and its activities are sparse. In a period of organization, it could be said that its hour has not yet come. The Workers' Commissions - despite all the attacks they get - are very powerful and have not suffered from the loss of prestige which afflicted their French counterpart, the C.G.T. after the "happenings" of May 1968.

2. Anarcho-terrorists. Isolated groups like G.A.R.I. or the M.I.L. (Iberian Movement of Liberation) are sporadically active, but they are of little importance. Puig Antich who, it will be remembered was executed a few years ago, was a member of the M.I.L.

3. Acratas /acrata = without authority, tr.7 A strange grouping of crazies which goes from anarcho-communists to the wierdest types. Here we have to bring in the magazine Ajoblanco. For example, the new factor in this situation, or of this "spirit" is its apparent break with the anarchist tradition. Or rather, they are not acquainted with it. Their anarchism does not come from Kropotkin or Malatesta; it comes from America, though some do not even know this; if it has to have father figures, these are the Yippie movement, the Weathermen, the Motherfuckers, the Situationists of May 68 and Cohn-Bendit, the provos and kabouters of Roel van Duyn. But perhaps they don't know these either. All the more authentic because of that. It is a matter of an authentic spontaneous process which is getting into the heads of kids in high schools and at university.

The movement is young. And it is related more to a "counter-cultural" movement which is springing up strongly in the country than to the C.N.T. It is because the State of Juan Carlos and Suarez knows that this is the revolution, that it has fined or seized two of the movement's magazines (Ajoblanco and Star, a comix magazine which was starting a second year with the seized number); and it has not done so with the press of the "democratic opposition", from Triunfo (increasingly dominated by the Communist Party) to Cuadernos para el Diálogo.

The situation can be compared with that of the U.S.A. or England in the 60s: the counter-cultural movement and all its consequences. In the U.S.A. the hippy appeared after the McCarthy-Eisenhower era; in Spain this incipient acratie movement is appearing after the years of collective stupidity of the Franco dictatorship. It is a force for FREEDOM.

The movement has many points of similarity. Acratic magazines like Ajoblanco recall the better periods of International Times. Comix magazines (Star, El Rollo enmascarado, Purita, Carajillo, Nasti de Plasti, very important in the present Spanish situation), new rock groups (Compania Electrica Dharma, for example), rock festivals - at a recent one I attended in Barcelona, at the Teatro Griego in Montjuich, black flags were being waved spontaneously all over the place and there were shouts of "Visca la C.N.T." (up with the C.N.T.) - discotheques like Zeleste - new "underground" writers like Mariano Antolin Rato, the translator of William Burroughs into Castilian - countercultural publishers (like "Kairos" with books by Paul Goodman, Murray Bookchin, Theodore Roszak, Alan Watts, etc.) and acratie ones like "Tusquets" - writers like Luis Racionero, one of the editorial collective of Ajoblanco, a student for some years in Berkeley and author of "Ensayos sobre el Apocalipsis" and other books, and others like Carlos Semprun Maura, or the philosopher Fernandes Savater, who is coming very close to the libertarian spirit.

All this gets feedback from the spontaneous spirit which is invading all parts of Spain: the streets, the walls, whose graffiti ("Hacia la orgia general", "Putas al poder que los hijos ya están", etc.) recall, to a marked extent those of the French May Days.

Barcelona is the magnetic centre of all this. It could be said that it is the equivalent of San Francisco in the Sixties. Just as in San Francisco there was an anarchist tradition (the IWW, etc.) the same case applies in Barcelona, but, of course, much more strongly.

In Spain we are rediscovering anarchism via Jerry Rubin, Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Roel van Duyn. Ajoblanco, essentially dedicated to the "new culture" has moved in the direction of an openly acratie spirit, at the cost of being prohibited for four months. This drawing close to the acratie tradition is getting stronger and it will give strength to the C.N.T. and other groups which have been renewed by young blood, as well as to the individualist, disorganized, acratie movement itself, so long as it does not dilute, and maintains its spontaneity.

Meanwhile, we watch in stupefaction the manoeuvres not only of the government and the ruling class, but also of the "democratic opposition" and its press, its worn-out methods and its mummification, even though it is getting new names: "Organizacion Revolucionaria de Trabajadores", "Partido del Trabajo", etc., etc., etc., etc.,: shit!

6 PROTEST ON RED SQUARE

ONE is always told, and rightly, by others that one should never treat as fundamental truths untested generalisations arrived at by superficial observations but this only applies to other people. I see what I see and on my prejudices I take my stand. I am of that generation who have seen new gods created and those new gods become idols to be broken and overthrown by the same minds and the same school of martyrs who created them and every thrown stone is wrapped in a guilt complex. Russia in the agony and the isolation of its birth as the first Utopia brought us out into the streets and in every country of the world men and women demonstrated in defence of the ideal become flesh. Too many police charges, too many men and women imprisoned and executed, too many broken lives but the cause was just, and if the revolution has been betrayed it is because men tire of the struggle and greed and self-interest moves in like unto rats into an abandoned church. And Russia is what it has always been, a place of evil or of holiness according to one's self-deceptions.

And so we moved into Russia from Kiev down to Georgia and over the great mountains and on to Leningrad and Moscow and between the beer, the vodka, the food and the communal diarrhoea we each in our own fashion searched for our version of a truth. And each man, committed man, sought to justify his own articles of faith and I saw and I asked and came to my own conclusions. We read and we were told that men retired from work at 60 and that women retired at 55 years of age and again and again I asked why it was that if women retired at 55, why were elderly women of 60 and 70 cleaning the streets, and my English companions explained that elderly people liked "something to occupy their leisure" and I ask why are only working class elderly women sweeping the streets, and still there is no answer. In town after town, blocks after blocks of working class flats finger the landscape Victorian in their brown and grey ugliness and I ask why do they have to be so ugly and my English companions explain the urgent need for houses, but I ask why are the the well designed blocks in Moscow built by western interests. Why the waste of human labour in the stores when people queue for a service that would take minutes in any western store and why are the material goods so shoddy and ill styled, and for this there is no answer for my English companions stood in those same long queues.

I have no illusions, that it is easy to try to condemn a society because of minor bureaucratic faults and rightly those who defend that society seek to explain away those faults, for in a placid dull society they appear content with their lot. I saw no poorly dressed person, except for the elderly women street cleaners, for every man and woman wore bright new western clothes, making we the travellers look shabby and the Russian youths wore their western jeans and the Russian girls their high wedged shoes and mini skirts and one was told of black markets and mail order buying to bypass the dull contents of the stores, but from Moscow to Georgia they moved slowly in the hot sun in their bright new western finery eating their ice creams and drinking the beer from the street tankers. And everywhere the street markets and a society with a whole market given over to the selling of flowers must have solved some problem of basic needs. We saw the play, but of work we saw nothing for it was always over there beyond the river that the factories lay and like American tourists locked in London by virtue of time and itinerary we failed to meet the worker for whom for over half a century men fought, protested and demonstrated.

Koldayev in his handout of the Rights and the Duties of the Soviet citizen poses certain questions and like all good politicians supplied the answers. He spoke up for Russian "freedom" in relation to speech, the press, demonstrations, conscience, personal searches and forced entry and explained that these could not be allowed to those "aimed at undermining or weakening Soviet government", that a free press is not for those "engaged in thoughtless and unwarranted censoring, in maliciously defaming everything and everyone" etc., and in the matter of spontaneous demonstrations Koldayev becomes lyrical, stating that "no revolutionary holiday in the USSR passes without street processions or demonstrations". In towns and villages alike, the people join in demonstrations during which they freely express their thoughts and feelings" and I can bear witness, Comrade Koldayev, that I saw the loudspeakers permanently fixed to town walls to marshal the spontaneous demonstrations. It is unfair, for it is so easy, to mock Comrade Koldayev, but a man who states that the "home of the Soviet citizen is inviolable" except for the hygiene and sanitation, insurance tax!, fire service, house maintenance committees, employees of the municipal services and of course the law lads is a worthy candidate for any British municipal election. Lenin argued that the worst internal enemy of the new socialist society was this bureaucracy that one witnessed on every hand, for what one is witnessing in Russia is the death of an ideal born out of the death of millions of people, be it willingly or unwillingly. A new middle class society, managerial paternalistic with two standards of living that each year makes the gulf between the working class and the newly created middle class wider and wider.

For one brief moment freedom flared in Russia and the writer, the artist and the poet held the world's stage, but now freedom is a dirty word and the huge statue of Mayakovsky the poet who killed himself on

the 14th of April 1930 "my very own statue will rise/over squares,/with gobs of tuberculosis,/where whores with hooligans/and syphilis./I'm fed/to the teeth/with agit-prop,/I'd like/to scribble for you/love-balls,-/" is erected, by the very people who destroyed the poet, in the centre of Moscow and until THEY carve the reason and the cause of Mayakovsky's suicide upon that base they stand condemned as the heirs to murder of the poet, the peasant, the worker and of freedom but let there be no mistake comrade, for the dream of the western industrialists, of Hitler and of Plato is coming into fruition in Lenin's Russia. For with an elitist 15,000,000 Communist Party members and a standard of living rising year by year, a bureaucratic control of speech and action and an acceptance as a religious orthodoxy of a managerial society of well fed, well clothed workers and a high living administrative middle class, we have seen the death of revolution and the need for a new struggle.

