

Freedom

Anarchist Weekly



OCTOBER 28 1967 Vol 28 No 33

Vietnam Demos: Farce and Riot

LONDON'S part in the International Mobilisation began with a flop restarted with a bang. On the day, a debacle in Trafalgar Square, organised by the Committee of 100 with support only from CND, YCND and the BCPV. The theme of British activity in the Vietnam War (i.e. the Party's acquiescence in their licking Lyndon's dollar-padded tail), despite its justice, was too point for a mass rally.

FRIDAY'S FIASCO

More than 1,500 watched a rambling show from the plinth. The six marching bands would barely have filled a double decker bus apiece. Amplified music and folk—their 'Let's go with Labour' record—lasted to five years ago.

Poetry, Adrian Mitchell, Denis and Roger Barnard, was good dramatic.

Speakers, Peace Movement, rode hobby-horses and the an apologetic.

The projected visual finale of the Labour Party cards, a highly original idea haphazardly executed, evaporated when police threats of future penalties in booking the Square, brought a police card burner off the plinth and to sight.

Sudden rain washed out the scheduled hour of discussion-in-the-Square. CND's Foreign Office picket was likewise saved from fiasco. The indoor direct link with demonstrations abroad half-filled Finsbury Park Town Hall (thank you BBC for refusing us Alexandra Palace).

An abysmal show of weakness by the Peace Movement. Enough said.

UNITED FRONT

The sun shone all Sunday afternoon; we left Grosvenor Square after dark with bodies riot-hot. Sunday's demonstration, though under VSC auspices, was very much a united front (united in hate), a fact some anarchists preferred to ignore. 'Victory to NLF' was tempered by PPU, Young Liberal, Peace Action and Anarchist banners. Also present were Barbican strikers, Black Power brothers and Irish Revolutionary Workers. Libertarians twice stood aside from Liberationists to chant 'We want Peace', sound instinct when faced with VSC's mob emotion. However, imagination does need a body to rest in. What evidence have we that any Vietnamese are affording themselves the luxury of an anarchist analysis?

Unintelligible 'third world' rantings from the balcony microphones set the militant tone for the day. At least 5,000 left Trafalgar Square for the US Embassy, marching via Australia House (weekend empty) and Whitehall. At Downing Street the march stopped, shuddered with impotent rage, knocked a few cops, lost a few arrested, then moved

ANARCHY 81

NEXT WEEK DISCUSSES

Anarchists in the Russian Revolution

ANARCHY is Published by
FREEDOM PRESS at 2s,
first Saturday of every month

Gloves Are Off!

GUNTER, CARRON, WYATT, what a trio to pontificate on the rights of workers. They are the finest exponents of 'Red Plot-hunting' in the business.

The only point they have made, inadvertently, which is correct, is that the connection between the Barbican Dispute, Docks, Railways, Provincial Buses, and Print is the fact that it is basically a struggle against the Government's policy of keeping the workers in control. One factor we must never forget—Wilson was elected to do just that. A Labour Government can always be relied upon to wield the big stick, they have an infamous record for using troops to strike-break.

To get the record straight: the employers realise that on any occasion when they decide to make a stand against the demands of the workers they have the full support of the Labour Government, even to the extent of supporting opposition to trade union organisation as in the Roberts-Arundel dispute, support by doing nothing.

The gulf between the trade union leadership and the rank-and-file is clear and distinct. Whereas union leadership has, with tongue in cheek, verbally opposed Government industrial policy, the rank-and-file are, by their actions, opposing it. Heath, in his speech closing the Tory Party Conference, denied that the trade



BATTLE OF THE BARBICAN

union leadership is too powerful but in fact is not powerful enough to control their members. These are the opinions of the TUC and Government; they would not disagree with the Tories on this one.

The analysis of the situation by the three wise men is ludicrous, to say the least. They first claim it is a Communist plot, then a Communist-Trotskyist plot to disrupt the economy of the country—they must live in the world of science fiction.