It is so easy to tease the official local guides about Joe Stalin and the Great Purges, easy and unfair, but they brush the questions aside like seasoned Hyde Park speakers, therefore one must observe and draw one's own conclusions. All the ghastly academic paintings in the State galleries and the swift rush through the cubist and surrealist gallery when one came across such a gallery. The empty bases across Russia that once held the statues of Stalin, the children with toy submachine guns guarding the war memorials and the servile and cringing cowardice of British visitors in the face and the person of uniformed Russian police or officials. People who in Britain would scream abuse at any traffic warden fearing to click a camera in a city street and justifying their cowardice at the hotel dining table. To sit in a hotel room in Leningrad while a young Swedish girl talks to her elderly Jewish uncle and of the three of us I sit in embarrassed silence as they talk of persecution and the Swedish girl is told by her uncle that her Leningrad relation will not meet her or accept her presents for they fear persecution if they meet someone from the west. I do not know if this is true or false but I sit in silence on my bed knowing that the Swedish girl must come to terms with her relations pleas. And she wishes for a companion to go with her to the synagogue and I agree but I am booked for the theatre so a Scots companion agrees to go with her, and on arrival at the synagogue loses his nerve and sits outside the building for an hour rather than enter. This is fear, Comrade Koldayev, and one must surely ask why do these people fear?

And I explain to all who will listen that the hope of freedom for the Russian people, if freedom is a gift to be given to slaves, lies as it always has with the lumpenproletariat, the criminal element who do not reject the State because they have never bothered to accept it. They were there, the black marketeers and the money speculators, and I had nothing to buy or sell but I stood and admired their panache, their courage and their contempt for an authoritarian State. And on the huge war memorial where the children stand guard with dummy machine guns and the brides lay their wedding bouquets and I was moved on by the police for kipping by the fountain, there burns the eternal flame, olympian bright in the hot sun and no one approaches beyond the child guards and at midnight a group of beats and Gay Libs sit on the base of the war memorial and toast marshmallows in the sacred flame and I know that I must make some small but personal protest or all my windy rhetoric is but wind and water. To sit in a basement, in Georgia, with a group of Russians and Britons roaring out "Red Front" between the verses of the International is fun because it annoyed a Tory Russian, and to get one's fellow Russian drinkers to toast "Anarchism" in glass after glass of vodka is a private pleasure, as with the scrawled slogans of the broad tipped felt pen but a public protest had to be made and I committed myself by publicly stating that I intended to piss on Red Square.

Red Square is no larger than a small football pitch free of any litter and with police cars parked along its sidelines. Here is the tomb of the tinted corpse of Lenin where the guards change on the hour to crashing goose steps. To stand and piss there was impossible for within seconds the police would grab, so as in politics one had to compromise. A French companion asked to be allowed to join me in the protest and we took a large empty beer bottle into a bath room and strained to fill it with our piss and at two thirty in the afternoon we walked onto the centre of Red Square. Behind us the soldiers stood to attention and but 20 feet away three policemen sat in a police car with its doors open like wings watching and wondering what we were going to do. The groups of tourists had created an open space, the guards stood to attention at Lenin's tomb and the three police leaned forward in their police car and I held the bottle of our piss above my head and splashed it onto the cobbles of Red Square and it splashed over my hands, my shoes and onto the Red Square while my French companion frantically clicked his camera. Out of the corner of the eyes we saw movement in the police car and we weaved our way to get lost among the tourists. But we had made our small publicised protest and there was rage from a Russian official who learned of it but feared to report it and could only shout "I hate you I hate you", but for 50 to a 100 people May Day on Red Square will never be the same again for as the weapons roll by and the Russian Top Brass take the salute they will remember that we poured our piss onto Red Square. Arthur Moyse. Russia. August 1976

FARE FIGHT MIXES IT WITH L.T.

THE Fare fight campaign organised in protest at London Transport's tube fare increase is still going strong and making new plans for the future. During the week beginning Monday 30 August Fare Fight will be bringing out stickers which can be obtained for a donation at Flat 3, 76 Sidney Street, London E.1. On Thursday, September 3 a meeting was held at Rising Free with representatives of the Cuts Campaign. Fare Fight have also contacted people connected with similar campaigns in Italy, and at the end of September, beginning of October it is hoped that an Italian bus worker will be coming to Britain for a proposed conference on Direct Action and Transport.

London Transport have sent letters to users of the Fare Fight deferred payment slips demanding payment. In response, Fare Fight have advised users to send back a printed form to London Transport, which contains 40 questions asking why fares have increased, etc. London Transport has also sent letters to regular deferred payment slip users stating that their credit with London Transport has been withdrawn. Fare Fight have therefore now issued rubber stamps, which are to be stamped on the deferred payment slips, stating "I acknowledge a letter from LTE purporting to withdraw my credit." Use of the deferred payment slips with this stamp is perfectly legal if you have already received a letter saying your credit has been withdrawn.

Address to contact: Fare Fight, Flat 3, 76 Sidney Street, London E.1. (Tel: 01-790-9965).

People's News Service



"HE'S TERRIBLY PATRIOTIC, HE HASN'T HAD A BATH FOR SIX MONTHS."

WATER!

THE FACT that most people have never tasted spring water, never mind rye or wholemeal bread, doesn't deter them from believing they face a real hardship because their taps may be turned off for most of the day. Their water supply will still be more than adequate and will indeed focus attention on the squandering of water; although this water will certainly be as much of a chemical mixture as is the daily bread of most people.

Having lived for some four years in a cottage which was self-sufficient for water—the supply coming from rainfall caught in the guttering and fed into a tank—I know just how differently one treats water when it is scarce and precious; and when it has to be carried by the jugful into the house. No taps means no careless waste of water. No unnecessary use. But taps are useful and essential in many situations; equally so are waterbutts—old barrels as they used to be; used by our parents and grandparents for washing clothes and hair. In emergencies used for drinking and washing generally. Simply to make it a built-in factor for new buildings, and introduced into old ones, a waterbutt or tank would create a free and plentiful supply of water for essential uses.

Only once did our tank dry up and we were fortunate in that a well was just a few fields away. Yet wells are much more common than most people believe. It is simply that they lack use; boarded up, concreted over, built upon, hidden by fifty years of neglect they exist in every area of town and country.

As recently as the 1940s my grandparents in Burton-on-Trent used a communal tap in the backyard, which was only connected for their row of cottages at the end of world war two. Until then they used the communal well in the backyard.

Probably most people have seen the old cast-iron handpumps which many wells were fitted with to make it easier to draw water: seen them in rural museums at least?

Meanwhile water is another issue the media exploit to create that ever-present "crisis" situation which is their livelihood. For if there is no tragic or horrendous situation they are likely to sell less newspapers, have fewer viewers or listeners.

Dennis Gould.

THE MURRAYS

OVER 100 PEOPLE demonstrated at the Curragh barracks, on Saturday 21st August, in protest at the conditions under which Noel Murray is being held. The demonstrators included members of the Murray Defence Committee and of the Relatives Action Committees (Belfast) who had earlier staged a demonstration at Portlaoise in support of republican prisoners.

The group of demonstrators shouted messages of support through a loud-hailer to Noel Murray and chanted the slogan "No Hanging here". They had been able to pass beyond the perimeter of the camp but had their progress stopped by several jeep-loads of soldiers who faced them with guns at the ready.

The last issue of FREEDOM stated that the Irish Republic, France, Bulgaria and the Soviet Union are the last remaining countries in Europe to retain the death penalty. This is not correct. Apart from Spain, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, the GDR, Albania, Yugoslavia still carry capital punishment. Even Hungary, probably the least oppressive of the East European countries at the moment, continues to apply the death penalty.

Letter

"Unfair to Tucker"

I was puzzled by a couple of things in Irving Levitas's letter about Benjamin Tucker (21 August, Review section).

He says that, when right-wing anarchists in America tried to revive Tucker's paper *Liberty*, he was asked by Tucker's daughter "to carry the case to court if necessary". He adds that "fortunately, the matter was settled out of court"; but if it hadn't been, would he have been prepared to defend the honour of one anarchist against other anarchists in court? That position hardly sounds like anarchism, right-wing, left-wing or any-wing. (He also says that Tucker's daughter "literally blew up", so it is not surprising that she is "now deceased".)

He also says that "Tucker broke with Kropotkin on the issue of World War I, Tucker against the war, Kropotkin for it". By then Tucker had left America and settled in France and, according to James J. Martin's history of individualist anarchism in the United States, *Men Against the State*, he was not against the war but for it. Indeed he wrote to Joseph Labadie as follows:

I favor the Allies because I love the French people, because I pity the Belgian people, because I admire the British influence that makes for liberty; because I feel some (tho I regret to say decreasing) concern for the future of the American people; because I have a considerable sympathy for the people of Russia, and because I hate and fear the German people as a nation of domineering brutes bent on turning the world into a police-ridden paradise of the Prussian pattern. (Instead of a Magazine, 15 September 1915; original emphasis.)

So what did Tucker break with Kropotkin about, since their positions seem to be identical? That statement hardly sounds like anarchism, right-wing, left-wing or any-wing, either.