Taking the pockets of struggle one by one. Liverpool Docks, with its very strong Catholic element, effective Communist influence could not be further from the truth. Whilst it is true that both the CP and the Socialist Labour League will fish in any muddy water and sup with anyone to gain control of a situation, in Liverpool Docks they are just peddlers of political rags.

The railway dispute. The 'most patient and conservative' of unions can be the NUR's proud boast. Make no mistake about it, rank-and-file pressure forced the NUR

leadership to make a reluctant stand.

Where is the 'Red Plot'? The truth is that militants of different political persuasion or none are now working together because they are involved in these disputes. How far this embarrasses their 'leaders' is a matter for conjecture.

The tragedy of the whole situation is the fact that three sections of workers are fighting the Government with the practical liaison between them negligible. The industrial struggle will intensify and therefore the industrial rank-and-file must unite on an industrial basis, the politicians will lead where they always lead, up blind alleys, then 'sell out'. They are not interested in the aspirations of Joe Soap but only how they can use and manipulate him to gain control.

We hear a load of crap about the 'good of the country'. Joe Soap is the country and it's up to him, in whatever sphere he works, to take control him- or herself—this is the only freedom.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

DOCK STRIKE ISSUES

Since the Labour Government has imposed the wage freeze, stopped agreed wages increases between employers and unions, tried to make strikes illegal and caused half a million unemployed, it is interesting to look back to 1964. Then Harold Wilson spoke of the pre-election boom manoeuvred by the Tories and said it was 'to induce people to forget 1961 and the pay pause, and the brutal interference with established wage bargaining and arbitration procedures, the nurses, the teachers, the railwaymen, the unemployed which their policies created. Because their secret weapon on which they count is short memories.' (Philharmonic Hall, Liverpool, on March 8, 1964). Mr. Wilson seems to rely on short memories as well.

CHARACTERISTICALLY the Labour Government has tried to dismiss the present strike of about 15,000 dockers in London and Liverpool simply as a 'Communist inspired plot' (remember the Seamen's strike?) to cover up dissatisfaction with the Government and to stir public opinion against the strikers. Quite clearly this is untrue as all decisions to strike have been taken by democratic votes from the men themselves.

So Mr. Ray Gunter's remark that 'one of the tragedies of the present situation is that the actions of a committed few are deliberately designed to damage the well-being of the many' is nonsense. True the Unofficial Liaison Committees that call for the votes are heavily laden with Communists but this, if anything, acts against them, as the vast majority of dockers are anti-Communist.

The demands of the men are quite moderate and simple. In London the abolition of the Continuity Rule (which took place when the Government introduced the new Dock Labour Scheme on September 18) is causing trouble. This rule was the most strongly defended of all by the dockers.

It ensured that once a docker started

on a particular job he stuck to it right to the end. This was to make all dockers accept the rough with the smooth as some cargoes are dirty, heavy and not very well paid, while others are easy to handle and are paid very well. Without the continuity rule an employer could put a 'blue-eyed boy' on a ship's hold when cars were being unloaded and then move him to another hold or ship when something like cement was being unloaded. Similarly he could put a militant docker he dislikes on a hard, messy, un lucrative cargo all the time.

When the new Scheme started this rule was abolished to achieve mobility of labour. Now if an employer is short of men and another employer has too many a man can be 'temporarily transferred' from one job to another. This is naturally very unpopular when a man is moved from a job on cars to one on cement.

The men complain of being treated 'like shuttlecocks' and there is nothing to stop employers using this new power against militants they dislike.

In Liverpool the dispute is over pay. At present London dockers are paid a minimum of £16 a week (the employers were prepared to pay £17 but Ray Gunter stepped in and disallowed it). Elsewhere dockers are paid a minimum of £15. Liverpool want the same pay as London and have struck for it, since the start of the new Scheme.