N. W.



DRAWN FROM LIFE

Policeman hurrying elderly women street cleaners to sweep the road before the arrival of a Rumanian delegation. Russia. August 1976.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

BOOKSHOP open normally:
 Tuesday- Friday 2 - 6 p.m.
 (Thursdays until 8.00 p.m.)
 Saturdays 10 am-4p.m.
 CLOSED FRIDAY 10 September.
 (Please add postage as in brackets
 when ordering by mail.)
 (Aldgate East underground station,
 Whitechapel Art Gallery exit and turn
 right. Angel Alley next to Wimpy Bar)

Victor Serge : Conquered City (Petro-
 grad/Leningrad 1919-20), first trans-
 lation into English of this novel publ.
 in France in 1932 (55p)

Barry Duncan: Invergordon '31 : How
 the Royal Navy Struck - and won!
 £1.00 (11p)

Libero International No. 4 (Japan),
 April 1976, on South Korea 10p (6½p)
New Humanist July/Aug. on Children,
 Abortion, Animal Liberation - and
 Zen & the art of motor cycle mainten-
 ance! 50p (9p)
The Freethinker August. Film censor-
 ship, Solzhenitsyn's religion 10p (6½p)
The Unequal Breadwinner, new NCCL
 pamphlet on discrimination against wo-
 men through the social security system
 comp. by Ruth Lister & Leo Wilson
 30p (6½p)

David Boadella: Wilhelm Reich, the
 evolution of his work (by a practition-
 er of Reichian psychiatry) £2.95(23p)

We carry always in stock standard
 works of theory and practice by anar-
 chists - Kropotkin, Bakunin, Berk-
 man, &c &c. New booklist shortly
 available.

CONTACT

NEXT DESPATCHING date for FREEDOM is
 Thursday 23 September. Come and help
 from 2 pm onwards. You are welcome each
 Thursday afternoon to early evening for infor-
 mal get together and folding session.

WE WELCOME news, reviews, letters, art-
 icles. NOTE NEW SCHEDULE : Latest
 date for receipt of copy for next review is
 Saturday 11 September and for news section
 Saturday 18 September.

WEA CLASSES in Central London. Subjects
 History of Socialist Movement in Britain;
 Music: emotion and understanding; Psycholo-
 gy; Theatre in London; Intro to Western Euro-
 pean Art; Modern Literature. New term
 begins Sept. 20. A chance to influence
 thought. S.A.E. to S. Billson, 33 Compton
 Road, N.1. for full details.

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

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

ANARCHIST TRANSPORT WORKERS: an at-
 tempt to organise. Contact Adam 01-247 4829

LIBERTARIAN EDUCATION Number 20 out
 now! 22p incl. post. 5 issue sub. 90p incl.
 post. 26 Oxford Road, Leicester.

PRISONERS

THE STOKE NEWINGTON FIVE Welfare Com-
 mittee still needs funds for books, etc. Box
 252, 240 Camden High Street, London, NW1.

DUBLIN ANARCHISTS Bob Cullen, Des Keane
 and Columba Longmore, Military Detention
 Centre, Curragh Camp, Co. Kildare, Eire.
 MARIE MURRAY and NOEL MURRAY - see
 news pages, but protest letters to the Justice
 Minister, 72-76 St. Stephen's Green, Dublin
 2; the Irish Ambassador, 17 Grosvenor Place,
 London SW1X 7HR.

MEETINGS

FRIDAY 10 September, "The Murrays", public
 meeting arranged by the London Murrays De-
 fence Committee. 7 pm at the Conway Hall.

SUNDAY 26 September, "The Fight to Live."
 Public meeting organised by the Federation of
 London Anarchist Groups. Speakers from the
 claimants' unions movement, Campaign against
 the Criminal Tresspass Law, Anarchist Workers'
 Association, and other organisations. Starts at
 8 pm at the Roebuck public house, 108a Tott-
 enham Court Road (Warren St./Goodge St.)

SATURDAY 11 September: "One Race, the
 Human Race". Anti Racists March to Black-
 burn, starting 2 pm from Brookhouse Lane,
 (Whalley Range area), Whalley, Lancs. Rally
 in King George's Hall, Blackburn at 3 p.m.
 Organised by AAR, P.O.Box 32, Blackburn
 BB2 5DY.

ITALY 24-26 September. 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 in/be present at the conference,
 are invited to get in touch with Nico Berti,
 CP 541, 35100 Padua, Italy.

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

EAST LONDON Libertarian Group holds regu-
 lar fortnightly mtgs. at 123 Lathom Road, 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.

Anarchists/Libertarians Colchester area inter-
 ested in local group contact Hilary Lester, 32
 Wellesley Rd. Colchester for mtg. details.

HYDE PARK Speakers Corner (Marble Arch)
 Anarchist Forum alternate Sundays 1 pm.
 Speakers, listeners and hecklers welcomed.

GROUPS

ABERDEEN c/o S. Blake, 162 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).

CAMBRIDGE Ron Stephan, Botany School
 Field Station, 34a 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 - term time

EDINBURGH - term time

FIFE - see West Fife

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

HARROW c/o 10 Kenton Ave., Harrow (Chris
 or Nick H.)

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

LEICESTER, Peter and Joan Miller, 41 Norman
 Street, Leicester (tel.549652).

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

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

ST. ANDREWS - term time

WEST FIFE write John Deming, 164 Agin
 Crescent, Dunfermline

Proposed Yorkshire Federation - interests indi-
 viduals or groups please contact Leeds group.

OVERSEAS

AUSTRALIA

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

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

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

NEW ZEALAND

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

COMMUNE

SPACE in libertarian, anti-militarist commun-
 al household for four people - adults and child-
 ren - preference for people with 'direction'.
 Karla, 22 Royal Road, Ramsgate, Kent.

subscribe

WE REGRET errors in the typesetting of the
 Press Fund in our last issue, corrected as
 follows:

Total 28 Jul-11Aug (£ 28.69) :	£ 28.64
Previously acknowledged	£ 719.01
TOTAL at 11.8.76 (£ 757.70)	£ 747.65
ADD to entry F.B. Kensington	70
Correct total to carry forward	£ 748.35

August 12th - 25th inclusive

SUTTON COURTENAY: P.B. 70p; CHELMS-
 FORD: E.A. 35p; ST. CLOUD, Minn.:
 M.G.A. £ 29.83; LONDON SW8: H.H. 85p;
 WOLVERHAMPTON: J.L. £ 1, J.K.W. 10p;
 LONDON E.4: S. & A.G. 50p; LEEDS:
 G.H.L. 18p; RENSSLAER, N.Y.: G.T.
 £ 2.81; LONDON N.1.: S.B. £ 1;
 NEEDHAM, Mass.: Liberty Club per M.T.:
 £ 13.75; GLASGOW: W.B. 30p; BRISTOL:
 D.D. 35p; LYTHAM ST. ANNES: B.L.P.
 25pp; WOLVERHAMPTON: J.L. £ 1, J.K.W.
 10p; CHEAM: O.L.L. 70p.

TOTAL:	£ 53.77
Previously acknowledged as above	£ 748.35

TOTAL TO DATE £ 802.12

PRESS FUND

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

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

(These rates are for surface mail all over the
 world. Airmail rates on request)

Please send FREEDOM for
 to:

.....

address.

Published by Freedom Press, London, E.1.

FREEDOM'S

Anarchist Review

SUPPLEMENT TO Vol. 37 No. 18

SEPTEMBER 1976

ORGANISING ANARCHY

YOU MAY THINK that in describing anarchism as a theory of organisation I am propounding a deliberate paradox; "anarchy" you may consider to be, by definition, the opposite of organisation. In fact, however, "anarchy" means the absence of government, the absence of authority. Can there be social organisation without authority, without government? The anarchists claim that there can be, and they also claim that it is desirable that there should be. They claim that, at the basis of our social problems is the principle of government. It is, after all, governments which prepare for war and wage war, even though you are obliged to fight in them and pay for them; the bombs you are worried about are not the bombs which cartoonists attribute to the anarchists, but the bombs which governments have perfected, at your expense. It is, after all, governments which make and enforce the laws which enable the "haves" to retain control over social assets rather than share them with the "have-nots". It is, after all, the principle of authority which ensures that people will work for someone else for the greater part of their lives, not because they enjoy it or have any control over their work, but because they see it as their only means of livelihood.

I said that it is governments which make wars and war preparations, but obviously it is not government alone—the power of a government, even the most absolute dictatorship, depends on the tacit assent of the governed. Why do people consent to be governed? It isn't only fear; what have millions of people to fear from a small group of politicians? It is because they subscribe to the same values as their governors. Rulers and ruled alike believe in the principle of authority, of hierarchy, of power. At most they offer their support to an alternative set of rulers—Labour instead of Conservative, Republican instead of Democratic, Communist, Fascist, or what you will, instead of liberal.

People have been conditioned from infancy to the idea of accepting an external authority—Mummy says, Daddy says, Teacher says, the Church says, the Boss says, the Prime Minister says, the experts say, the Archbishop says, God says—they have heard the voice of authority for so long that they cannot conceive an alternative. Society must be organised, they say, how can this possibly be done without authority? After all, without authority we would have anarchy!

And the anarchists agree with them. "Anarchism [I am quoting the definition written for the Encyclopaedia Britannica by Peter Kropotkin] is the name given to a principle or theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government—harmony in such a society being obtained, not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements conducted between the various groups, territorial and professional, freely constituted for the sake of production and consumption, as also for the satisfaction of the infinite variety of needs and aspirations of a civilised being..." and so on. Elsewhere he observes that: "It seeks the most complete development of individuality combined with the highest degree of voluntary association in all its aspects, in all possible degrees, for all imaginable purposes; ever modified associations which carry in themselves the elements of their durability and constantly assume new forms which answer best the multiple aspirations of all."