London also struck over pay when the Scheme started, but this strike soon petered out. They wanted the £17 the employers were prepared to pay, but for a 40-hour week with all overtime paid for. At present a man can work two evenings' overtime and still only get £16.

This is because the basic time rate for dockers in London is still only £11 1s. 8d. a week—and timework is based on this and not £16. So if a docker does not make much on piece-work, his earnings off his own bat can

still fall below £16, even with two nights' overtime. Then it is made up to £16—as it would have been if he had not worked overtime at all. The dockers' day is from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. or 7 p.m.

So it can be seen the demands of dockers in London and Liverpool are not unreasonable—and the employers' spokesman has admitted the employers can afford them. Mr. Lindsay Alexander (Chairman of the Liverpool employers) said: 'The strike could always be ended by giving the strikers what they want. But we do not believe this would either be responsible or in the national interest. It does not seem proper therefore that allegations of irresponsibility should be against the employers.' This of course is a matter of opinion. It has been widely publicised that £100m. of exports are being held up and Mr. Anthony Cayzer (President of the United Kingdom Chamber of Shipping) has claimed the shipowners are losing millions of pounds. All for the sake of about £9,000 a week. The employers are saving more than that in London alone thanks to Mr. Gunter's refusal to let them pay an extra £1 a week. And if they are losing millions of pounds of profit, as Mr. Cayzer says, £9,000 would not make a very big hole in them.

So little is at stake for the employers compared with what they can afford that it seems ridiculous for them to accuse the men of disregarding the national interest. The employers are obviously putting their self-interest above the nation's, just like everybody else.

As it is they are capitalising on the unpopularity of the dockers caused by the accusations of 'red plots' and 'disregarding the national interest' (and the way it is hitting workers in textiles industries through lack of raw materials) to try and get them firmly under the heel when they do return to work.

Mr. G. E. Toye (Chairman of the National Association of Port Employers)
Continued on page 7

books ?

We can supply any book in print

NEW BOOKS

- The Russian Anarchists Paul Avrich 40/-
- The Discovery of the Orgone: the Function of the Orgasm Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 21/-
- The Murder of Christ Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 16/-
- Listen, Little Man Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 15/-
- Commonwealth Versus Sacco and Vanzetti (ed.) Robert P. Weeks (paperback) 24/-
- Sahara Conquest Richard St. Barbe Baker (paperback) 8/6
- War and the Intellectuals Randolph S. Bourne (paperback) 16/-
- The Adventures of Caleb Williams William Godwin (paperback) 9/6
- Anarchy and Order (includes Philosophy of Anarchism; Poetry and Anarchism and Existentialism; Marxism and Anarchism.) 21/-
- Chartist Studies (ed.) Asa Briggs (paperback) 21/-
- Fear of Freedom Erich Fromm (paperback) 10/-
- The Art of Loving Erich Fromm (paperback) 4/6
- The Political Philosophy of Bakunin (ed.) G. P. Maximoff (paperback) 21/-
- The Unmentionable Nechaev Michael Prawdin (remainder) 15/-
- The Anxiety Makers Alex Comfort 30/-
- The Best of Connolly (paperback) 10/-
- The Death Ship B. Traven 6/-

Postage Extra

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily; 10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays; 10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays.)

17a MAXWELL ROAD FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

- Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial
- Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano
- Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists
- Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters
- Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era
- Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair
- Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
- Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa
- Vol 11 1961: The People in the Street
- Vol 12 1962: Pilkington v. Beeching
- Vol 13 1963: Forces of Law and Order
- Vol 14 1964: Election Years

Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6. The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/6 post free.

VERNON RICHARDS

Malatesta: His Life and Ideas cloth 21/-; paper 10/6

E. MALATESTA

Anarchy Paper 1/-
ALEXANDER BERKMAN
ABC of Anarchism paper 2/6
ALEX COMFORT
Delinquency 6d.