You might conclude that this is a kind of idealised view of democracy. If it is, it is very far from the kind of democracy we actually know about, since the notion of democracy as popular self-government has long since been replaced by the concept of democracy as a competition between rival, and similar, elites, for the people's votes. Over fifty years ago Robert Michels wrote a book Political Parties on oligarchal tendencies inherent in every allegedly democratic organisations. Nothing that we have learnt from the experience of trade union or socialist movements has belied his thesis; it

has in fact invariably been re-affirmed by experience. The same tendencies are, of course, observable in political parties of the right, industrial and commercial firms, public corporations, nationalised industries and so on. The difference is simply that they at least do not set out to be "democratic" or to be answerable to, or controlled by, their members. Nor, in some senses, do the organisations of the Left. Dr. Victor Allen, for instance, points out in his book Power in Trade Unions that "the end of trade union activity is to protect and improve the general standards of its members and not to provide workers with an exercise in self-government". Similarly, after the majority vote in the Labour Party's Scarborough Conference in favour of unilateral disarmament, Hugh Gaitskill, in refusing to be bound by the vote, declared that the purpose of the Parliamentary Labour Party was to provide an alternative government (and not, he implied, to be swayed by the fact that Frank Cousins was able to manipulate the trade union block vote to the "left" in the same way as his predecessors had always been able to manipulate it in favour of the leadership).

We could very well claim that the nineteenth century anarchist thinkers like Proudhon or Bakunin were forerunners of Michels in their criticism of democratic and socialist theory. Michels himself devotes a chapter each to syndicalism and anarchism as "prophylactics" in his section on attempts to restrict the influence of leaders. Each tendency gets its modicum of praise, but his conclusions are not optimistic.

CAN WE ORGANISE 'FROM THE BOTTOM UP'?

In fact it would be hard to find any writer on the theory of organisation who is optimistic about organisations from the bottom up. Organisation and its problems have developed a vast and expanding literature because of its importance for those concerned with industrial management and governmental administration. Very little of this vast literature provides anything of value for the anarchist, except in his role of destructive critic. Nor has any very convincing anarchist theory of organisation grown up, even though whether we regard anarchism as a method, or as a destination, the question of organisation is important for us. The fact is that while there are thousands of students of government, there are hardly any of non-government; there is an immense amount of research into methods of administration, but hardly any into self-regulation. There are whole libraries on, and management courses in, industrial management, and big fees for management consultants, but there is scarcely any literature, no course of study and certainly no fees for those who want to do away with management and substitute workers' autonomy. The only industrial consultant who advocated anything approaching this was James J. Gillespie, the author of Free Expression in Industry and of Anarchy 47 ("Towards Freedom of Work"). The brains are sold to the big battalions, and we have to build up a theory on what little actual experience has been gained and assessed. For instance the work which has been done on the borders of social psychology and sociology on the nature of small groups, autonomous groups and leaderless groups.

Now all of us, except the most isolated of people, belong to a whole network of groups, based on common interests and common tasks. Anyone can see that there are at least two kinds of organisation. There is the kind that is forced on you, the kind which is run from above, and there is the kind of organisation which is run from below, which can't force you to do anything, and which you are free to join or free to leave alone. Most people have the experience of starting some club or some branch of a voluntary organisation or simply a group of friends who drink together on Fridays and listen to records. We could say that the anarchists are people who want to transform all forms of human organisation

into that kind of purely voluntary association where people can pull out and start one of their own if they don't like it. This doesn't mean committees, votes, membership cards. For the formalised kind of voluntary organisation, as you all know, only really works because of some internal gang of people who are really concerned with the function of the organisation and are prepared to do its work. If this is democracy, it is what the dissident Freudian, Wilhelm Reich, called work-democracy, and his description of his own experience of this mode of organisation mirrors exactly my experience of anarchist groups. He asks:

...On what principle, then, was our organisation based, if there were no votes, no directives and commands, no secretaries, presidents, vice-presidents, etc.?

What kept us together was our work, our mutual interdependencies in this work, our factual interest in one gigantic problem with its many specialist ramifications. I had not solicited co-workers. They had come of themselves. They remained, or they left when the work no longer held them. We had not formed a political group or worked out a programme of action... Each one made his contribution according to his interest in the work... There are then, objective biological work interests and work functions capable of regulating human co-operation. Exemplary work organises its forms of functioning organically and spontaneously, even though only gradually, gropingly and often making mistakes. In contradistinction, the political organisations with their 'campaigns' and 'platforms' proceed without any connection with the tasks and problems of daily life.

Elsewhere in his paper he notes that

If personal enmities, intrigues and political manoeuvres make their appearance in an organisation, one can be sure that its members no longer have a factual meeting ground in common, that they are no longer held together by a common work-interest... Just as organisational ties result from common work-interests, so they dissolve when the work-interests dissolve or begin to conflict with each other."

We can deduce from these astute observations certain principles of organisation. I once, in reviewing that frivolous but useful little book Parkinson's Law, attempted to enunciate four principles behind an anarchist theory of organisations: that they should be (1) voluntary, (2) functional, (3) temporary and (4) small. They should be voluntary for obvious reasons. There is no point in our advocating individual freedom and responsibility if we are going to advocate organisations for which membership is mandatory. They should be functional for reasons which are equally obvious but are not always observed. There is a tendency for organisations to exist without a genuine function, or which have outlived their functions. They should be temporary precisely because permanence is one of those factors which hardens the arteries of an organisation, giving it a vested interest in its own survival, in serving the interests of its office holders rather than in serving its ostensible functions. They should be small precisely because in small face-to-face groups, the bureaucratising and hierarchical tendencies inherent in organisation have least opportunity to develop.

But it is from this final point that our difficulties arise. If we take it for granted that a small group can function anarchically, we are still faced with the problem of all those social functions for which organisation is necessary, but which require it on a much bigger scale. Well, we might say in response to this point, "If big organisations are necessary count us out. We will get by as well as we can without them." We can say this all right, but if we are propagating anarchism as a social philosophy, we must take into account, and not evade, social facts. Better to say, "Let us find ways in which the large-scale functions can be broken down into functions capable of being organised by small functional groups and then link these groups in a federal manner. This leads us to consider an anarchist theory of federalism."

Now the classical anarchists, in considering how they envisaged the organisation of a future society, thought in terms of two kinds of social institution; as the territorial unit the commune, a French word which you might consider as the equivalent of the word parish, or of the Russian word soviet in its original meaning, but which also has overtones of the ancient village institutions for cultivating the land in common;

and the syndicate; another French word from trade union terminology, the 'syndicate' or workers' council as the unit of industrial organisation. These were envisaged as small local units which would federate with each other for the larger affairs of life, each commune and each syndicate retaining its own autonomy, the one federating territorially and the other industrially. Proudhon and Kropotkin devoted a lot of attention to the federative principle and we do know something about the factors which make for successful and unsuccessful federations.

"By federation," George Woodcock notes in his biography of Proudhon, "by federation Proudhon does not mean a world government or a federation of states. For him the principle of confederation begins from the simplest level of society. The organs of administration are local and lie as near the direct control of the people as possible. Above that primary level the confederal organisation becomes progressively less an organ of administration than of co-ordination of regions, and Europe a confederation of confederations in which the interest of the smallest province will have as much expression as that of the largest, since all affairs will be settled by mutual agreement, contract and arbitration."

Now without wishing to sing a song of praise for the Swiss political system, we can see that, in territorial terms, the 22 sovereign cantons of Switzerland are an outstanding example of a successful federation. It is a federation of like units, of small cells, and the cantonal boundaries cut across the linguistic and ethnic boundaries, so that unlike the many examples of unsuccessful federation, the confederation is not dominated by one or a few powerful units. The problem of federation, as Leopold Kohr puts it, is one of division, not of union. We may consider the Swiss a rather stodgy and provincial lot, but they have something in their national life which we certainly haven't. I was talking to a Swiss citizen (or rather a citizen of Zurich, for there is strictly speaking no such thing as a Swiss citizen) about the Beeching Report, and he remarked that it would be inconceivable in a Swiss context that a chairman in London could decide to write off the railway system of the north of Scotland. This led me to Herbert Luethy's study of his country in which he remarked that

Every Sunday the inhabitants of scores of communes go to the polling booths to elect their civil servants, ratify such and such an item of expenditure, or decide whether a road or a school should be built; after settling the business of the commune, they deal with cantonal elections and voting on cantonal issues; lastly, ... come the decisions on federal issues. In some cantons, the sovereign people still meet in Rousseau-like fashion to discuss questions of common interest. It may be thought that this ancient form of assembly is no more than a pious tradition with a certain value as a tourist attraction. If so, it is worth looking at the results of local democracy.

The simplest example is the Swiss railway system, which is the densest network in the world. At great cost and with great trouble, it has been made to serve the needs of the smallest localities and most remote valleys, not as a paying proposition but because such was the will of the people. It is the outcome of fierce political struggles. In the 19th century, the 'democratic railway movement' brought the small Swiss communities into conflict with the big towns, which had plans for centralisation... And if we compare the Swiss system with the French which, with admirable geometrical regularity, is entirely centred on Paris so that the prosperity or the decline, the life or the decline, the life or death of whole regions has depended on the quality of the link with the capital, we see the difference between a centralised state and a federal alliance. The railway map is the easiest to read at a glance, but let us now superimposed on it another showing economic activity and the movement of population. The distribution of industrial activity all over Switzerland, even in the outlying areas, accounts for the strength and stability of the social structure of the country and prevented those horrible 19th century concentrations of industry, with their slums and rootless proletariat.

I quote all this, as I said, not to praise Swiss democracy, but to indicate that the federal principle which is in the centre of anarchist social theory, is worth much more attention than it is given in textbooks on political science. Even in the context of ordinary political institutions its adoption has a far-reaching effect.

Colin Ward.

TO BE CONTINUED IN THE NEXT ISSUE

EGOCENTRIC SAPIENS

I MAKE no apologies for dealing with S.E. Parker's letter in *FREEDOM* (21 August) along with Sir Keith Joseph's case against equality in the *Observer* of 22nd August. Arriving at concepts of anarchism via socialism, I am at one with Sid Parker in believing that there is nothing to prevent socialism becoming tyranny. That being said, it is quite obvious that the physical and social problems derive from the egocentric individualism of capitalism. It is, in a crowded world, becoming ever more difficult for man to be an island even if he desired to be so.

Anarchism to me is not individualism as Sid Parker claims; it is as far from individualism as it is from socialism. No living creature in fact can be isolated from the biological entity that we call the earth. It is because human beings have the capacity to disrupt it that for their own comfort they have the duty to understand it. Which brings me to Sir Keith Joseph:

"People of goodwill have been manipulated into confusing the ideals of eliminating poverty and of raising living standards with egalitarianism. I shall argue that we can and should eliminate poverty, in the sense of inadequate income for decent choice, but that the pursuit of equality, far from achieving that purpose, will actually increase poverty and install tyranny. If these views seem shocking, that is merely the parochialism of the post-war Western world. To earlier observers they would have seemed self-evident."

This view has to some extent been forced upon the establishment and the earlier view would have been that poverty for some was a natural state. Poverty now, to some extent, has become zonal but just as, if not more extensive.

Joseph argues for equality before the law and equality of opportunity: both meaningless concepts when one realises that the law is the bastion of privilege and equality of opportunity meaningless in the context of inherited wealth or rather inherited privilege. For one of the essentials today is to define wealth and understand what it is. Sir Keith Joseph believes that

...the total wealth that a society has is not to be taken for granted, nor will it necessarily grow. Our national income depends in a highly competitive world upon our performance—as farmers, manufacturers, providers of services. And that performance depends upon the enterprise, judgment, initiative, effort, skills of millions of individuals—making decisions, taking risks, investing effort, imagination, co-operation, money.

It is quite obvious from the above paragraph that Joseph has not the faintest idea of what wealth is. Indeed it could be said that most of the largest captains

of industry have consumed real wealth at an alarming rate. Our privileged position in the world has indeed depended on the sale in a competitive world of our products. This, make no mistake, is going to become a more and more precarious way of providing the necessities of life.

All egalitarian policy squeezing differentials, high direct taxation on nearly all income levels, discouraging capital accumulation and transmission, narrowing the gap between the incomes of the successful and unsuccessful, will discourage wealth-creators.

The whole of this paragraph is sheer nonsense, for wealth creation in this sense refers to the manipulators of finance who ultimately corner access to power and privilege. Many of their activities stand in the way of the creation of real wealth in that finance prevents many who are capable of creating wealth from doing so.

Biological nature slowly created wealth by utilising energy from outside the planet and converting it to organic materials on earth in the form of life, soil and fossil fuels. Added to this it could be said that the development of tools that aided this process could also be described as wealth producing.

Egocentric individual capitalism has disturbed this process to such a degree that the state resorted to interference in the process, without any great success. According to Sir Keith Joseph

It is no good pretending that the curcial decision-makers can be replaced by public officials. No civil servant, however clever, can respond nearly as sensitively or effectively to the endlessly shifting changes of home and world demand and supply as can individuals: their careers, families and savings depend upon their being right more often than wrong in judging the market.

Individual capitalist decision makers are as little competent as public officials in making the decisions on our behalf. Particularly as by the nature of such decision making it is necessary for power and privilege to become larger and larger, and within my definition of wealth producing, more wasteful and less efficient.

The inefficiency and wastefulness of the whole market economy is becoming more and more obvious. In terms of real wealth there is no such thing as capital accumulation; in Sir Keith Joseph's society it is a dangerous illusion which will if not recognised and understood lead to more violence and destruction of resources.

The freedom of which Joseph talks is the freedom of landowners to burn straw in autumn, creating fire hazards and

burning much-needed homes, to add to the general pollution, to cover vast areas with poisonous chemicals, often indiscriminately from aircraft; for industrialists to hazard the world with dangerous chemicals and growth-based plutonium technology.

Joseph still talks in nineteenth century terms when people were under the misapprehension that we were living in a world of limitless resources, reflected in the absolute nonsense expressed in the following paragraph:

We shall do better for all, including those now poor or hard-pressed, with a market economy, precisely because the inequality of rewards and benefits involved will create greater wealth, which is bound to raise general living standards, and can be used to increase social benefits for those who need help.

On a world basis this is obviously false and reflects a complete unawareness of the biological world. The statement that "Egalitarianism destroys not only prosperity but freedom and culture" seems to me to be refuted by the obvious fact that in the world today there has never been less equality but there has never been less freedom and culture.

In fact it could be said that "privilege has destroyed not only prosperity but freedom and culture".

This brings me to the question of individualism and anarchism and the collective of which we are all part. Our freedom is within the biological restrictions of our place within that collective. This is an acceptable authority. What is unacceptable to anarchists is the authority of privilege.

A. A.

Freedom Press

HOUSING: An anarchist approach, Colin Ward £1.25 (20p) \$3

COLLECTIVES IN THE SPANISH REVOLUTION, Gaston Leval
cloth £4.00 (55p) \$10.
paper £2.00 (47p) \$5

LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION, Vernon Richards
cloth £1.50 (55p) \$4.
Paper £0.75 (47p) \$2.

ANARCHISM AND ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM, Rudolf Rocker 20p (9p) 65c
THE STATE, Its Historic Role, Peter Kropotkin 20p (9p) 65c
ANARCHY, Errico Malatesta 25p (9p) 75c

BAKUNIN & NECHAEV, Paul Avrich 20p (9p) 65c

Complete list of Freedom Press publications, including available issues of *Anarchy*, supplied on request.

● REVOLUTIONARIES...

Revolutionaries in Modern Britain, by Peter Shipley (Bodley Head, £5).

FROM TIME to time anarchism is taken up by the media, and there are articles in newspapers and magazines or programmes on radio and television describing our ideas and activities, generally from a position of prejudice or ignorance or both. Such items don't matter very much, because no-one believes the mass media and they are soon forgotten. What matters more is the coverage of anarchism in books, which always seem to be impartial and which also last a long time.

Ten years ago George Thayer wrote a journalistic book called *The British Political Fringe*, which covered the groups to the left of the Communists and to the right of the Conservatives, mainly on the basis of interviews, and discussed the libertarian left in chapters on "The Outside Left" and "The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament". Now Peter Shipley has written a journalistic book called *Revolutionaries in Modern Britain*, which covers the groups to the left of the Labour Party, mainly on the basis of their literature.

After an introductory chapter on "The Awakening of the Revolutionaries" in the 1960s, there is one chapter each on the old orthodox (Muscovite) Communist Parties, four chapters on the 57 varieties of Trotskyism, and one on "The Libertarian Alternative", followed by a concluding chapter. There are also appendices on the structures of some of their publications.

There are some obvious omissions, such as groups like the Independent Labour Party and the Socialist Party of Great Britain or issues like women's liberation. I know too little about all the Marxist organisations to offer a proper critique of them - though I must say that the account of the CPGB misses the flavour of that remarkable institution, that the account of the Maoists misses their most interesting section (the Communist Organisation in the British Isles, which was formed in 1974 and publishes *Proletarian*), and that the account of the Trotskyists is misleading in all the areas where I know something.

But I am mainly concerned with the account of the libertarian movement, and here the book is very weak. Shipley's view of the historical anarchist movement is taken clumsily from previous books on the subject; his version of the contemporary anarchist movement is put together just as clumsily from many recent publications. He has difficulty in copying out quotations correctly and in getting details right - thus nearly every reference to activities I have been involved in is inaccurate - and above all in working out how anarchism itself is related to other things, such as terrorism and pacifism, situationism and syndicalism, com-

munes and community politics. He has read too much and learnt too little, and even quite sensible discussions are spoilt by howlers like "A. S. Neill's Risinghill".

While I read a proof copy I noticed that a quotation from an article I wrote in *FREEDOM* had nine errors in less than eleven lines. I pointed this out to the publishers, and the author made some quick corrections. When I read the published version of the book I noticed that the quotation still has four errors. Similarly a quotation from George Woodcock's *Anarchism* has six errors in seventeen lines.

There are many facts in this book, probably more than in any other survey of the British left, but there is little knowledge. When the publishers say that it "sweeps away many of the

myths and half-truths surrounding this controversial subject", they are spreading yet another myth and half-truth. In fact the book is not very reliable and not even very readable. It is written from the outside like an intelligence report, and in an appropriate style. The author is a young journalist who has not learnt the first thing about journalism - check your facts. What might be forgivable in an article or programme is unforgivable in a book and this book should be read as a source of information not about the left but about a particular way of looking at the left. It is the sort of thing which appears in the *Spectator* - and indeed Shipley writes in the *Spectator* - and is probably useful to make people who don't know anything about the subject feel as if they do. To people who do know something about the left or who are personally involved in the left it is useful only if you want to lose your temper or have a laugh.

N. W.

CONTROVERSY

● SYNDICALISM....

One would hope that the re-publication of earlier syndicalist documents and texts might, as your reviewers suggest ("Workshop Politics" Vol. 37 no. 16), arouse some interest among those anarchists who seek to base their anarchism upon a grasp of everyday life. But it is unfortunate that such republications are being done by Pluto Press as they always contain errors or distortions in the introductions.