PAUL ELTZBACHER

Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-
RUDOLF ROCKER
Nationalism and Culture
cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN

Towards a Free Society 2/6

JOHN HEWITSON

Ill-Health, Poverty and the State
cloth 2/6; paper 1/-

VOLINE

Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)
cloth 12/6

E. A. GUTKIND

The Expanding Environment
(illustrated) boards 8/6

GEORGE BARRETT

The First Person (Selections) 2/6

MICHAEL BAKUNIN

Marxism, Freedom and the State
(ed.) K. J. Kenafick (paper) 7/6

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI

Neither East nor West (Selected Writings) (paper) 6/-

LUIS BUNUEL. A Studio Vista book. Text by Raymond Durgnat. Price 21/-.

IN EVERY AGE and in every period there is thrown up one single poem, one single painting, or one single slogan, that in their stark simplicity epitomises the images that will dominate the history of those particular years.

The social historian and the political economist will lay before us the wastelands of documented facts and figures, but we will accept the rabble call of history as the gathering point for our studied arguments for future actions. For history is but the life struggles of millions of men and women who were born for oblivion, and whose sole claim for attention lay in the manner and the violence of their deaths, not singly but in tribes, in armies and in nations. And when men speak of wars we shall remember Errol Flynn charging into a technicoloured glory, Baden Powell's knees and Kitchener's finger and the sweet banality of Rupert Brooke's muffin song.

Our middle class will recall with quiet pride the yellowing newsprinted photographs of their forebears who drove a London bus to break a General Strike and we in our turn visualise the *Picture Post* pages of the Hunger Marchers, the Battle of Cable Street, James Cagney and Picasso's *Guernica* and the cry of 'They shall not pass' that symbolised the splendour and the misery of the embattled Spanish people.

We will deny the hot summers for a single photograph of the mud of Paschendaele and dear Oscar will scent the social cesspools of his age with a single witty epigram. The road to the grave is too crowded and too short to dispute the selective images that crowd onto the walls of our minds, and we will laugh or weep as readily as a Pavlovian dog, if the necessity is unimportant and the discussion merely time consuming, for one has but to name the year and the accepted image is ready to trigger off the emotion.

But there comes a time when men and classes choose diverse elemental images for their adopted past and that choice becomes the mental banners to justify the death of innocence. For the

THE CURRENT SEASON at the National Film Theatre (Oct.-Dec.) should be of more than passing interest to readers of this paper. As usual three seasons are being run concurrently. They are: twelve features by Godard, decked out with films by other directors who've influenced Godard enough for him to assimilate their ideas into his own films. Example: *Paisa* was the inspiration for *Les Carabiniers*, while *Pierrot Le Fou* owes a lot to *You Only Live Once*. This is not plagiarism on Godard's part as some might think—it's all a matter of affinity and inspiration, though even when the season is over they'll still be the argument on whether Godard's films are based on attitudes or platitudes.

The fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution wouldn't be complete without a film recap, so the NFT is showing some of the Russian 'silents' many of which deserve to be called both masterpieces and classics. This time though, the season is developed by content, thus we start from Tzarist misery, continue with preparations for revolt,

The Mocker

intelligentsia of the 1920s and the 1930s it was an age of political and social involvement, for across the world old values crashed with each closing bank, men fought and died for the printed promise, while Church and State brawled in the gutters for the keys of the burning prisons. No man could stand aside and the artist danced from café to committee room defending or attacking in rhyme or paint the political or social morality of his choice.

But too often and too easily the artists of the western world played at the game of revolution and fought out their battles in wine stains on the café tables, for the new battles were being fought half a thousand miles away, the old wars still stank and the slave camps of the newly created States still awaited their classification and their inmates.

It was at this moment in time that two single images were born that marked out each intellectual camp into the socially committed, and the iconoclastic dilettante seeking a vicarious amusement, amid the corruption of a rotting society.