When they republished Tom Mann's pamphlet on the 8-Hour Day in 1972 the introduction by Richard Hyman contained some criticism of Mann which is valid enough so far as it goes. I do not have a very high opinion of Mann myself and would agree with the judgement quoted by Hyman that he was "essentially a propagandist of current radical ideas and not a theoretician"; and not a very good propagandist either, I would add. But Hyman would find it difficult to sustain his subsequent conclusion that "British syndicalism was characterised by its theoretical flabbiness". Anyone who has read some of the articles on syndicalism by Gaylord Wilshire, one of the first editors of *Solidarity* and author of *Syndicalism: what it is*, would find it difficult to agree. So too would the reader of William Paul's pamphlet on *The State--its origins and functions*. Mann's pamphlet*, incidentally, was written in 1886 before Mann himself became a syndicalist and is therefore hardly relevant evidence as to whether British syndicalism was or was not theoretically flabby.

In 1973, Pluto Press republished one of the most important syndicalist documents ever published in Britain, *The Miners' Next Step*, with an introduction by R. Merfyn Jones who also set out to demonstrate the theoretical flabbiness of British syndicalism. Thus in a footnote on page 7: "It was this industrial

unionist emphasis on effective centralisation which caused *The Miners' Next Step* programme to be shipwrecked on the rock-like sense of district autonomy to which the South Wales miners were particularly attached." Yet in the text of *The Miners' Next Step* (p. 30) we find the syndicalist principles clearly stated -- "Decentralisation for Negotiating - Centralisation for Fighting."

There is the clear implication (p. 5.) that the ideas embodied in the *M.N.S.* emanated from the Plebs League established in Ruskin College, Oxford. But to anyone who has read both documents *The Miners' Next Step* is simply *The IWW*, its history, structure and methods modified and adapted to Welsh conditions. Bill Haywood of the IWW, who was himself a miner, had visited England in 1910 and spoke to the Welsh miners. And Noah Ablett, a Welsh miner and part-author of *The Miners' Next Step*, was a syndicalist and an advocate of direct action, as he proved when addressing the TUC in Newport in 1912: "The Federation of Miners has waited twenty years for the eight-hour day law; but less than twelve months' fight sufficed to obtain the minimum wage. We syndicalists will make our congress the industrial parliament of the future."

Anarchists who are not familiar with the origins and ideas of syndicalism in Britain are liable to be confused by the fact that much of what purports to be the "history" of syndicalism in Britain has not been written by the syndicalists themselves but by academics like G.D.H. Cole whose definition of syndicalism as quoted in your review has been "borrowed" (Cole could have been successfully sued for plagiarism several times over) from Trautman of the IWW who stated that "the workers will become conscious of their power, and

they will develop the faculties to operate the factories and mills etc., through agencies and instruments of their own creation". Those agencies included democratically co-ordinated neighbourhood, municipal and regional workers' councils and were not simply confined to the industrial unions and federations of such unions, as Cole suggests.

But having "proved" to his own satisfaction that the syndicalists were unable to see beyond the workshop he developed his own theory of guild socialism, which he had borrowed in part from Sorel. This postulated a clash of interests between producers and consumers (ignoring the fact that the syndicalists had already suggested the creation of suitable agencies and instruments which would have dispensed with the need for a State). But academics, who usually depend upon the State for their livelihood, are unlikely ever to advocate any form of society which does not provide for them a well paid role as State functionaries.

It is unfortunate that no history of syndicalism in Britain written from a specifically syndicalist viewpoint is available but even so it ought not to be too difficult to counter the methods used by the Trotskyite school of falsification. Most of the practitioners of this school are academics and they and their kind have been at the game for a long time, as is testified to in this extract from an article by Christian Cornelissen which appeared in the Bulletin international du mouvement syndicaliste before the First World War:

"WE HAVE receive many newspaper and magazine articles combating or defending syndicalism.... But we are astonished to see how few of the men who study the movement have gone to its sources, observed strikes, workers' struggles, or even read working-class publication.... Instead of studying the French movement through its official organ La Voix du Peuple, or through pamphlets written by militant syndicalists, the authors of articles on syndicalism prefer to quote French and Italian writers who are outside the movement and with whom the French unions have nothing to do. A few weeks ago there appeared in the English press a series of articles by the socialist deputy, Ramsay MacDonald, who traced the origin of the syndicalist movement to the theories of Georges Sorel and of his master, Professor Bergson of the Sorbonne. In the International Socialist Review of Chicago we find an article on 'Sabotage and Revolutionary Syndicalism' where the readers are referred to the 'new school' which considers itself neo-Marxist, and to Sorel.

"We do not wish to insist on all the

... IN BRITAIN

nonsense contained in these articles. Let us point out one fact: The revolutionary syndicalist movement in France, in England, in the United States and everywhere else, is a mass movement. It is the revolutionary militants of France who have created this movement from the experience they gained in many years' struggle. It has nothing to do with any school, old or new, with Marxism, neo-Marxism or Bergsonism. In England and the United States it is the recent strikes which have attracted the world's attention to this movement and to what preceded the strikes; it is not a new school of philosophy, but the hard work of organisation and the practical experience of the masses in the service of capitalists and in their daily struggle against exploitation."

H. B.

*What the Eight Hour Day Means for the Workers

Hem Day

IN THE night of August 13th, 1969 in Brussels, Hem Day died at the early age of 67.

I got to know him personally five years before his death and in those last five years of his life, I went to see him as often as possible. And every time I came back from seeing him encouraged and strengthened.

Hem Day was a great philosopher, a very wise man and a tireless worker who for half a century gave with equal humility and modesty to international anarchism; and by himself he built up a centre of historical documentation.

From my personal acquaintance with Hem Day, I derived a clearer and more lucid idea of anarchism.

Hem Day was an initiator and allowed the individual to develop by himself; he was sure of the good quality of his seed and he was right. His anarchist propaganda consisted in the harmony of thought and action; it seems to me that today there are no longer anarchists of the temper of Hem Day.

Hem Day through his ability at organising his propaganda was against formal organisation, even if the organisation defined itself as anarchist.

To set up a formal organisation means inability to organise anarchistically. The will of the INDIVIDUAL makes the ANARCHIST and only with the WILL of the INDIVIDUAL can the anarchist movement be developed.

Men like Hem Day, Han Ryner, Emile Armand, Errico Malatesta... were such through their INDIVIDUAL and not their organisational talents.

Giovanni Tropani.

DIRTY POLITICS

RECENT AUSTRALIAN elections presented uncustomarily revealing shows by their parliamentary casts. The election which prompted the following reflection is in the past; its content is contemporary with elections past, present and future. It is by the editor of Rationalist News in the May-June 1976 issue (58 Regent Street, Chippendale, N.S.W. 2008, Australia).

*

THE TRUTH is politics is a dirty game - unethical, sly, deceitful, malicious, and so on. At the time of this journal going to press the people of New South Wales will have either elected a Labor or Liberal government again, after all the promises both parties have declared they will put into operation when in power. And most people, as usual, are as confused as ever about the basic issues, let alone in understanding how bureaucratic government functions. On this score I am reminded of what William C. Owen said in a pamphlet he wrote in 1922 about elections and the mistakes even Socialists make when contesting at the ballot box. I quote Owen's statement - which is published in Anarchism versus Socialism by Freedom Press, London:

"The truth is that the Socialists have become the helpless victims of their own political tactics. We speak correctly of political 'campaigns', for politics is warfare. Its object is to get power, by gathering to its side the majority, and reduce the minority to submission. In politics, as in every other branch of war, the entire armoury of spies, treachery, stratagem, and deceit of every kind is utilised to gain the one important end - victory in the fight. And it is precisely because our modern democracy is engaged, year in and year out, in this most unscrupulous warfare that the basic and all-essential virtues of truth, honesty, and the spirit of fair play have almost disappeared ..."

Remember, the above was written in 1922 - in fact 18 years before that date, I think; and things haven't changed a great deal since. All political parties, then, cannot really be trusted. Party politics has not won us freedom, nor helped to emancipate the people. It is still engaged in arguing the point. And it will continue to do so until such time as people really start to do some original thinking, to do their own thing, to learn to co-operate instead of listening to politicians and bowing to authoritarian governments. That's why the Rationalist Association is in existence - to encourage people to reason, to think for themselves and to question all forms of dogma, superstition and obscurantism. Freedom is a person's birthright, and no government, church tyrant, or individual has a right to deny it to any person.

LETTER

I AM sorry J.W. has "little to quarrel with" in my criticism of George Woodcock, but I am glad he managed to find something. His letter (21 August) raises two points in my last instalment (10 July) - one about the influence of Herbert Read and Alex Comfort in the anarchist movement, and one about me.

To take the first point, I said: "Herbert Read played no part in the anarchist movement after he accepted a knighthood in 1953, and I doubt whether a single young person was impelled in a libertarian direction by his example during the period in question, though his earlier writings had some influence." I accept that Read was taken seriously by foreign anarchists longer than by British ones, that his libertarian writings were still read after 1953, and that at least J.W. was influenced by him. But I still think that his part in the anarchist movement virtually ceased during the 1950s and that his influence was virtually negligible by the 1960s.

I didn't mention Alex Comfort's book *Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State* because it was one of "his writings of the 1940s" which I did mention, like several other brilliant books and pamphlets.

I didn't underemphasise these two figures. The context of my discussion of them was Woodcock's claim that they "provided links between classic anarchism and the younger people" in the nuclear disarmament movement and especially in the Committee of 100. I was a member of the anarchist and nuclear disarmament movement who belonged to the Committee of 100, and I observed no such links. Both Comfort and Read exerted great influence through their writings before the 1950s, but after the 1950s they exerted no direct influence of the kind.

Woodcock imagines. Comfort deliberately kept out of the limelight, and Read's appearances were highly ambiguous. It is true that he took part in two sit-downs in London in 1961, but it is also true that later that year he resigned from the Committee of 100 and publicly attacked it for abandoning Gandhian non-violence.