From Russia came Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin*, that flung onto the screens of the west the sword-slashed face of a screaming woman, from whose torn eye poured forth her life-blood, yet Eisenstein offered this as the culmination of a slow and steady build-up of actions, while from the west came Bunuel's *Un Chien Andalou* where, in the opening scene, there is the close-up of a young and pretty woman having her eye sliced with a razor blade and its gelatinous contents dribbling like thick tears onto Bunuel's hand.

Eisenstein used his image as a climax to a sequence within his film to win the support of the audience, but Bunuel deliberately set out to shock his audience into a violent opposition to his filmed action, and this he has attempted and succeeded in almost every film.

Over the years these two single stills have divided the spectators for while

we admire the virtuosity and the social dedication of Eisenstein we relate it now to its propaganda background, but Luis Bunuel's stark honesty cannot be questioned or faulted.

Too many have attempted to claim the surrealists as allies to bolster their own particular cause and they have just as easily rejected them when they felt they were out of favour, as Salvador Dali, who worked in complete co-operation with Bunuel on his first two films, repudiated Bunuel after the 1943 publication of Dali's *Secret Life*.

For this action Bunuel was forced to resign from his post in the Museum of Modern Art but this was but an epitaph for the purges of the thirties. Bunuel has never been a social proselytiser for, despite his political associations, he has always and only attacked the corruption within the established moralities. He has spat upon the altars within the temples, degraded women in their traditional role, mocked the sentimentalised blind and infirm and played fool with hallowed corruption of the sacred dead.

Like God's clown he has always mocked the faithful, for he is the heretic, searching among the dirt for the true faith. He is the child who attacks his mother for the indignity of his creation, who mocks the priest because he is not Christ, who jeers at his society because it is sick and he attempts to read the future in its own vomit.

Bunuel has never learned that it is the pure and dedicated guardians of the temples who are the enemies of innocence, for their honesty, their sacrifice, and their open and proclaimed love for their victims is accepted as the justification for the corruption of their office.

The world failed the intelligentsia of the inter-war years and they spat upon the face of man in a rage of savage frustration. But it was an honest rage of men who sought an answer and men from Eisenstein to Ford and Hitchcock could learn from this gentle man seek-

days of getting a film centre in your city. The provinces often take their cue from London where programming is concerned, although I've always myself believed in a paper ballot by film-theatre members rather than passing a request to a harassed-looking house manager. This for once could be a vote which would reflect both the individual and the collective membership.

The London Film Festival will be with us again at the end of November, and I'm keeping my fingers crossed hoping Bunuel's *Belle de Jour* will be shown. It is said to be a masterpiece by those who've seen it, which is saying something after his work over the past eight years! Bunuel is reported as saying this is his farewell picture, but one hopes that, like too many politicians, he doesn't remotely intend to keep his promise, this time in a good cause, for each Luis Bunuel film has been a sanctuary of sanity in a mad world, and we can ill-afford the loss of such a fine anarchist, moralist and entertainer.

R.P.

SEASON AT THE NFT

survey the revolution itself through the interpretations of Eisenstein and Pudovkin, to the Civil War that preceded it.

Anarchist Federation of Britain

Temporary address, c/o Wooden Shoe, 42 New Compton Street, London, W.C.2

LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS. Temporary address c/o Wooden Shoe, 42 New Compton Street, London, W.C.2. Sunday evening meetings 8 p.m. Lamb & Flag, Rose Street, off Garrick Street, London, W.C.2 (Leicester Square tube). Oct. 29 L. Harvey.

What is Wrong with Individualist Anarchism LEWISHAM. Contact Mike Malet, 61 Granville Park, Lewisham, London, S.E.13
EALING ANARCHIST GROUP. Get into touch with Ken King, 54 Norwood Road, Southall.

OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

3rd Wednesday of each month at Jack Robinson and Mary Canipa's, 21 Rumbold Road, S.W.6 (off King's Road), 8 p.m.
3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald and Irene Rourke's, now at 13 Savernake Road, London, N.W.3.
2nd and 4th Friday of each month, 8 p.m., at Brenda Mercer's and dj Austin's, 80 Crouch Hill, N.8 (Finsbury Park Underground, 212 bus to door).

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS

ABERDEEN ANARCHISTS meet 1st and 3rd Wednesdays of month at M. Day's, 142 Walker Road, 2nd and 4th Wednesdays at Liz Smith's, 3 Sinclair Road. Correspondence to either address.
ALTRINCHAM ANARCHIST YOUTH GROUP. Get in touch with Stephen Richards, 25 North Vale Road, Timperley, Cheshire.
BEXLEY ANARCHIST GROUP. Correspondence to Paul Wildish, 2 Cumbrian Avenue, Barnhurst Kent.

BELFAST: Contact Tony Adams, 11 Winetavern Street, Smithfield Square, Belfast.
BIRMINGHAM LIBERTARIAN GROUP. All anarchists, syndicalists, individualists, etc., please contact Geoff and Caroline Charlton, top flat, 8 Lightwoods Hill, Smethwick, Warley, Worcs. 25 mins. from Birmingham City centre, No. 9 bus.
RESISTANCE GROUP. c/o Birmingham Peace Action Centre (formerly CND office), Factory Road, Birmingham, 19.
BOLTON. Get in touch with Les Smith, 74 Arnold Street, Bolton, Lancs.

BRIGHTON. Get in touch with 79 Coleman Street, Brighton, 7. Poetry readings every Tuesday in Archway 187 on the Seafront. Admission is free and all poets welcome. 8.30 p.m. onwards.

BRISTOL. Contact: Dave and Pat Thorne, 22 Hampton Road, Redland, Bristol, 6.
DUNDEE GROUP. Contact Bob and Una Turnbull, 39 Stratheden Park, Stratheden Hospital, by Cupar, Fife.

EXETER ANARCHIST GROUP. Get in touch with Anthony Webb, 39 Cowick Lane, St. Thomas, Exeter, Devon.

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP ONE. Correspondence to Robert Lynn, 2b Saracen Head Lane, Glasgow, C.1.

HARLOW ANARCHIST GROUP. Enquiries to John Deards, 184 Carters Mead, Harlow and/or Geoff Hardy, 6 Redricks Lane, Harlow.

HERTS. Contact either Stuart Mitchell at South View, Potters Heath Lane, Potters Heath, Welwyn, Herts OR Jeff Cloves, 46 Hughendon Road, Marshalswick, St. Albans, Herts. Saturday, October 28. Harlow anarchists on 'Anarchy in New Towns' at 10 Fry Road, Chells, Stevenage, 8 p.m.

HULL ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact J. Contact 34 Durham Street, Holderness Road, Hull, Yorks.

HULL INDIVIDUALIST ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact 34 Outram Street, Holderness Road, Hull, Yorks.

IPSWICH ANARCHISTS. Contact Neil Dean, 74 Cemetery Road, Ipswich, Suffolk.

ISLINGTON, LONDON. Next meeting at the General Picton pub, Caledonian Road (near Kings Cross) at 8 p.m., Friday, November 3.
KILBURN, LONDON. Contact Andrew Dewar, 16 Kilburn House, Malvern Place, London, N.W.6. Meetings 8 p.m. every Tuesday.

NORTH EAST ESSEX. Group meets the first Monday in each month 7.15 p.m. at 91 Brook Street, Tolleshurst Knights, Tiptree, Essex. For further information write P. Newell, 'Maybush', Maypole Road, Tiptree, Essex.

NORTH SOMERSET ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Roy Emery, 3 Abbey Street, Bath, or Geoffrey Barfoot, 71 St. Thomas Street, Wells.

ORPINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Knockholt, Nr. Sevenoaks, Kent. Every six weeks at Greenway, Knockholt. Phone: Knockholt 2316. Brian and Maureen Richardson.

PLYMOUTH ANARCHIST FEDERATION. Contact J. Hill, 79 Underlane, Plymstock, Plymouth, Devon.

READING ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Alan Ross, 116 Belmont Road, Reading, Berks.
ROCHDALE. Please contact Richard Crawford, 4 Hargreaves Street, Sudden, Rochdale.

SHEFFIELD RADICAL GROUP. Contact S.R.G., 31 Harcourt Road, Sheffield, 10.
SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY GROUP. Contact Robin Lovell c/o Students' Union, Sheffield University.

SLOUGH ANARCHIST GROUP AND 'HIPPI' GROUP. Contact B. P. Norcott, 116 Lower Copenham Lane, Slough, Bucks. Meetings every other Friday.

SOUTH EAST ESSEX ANARCHIST GROUP. We would love to hear from fellow-sympathisers in area. All enquiries to M. Powell, 7 Lingcroft, Basildon, Essex.

SOUTH WEST MIDDLESEX ANARCHIST GROUP meets alternate Thursdays and Saturdays, on Eel Pie Island, Contact P. J. Goody, 36 Norman Avenue, Hanworth, Middlesex.

TROWBRIDGE PEACE ACTION GROUP. Contact P. Weston, Chivell, Butts Lane, Keevil, Trowbridge, Wiltshire. Meetings every Tuesday 7.30 p.m. Friends' Meeting House (opp. Bus Station).

WEST HAM ANARCHISTS. Contact Stephen Higgs, Westbury Road, Forest Gate, E.7.

NORTH-WEST FEDERATION

Regional Secretary: Alistair Rattray, 35a Devonshire Road, Chorley.

NORTH WEST ANARCHIST FEDERATION. BUXTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary: F. A. Gresty, Punchbowl, Manchester Road, Buxton.

CHORLEY ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary: Alistair T. Rattray, 35a Devonshire Road, Chorley.

LIVERPOOL ANARCHIST PROPAGANDA GROUP AND 'HIPPI' MOVEMENT. Gerry Bree, 16 Faulkner Square, Liverpool, 8. Meetings weekly. 'Freedom' Sales—Liver Head, Saturdays, Sundays, Evenings.

MANCHESTER ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary: Dave Poulson, 9 Boland Street, Fallowfield, Manchester, 14.

SOUTH WALES ANARCHIST FEDERATION

CARDIFF ANARCHIST GROUP. SWANSEA ANARCHIST GROUP. All correspondence to: Julian Ross, 111 King Edwards Road, Brynmill, Swansea.

LIBERTARIAN TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION

Meetings—discussions—activities. Contact Peter Ford, 82 North Road, Highgate, N.6. (Tel.: MOU 5702).

ing his... and finding nothing but questions.

Studio Vista have served Bunuel well with this small book and Raymond Durgnat has charted Bunuel's film life in a well-documented survey of all his work. In the history of our time Bunuel has served his purpose. For good or ill, for good or ill.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

Charge!

A RIDICULOUS INCIDENT occurred on the 'anarchist march' on Sunday. We left the funeral procession by turning into Horseguards Avenue from the Embankment. On reaching Whitehall we wished to go through Horseguard Parade but at the gate a guardsman, in a long blue coat with red trimmings and a brass helmet with plumes, went berserk and shouted at us in mediocre English. When we failed to understand him he drew his long sword and swished it violently in the air just failing to decapitate an irreplaceable friend and comrade.

We were told afterwards by a knowledgeable chap that had this character caused any damage he would not answerable to British justice.

Vietnam Dem Remands

THE MORNING after the Grosvenor Square demonstrations, among 48 people charged at Marlborough Street were a number of anarchists. The case against Ricky Cook was postponed until October 31, he is charged with 'grievous bodily harm' and remanded on £100 bail. He pleaded guilty and is strenuously denying the charge. He would like witnesses to come forward who saw him arrested. His brother, John Cook, also arrested at the same time.