To take the second point, J.W. uses his letter to make an oblique attack which has nothing to do with this discussion. He says that revolutionary anarchists do not object to "pacifism" but rather to "certain pacifists who, unlike Read, turned on libertarian comrades when they were in trouble over a trial." In fact "revolutionary" anarchists do object to pacifism - their leading figure in this country, Albert Meltzer, has frequently described it as "non-violent fascism" and in fact Read did turn on libertarian comrades when they were in trouble over a trial, since he turned against the Committee of 100 just when its leaders faced imprisonment.

The reference to "certain pacifists", etc., is a repetition of public and private attacks made on me since 1971 by Marcus Graham, Albert Meltzer and Jeremy Westall because of my attitude to the Angry Brigade. I don't want to repeat the whole argument, but I do want to point out that J.W.'s reference is based on two lies - that I am a pacifist, and that I turned on comrades on trial. I am not and never have been a pacifist; I criticised the activity of the Angry Brigade and the arguments of the Stoke Newington Defence Group, but I said nothing against the defendants in the two Angry Brigade trials - indeed I offered sureties to them and donated money to their fund.

If J.W. wants to find something to quarrel about, he might do better to get his facts right before he begins.

N.W.

THE CRIME OF ELECTIONS

Comrade Billy Mick of Paragould, Portland, USA was arrested for giving out anarchist literature 100 feet from a polling-place and thereby 'wilfully causing a disturbance at a polling place'. This is a vague charge and the judge admitted that he was 'inflamed about this thing' and took Billy Mick's case 'under advisement' for some days so that he could study the law and 'cool down'. We have heard that, since then, the case has been adjourned until December so presumably his honour will have time to cool off! He is said by Billy to be contemplating a charge of attempting to prevent people from voting - which is a felony!

The judge was rather scathing and after he had received an explanation of Billy's anti-voting position he said, "I believe you better grow up a little bit" and, of all things in a court, the law was made for protecting the rights of citizens "particularly for little weaklings like you". The Prosecuting Attorney said that although the material was "repugnant to him - and others" the constitution guarantees freedom of speech and the right to distribute the literature; he was unsure Billy had committed a criminal offence.

The leaflet, printed by the Social Revolutionary Anarchist Federation of

Madison, Wisconsin, urges people not to vote because 'the free and informed will of the individual is the ultimate strength of (the) group and of society itself. Anarchists believe in individual responsibility and initiative and in the whole-hearted co-operation of groups composed of free individuals'.

The local paper report which has been sent to us seems fairly impartial and concludes on a note of reactions of leaflet recipients. "As one man said, 'This just proves it's a free country. But why did he pick out this ward?'".

J. R.

P.S. Comrade Mick (of 404 Canal Street, Paragould, OR 72450, USA) is interested in plans for an anarchist international currency and would be interested to hear from anybody on this.

DIALECTICS

OF THE CAPITALIST JOKE

IT IS NOT possible to find in Marx, Engels, Trotsky, Lenin, Stalin and all the Marxist writers any wit or humour. Occasionally one detects heavy sarcasm but no more. This is primarily because humour by its nature is counter-revolutionary, if not revisionist in tendency and in its refined form is quite obviously the province of the bourgeois intellectual. This volume *Big Red Joke*

Book belongs to this class. A quote from the notorious reactionary George Orwell confirms this. The concepts of democratic leadership, of national liberation, of proletarian solidarity, of historical determinism, of dialectical materialism, of class conflict - except in its most elementary forms; of any respect for the Soviet Union and its achievements, and those of the Peoples' Democracies (who are continually pictured as complaining about the historic role of the USSR); of the economic freedom of Soviet citizens; - all are omitted from this compilation of stale mish-mash from the capitalist press. (The name Pluto i.e. 'plutocracy in itself is highly significant.)

This collection of foul libels is added to by jokes from 'Radio Erivan', that revanchist apparatus of capitalism-imperialism functioning, it would seem, from within one of the previously oppressed minorities of the glorious Soviet fatherland.

We Communists can see a joke as well as the next man, if it is explained to us on the scientific principles of the dialectical process. As we understand it, the thesis is Man in a Capitalist Society, the antithesis is the banana-skin symbolising colonial exploitation and the wasteful aspects of Western society, the synthesis is the collapse of the individual symbolising the society which he represents and the downfall of capitalism - through the intervention of imperialism (symbolised by the banana skin) and the integument (in this case his trousers) bursts asunder.

Humour in the most general sense, conceived as the mode of existence, the inherent attribute of laughter, comprehends all changes and processes occurring in the universe, from mere chance of place right to laughing. The investigation of the nature of humour had as a matter of course to start from the lowest, simplest form of wit and learn to grasp these before it could achieve anything in the way of explanation of the higher and more complicated forms.

In the USSR the change of humour from quantity to quality in the delicate shafts of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin ("the dictatorship of the proletariat": "Building up the State in order to prepare for the withering away of the states") presaged a new Soviet humour.

This book* is not that.

[Prof.] Johanne Rotkelchen
Univ. of Utrecht.

*The *Big Red Joke Book*, ed. Benton and Loomes (Pluto Press, paper, 90p)

ORGANISING ANARCHY... Pages 9-10

This article appeared ten years ago in *Anarchy* 62 (April, 1966), since when there have been developments in and further material published on some of the fields chosen by Colin Ward (e.g. squatting, and workers' control). The article nonetheless stands as a persuasive illustration of the validity of anarchism as a theory of organisation.

SPANISH ANARCHISM NOW

THIS SECOND section of "Spanish Anarchism—situation and prospects" by Freddy, a contributor to *Frente Libertario*, covers the year 1974, a traumatic one for the renascent Spanish libertarian movement. (Translation by D. L. M.)

1974 — ACTIVISM, REPRESSION, FRUSTRATION

Two striking facts characterised the activity of the movement in the last months of 1973. On the one hand there was growing evidence of a real development of the anarcho-syndicalist tendency (contacts, coordination, publication of several numbers of *C.N.T. Informa* and *Opcion*, a militant presence in struggles, etc.). Parallel to this development there were reports of armed exploits in Catalonia, carried out by anti-authoritarian activist groups... These groups were credited with several hold-ups and various "expropriation" or "socialisations". These actions, claimed either by the M.I.L. (Iberian Liberation Movement) or by the G.A.C. (Autonomous Combat Groups)¹ led to the arrest, in September 1973, of several militants, among them Salvador Puig Antich.

What relationships existed between these armed groups and the Catalan libertarian groups? Before September 1973 nobody, with very few exceptions, knew of the existence of these groups. From information released subsequently by the M.I.L. we know now that these groups were made up of anarchist and council-communist militants. From their frequent references to the ultra-left, they were, from a strict theoretical point of view, closer to certain tendencies in the G.O.A. [see Part 1, last issue, --trans.] than to autonomous anarchist or anarcho-syndicalist groups. Putting forward "armed agitation" as a "tactical exigency" of the workers' movement, the M.I.L. did not claim to embody the armed wing of the revolution. Its strategy of violence was understood as one stage on the way to the final objective: the self-organisation of the class for the insurrectionary and expropriatory strike.

When the first arrests occurred, the M.I.L. no longer existed. It had dissolved itself in August 1973, and its militants had decided to devote themselves to theoretical work and the printing of texts in the framework of *Editions May 37*. The G.A.C. continued... When the first arrests were announced, accompanied by an intense anti-anarchist press campaign, the Catalan libertarian groups put a brake on their activities. Conscious of the fact that through the M.I.L. the police machine was seeking to destroy the libertarian movement in its entirety, the groups, all tendencies together,² organized for self-defence and to save Puig Antich from the death penalty. The coordination of the libertarians, was going to turn out to be particularly difficult, however. The first clashes came about over the value to be placed on the tactic of "armed agitation". The two principal theses put forward about the organization of solidarity for the imprisoned comrades were completely antagonistic. Whilst the G.A.C. and other sections considered that there could be no defence other than a political one, based on support for revolutionary activism, most of the anarcho-syndicalist and some of the libertarian groups were opposed to any systematic political justification of the M.I.L. An agreement of sorts was reached which set up a "Committee of Support for the imprisoned members of the M.I.L." responsible for coordinating the defence.

When the death sentence on Puig Antich was announced early in January 1974, the "Committee of Support" intensified its campaign. Right up to March, the entire militant capacity of the libertarian groups was to be devoted to this campaign. During this period all did not go well inside the "Committee of Support". Differences of opinion on militantism, on the ex-M.I.L., on activism, caused conflicts between the different groups and tendencies represented in the Committee. On March 2nd, Salvador Puig Antich was assassinated. Torn between sorrow and rage, many libertarian

groups reacted violently to the news of the execution. Some talked of taking the offensive again by reactivating "armed agitation", whilst others thought it was necessary to put an end to "suicidal" practices once and for all. The coordination achieved to defend the militants of the M.I.L. quickly broke up. Relations between the different libertarian groups became particularly strained in Catalonia. In other regions, by contrast, the repercussions of this affair did not have the same disastrous effects as in Catalonia. In Madrid, for example, the process of organization of anarcho-syndicalist groups speeded up. Whilst in Barcelona the campaign of solidarity with the imprisoned members of the M.I.L. served to emphasise incompatibilities, in Madrid it permitted various groups which had previously had no contacts, to get to know each other. In Valencia the situation was similar to that in Madrid. It is true that in both Madrid and Valencia anarchist activism remained a theoretical problem. In Barcelona, by contrast, it was a far from negligible element in libertarian reality.

The break-up of the "Committee of Support" did not resolve all the problems. It did, however, reduce divergencies and conflicts. Each tendency devoted itself to its activities. One of the direct consequences of the assassination of Puig Antich could be seen in the recrudescence of groups advocating armed struggle. The feeling of powerlessness before barbarism, despair and the monstrosity of repression, provoked in certain groups or individuals a sort of fascination with violence, individual or collective. This unthinking and sentimental inclination to vengeful armed struggle, was even to tend to attain disturbing proportions.

The kidnapping in May 1974 in Paris of the manager of the Bank of Bilbao by the G.A.R.I. (Group for International Revolutionary Action) brought matters to a head. Police solidarity was not slow, indeed, to display itself. Several anarcho-syndicalist militants in Barcelona were immediately harassed. The Francoist police undertook, with the aid of the servile press, the liquidation of the movement in Catalonia. In June of that year four anarcho-syndicalist militants (Luis Edo, David Urbano, Luis Burro and Juan Ferran) were arrested. After an attempt had been made to accuse them of complicity in the Paris affair, they were sentenced to several years of imprisonment. Later, the police, with any amount of communiqués and photos in the press, announced the dismantling of a "dangerous anarchist organization called O.L.L.A. (Organization of Armed Struggle)" and the arrest of its principal "leaders". This pure police invention served as a pretext to assimilate libertarians a little more to "dangerous terrorists" and to criminalise militants. The repressive wave was particularly intense and prolonged. Every libertarian group was threatened.

At the end of the first six months of 1974, the situation of the Movement in Catalonia was not sparkling. Militants were in prison, groups disjointed, others dissolved to escape repression and internal conflicts were attaining alarming proportions. The only positive element in this period was the active participation of anarcho-syndicalist militants in the strike in Baix Llobregat in June. Whilst regrouping, the anarcho-syndicalists kept at a good distance from activism and minority violence. After being the most active centre of the libertarian renaissance, Barcelona was to experience great difficulties in regaining its strength. Madrid and Valencia, on the contrary, became the centre of the anarcho-syndicalist tendency. The situation was particularly interesting in Madrid where several groups started off a process of fusion (*Solidaridad*, *Ateneo*, *Salud companero*, amongst others). This tendency toward unification was subsequently confirmed. In Valencia the organizational process, less advanced than in Madrid, was also well on the way. In other regions, the idea of reconstructing the C.N.T. was gaining in popularity, and anarcho-syndicalist groups tightened up their links.

PARTIAL ANALYSIS OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF ACTIVISM

As we have just seen, 1974 was marked by the development of activist tendencies in Catalonia. Lack of space rules out an analysis of this phenomenon. One conclusion, however, is unavoidable: activism considerably slowed up the process of development of the Movement. The divergences that came about within the "Committee of Support in Barcelona prove that the debate had its basis. It is in this context that it is interesting to quote some passages of a text drawn up by the *Frente Libertario* group on this question³.

We have insisted for a long time on the danger that the 'terrorist' line represented. We say 'line' in reference to the insistence with which its partisans transform every revolutionary struggle into fetishism of the machine-gun. For a Movement like ours which was gradually beginning to rise out of the void, the consequences of this 'line' have been disastrous. Just when it was possible to think that the mistakes of a relatively close past had been done with, we come to the cruel realization that it is not so.... The time has come to adopt a position on this question and to make a collective effort at analysis to answer two questions: who are we? what do we want? We are not interested in dogmatism, on the contrary we want to know what is favourable. We leave to one side the danger implicit in the line upheld by the M.I.L. or G.A.R.I. of the "militarization" of minds, to make a critique of the "dogmatism of violence" and of the incoherence which serves it as a justification. Where is the coherence in a group which, whilst referring itself to anarchism and to "workers' councils", declares that it is opposed to any ideology? Where is the coherence when this same group declares (Conspiracion internacional anarquista, no.1 p.18): "...an avant-garde organization can only really be effective and positive by abandoning all substitutionist pretensions..." and a little later adds: "avant-garde groups, in their practice, must have more radical objectives than those presented by a broad mass movement..."? It would be easy to multiply examples..."

The particularly polemical tone of this text finds its justification in the situation which motivated it. Armed struggle, revolutionary activism, minority violence could be very easily explained by the mere existence of fascism. This has been the case for a long time in Spain. The problem, here, however, is a tactical one. By giving priority to this kind of struggle, must the rest be compromised? Is it not suicidal to throw oneself into "armed agitation" without being able to count on any mass support? What political interest does this kind of struggle have? What revolutionary impact does it achieve? So many questions which most often are dodged or not answered...

TO BE CONCLUDED NEXT ISSUE.

NOTES

¹The G.A.C. were also called "Armed Combat Groups". There are several versions or hypotheses of the exact date of birth of these armed groups. Some people claim that the G.A.C. came into existence after the Burgos trial of 1970. Several actions of denunciation of the masquerade of a trial brought by the Francoist authorities against Basque resistance fighters had taken place in Toulouse (attacks on the Consulate and the offices of Iberia airlines) and would seem to have been the work of the G.A.C. In the same way, the M.I.L. seems to have been constituted at the beginning of 1971. Signing their first actions "Grupo 1000", it was only later that their members gave themselves the acronym M.I.L., which could signify "Libertarian Insurreccional Movement" or "Libertarian Iberia Movement" or "Insurreccional Movement for Liberation". It seems, however, that the real meaning of the acronym M.I.L. was, in fact, "Iberian Movement for Liberation". In December 1972, then in March 1973 the police had reported the existence of "armed groups of a communist tendency", as active in Catalonia. At that time the M.I.L. was, however, only known by its members and by the police. To get a more or less factual idea of the G.A.C. and the M.I.L. read the pamphlet by the "Editions Mai 37": Sur l'activité des 'gangsters' de Barcelone and the pamphlet published by the "Comite verite pour les revolutionnaires espagnols" entitled Gangsters ou revolutionnaires?

²It must be noted, however, that when the arrests were announced, some groups in Barcelona saw fit to release a communiqué stating that the comrades arrested had nothing to do with the libertarian Movement, and likening them to provocateurs. This communiqué was published in the papers of the "official" CNT: Espoir and Combat Syndicaliste. Puig Antich had to be assassinated for these papers to present him as an anarchist martyr.

³Part of this text, which was at first restricted to internal distribution, was published in the discussion bulletin Opcion, accompanied by other texts treating the same problem.

THE QUEEN'S MUSIC

ONE ALWAYS assumes, and probably correctly, that music as a part of prison culture is an art peculiar to the American and the Irish. The plaintive prison work song and the weeping guitar is our sound image of the American concrete and steel northern prisons and the southern chain gangs, and from the coffee houses of Hampstead to the twee poster-blown homes of the Scottish Nationalist middle class suing the southern government for economic freedom come the stereo high-fi recordings of men without hope singing and strumming their chained lives away. Only the Irish create prison songs of hope and revolt and they are worthy vocal ammunition for the Boston revolutionaries fighting to contribute to the passing collection box in an uptight town of plastic shamrock where the hard stuff is gin on the rocks. One owes much to Koestler for his Arts Award Scheme in relation to Brenda's prison population, for he gave these men and women a chance to show the Town and his Guardian frau the creative works that they have produced in the prison work shops and in the crowded prison cells. Prison art, children's art, the art of the physically or mentally afflicted, students' art by the very nature of its labelling presupposes the second or third rate in relation to Art with a capital A. And there is truth in this for if there is talent among any of these groups then it must not hide in benevolent or patronising grouping but must stand or fall in the harsh realities of acclaimed equals.

Having said this then one accepts the results of the Koestler Award Scheme with those reservations. In the Top of the Prison Pops it is a prisoner from Holloway who has waltzed away with the top £10.00 prize with a voice and guitar entry, and one must bear in mind that 110 prisoners submitted 85 entries from 13 prison establishments and this for no more than a collective prize money of no more than £89.00. In the matter of music it is hard to form a judgement by reason of distance and the key of the door but tape recording were made within the prisons by the local BBC radio stations and these were shipped off to James Peschek, Director of Music at Uppington School, with the understanding that the BBC local radio stations would transmit selections of the entries on their programmes. One must accept this but what I would like to see in this type of situation is for the Home Office rule to be waived and the prisoners allowed to publicise their work with their own names if they so wished, but at this moment in time one must accept the Home Office anonymous policy. Secondly, in the matter of music the work to be fed into the BBC and local radio stations without any hint of its place of origin so that it can be publicly judged without prejudice or sentimentality. The instruments range from the piano, drums, organ and harmonica to the guitar and flute and harmonica and hands, though the Home Office in their Prize List hand-out failed to mention the flute of the Maidstone Group who won the £6.00 prize and had their work broadcast on Radio Medway. A small pedantic point but I feel important in this context. The music that I heard was pleasant to my untrained ear honed to the beat of the military band, George Melly and the 1930 American blues ballads of Sleepy Time Gal but it was created in captivity and found an audience outside the prison walls.

There were 85 entries of whom seven were simply 'commended' in a prize list of money awards that ranged from the top £10 to £300, and of my simplicity I feel that when men and women create music and they offer their music to an audience outside their barred existence then one should avoid the rat race of civilised living by not creating greater or lesser. That they should have offered their work should be enough and £89.00 should be divided 110 ways. The schools have abolished prizes among children for the envy and the heartache it caused and the Home Office must learn the children.

But this is the fourth year that music has been included in Arthur Koestler's Award Scheme so if we have to choose between better music or empty prisons then let the guitar stay silent in Georgia, the revolutionary songs become no more than scribbled graffiti on the walls of emptied Irish prisons and the lute, the flute and the guitar be the free songs of free men and women filling an idle hour.

Arthur Moyse.