Approximately 40 other cases were remanded, on bail, on various dates.

On Saturday evening Neill Collins was wrongfully arrested at the start of a march from Embankment Gardens. The case is to be heard on November 12.

Leaflet on the October Revolution

Comrades: We think the article by N.W. in this issue should be produced also as a leaflet. If groups agree with us could they write at once? Price will be approximately 30/- a 1,000.—Editors.

PROPOSED GROUPS

MUCH HADHAM, HERTS. Get in touch with Leslie Riordan, High Street, Much Hadham, Herts.

LONDON; NOTTING HILL. Please get in touch with John Bennett and Marilyn Faddy, Flat 4, 88 Clarendon Road, London, W.11 Tel.: 727 9745.

TORONTO, CANADA. Any Torontonians interested in Anarchism please contact Leonard Tarka, 108 Silverhill Drive, Islington, Ontario, Canada.

S.W. LONDON. Syndicalists, Anarchists, Pacifists and Libertarian-Socialists wanted to form S.W. London Libertarians. Correspondence to Martin Page, 15 Thornton Avenue, London, S.W.2.

EAST DORSET ANARCHISTS. Please contact Tim Deane, 'Juliet', West Moors, Wimborne, Dorset, Ferndown 3588.

CORNWALL ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact A. C. Jacob, 76 East Hill, St. Austell, Cornwall.

WOLVERHAMPTON. Contact Martin Bashforth at 11 Lyndhurst Road, Wolverhampton.

ABROAD

AUSTRALIA. Federation of Australian Anarchists, P.O. Box A 389, Sydney South. Public meetings every Sunday in the Domain, 2 p.m. and Mondays, 72 Oxford Street, Paddington, Sydney, 8 p.m.

DANISH ANARCHIST FEDERATION. Göteborg, 27, Viborg, Denmark.

VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA. Anyone interested in forming anarchist and/or direct action peace group contact Derek A. James, 1880 Grand Boulevard, North Vancouver, B.C., Canada. Tel.: 987-2693.

USA; VERMONT. New Hampshire Anarchist Group. Meets weekly — discussion, individual action. Contact Ed. Strauss at RFD 2, Woodstock, Vermont 05091, USA.

SWEDEN. Stockholm Anarchist Federation. Contact Nadir, Box 19104, Stockholm 19, Sweden.

CANADA; WIANIPEG. Anyone interested in Direct action/anarchy contact G. J. Nasir, Matheson Avenue, Winnipeg, 17, Manitoba.

BELGIUM; LIEGE. Provos, c/o Jacques, Belgium, 11 Avenue de la Laiterie, Sclessin-Liege. EAST AFRICA. George Matthews would like to make contact. Secondary school teacher. UK, PO Box 90, Kakamega, Kenya. USA. James W. Cain, secretary. Incurable Anarchist Association, 323 Fourth Street, Clovis, Minnesota 55720, USA. G. GROUP (TREASON. Australian Anarchist, Melbourne University Union or A.R. C. Peters, c/o same.

BLACK POWER OR COLOUR BLINDNESS



'DETROIT TODAY, London tomorrow—is this the slogan we are increasingly to hear from the radical Negro leaders, the Stokeley Carmichaels and their English followers? Already we have Michael de Freitas (*alias* this, that, and the other) attacking the 'white' majority in England in terms usually employed by racists about 'coloured' people. The radicals are not simply changing their means; their ends have changed too. They are, they tell us, not interested in civil rights, in racial equality, in integration. They reject 'white society', and claim variously to hate and despise the 'white'. In the United States, the Black Muslims form an internally coherent sub-culture, in which exogamy, for instance, is regarded with horror.

With this rejection of a society that has done so much to injure and insult the Negro (or Afro-American, to use the preferred—and more consistent—term), we can have a certain sympathy; nevertheless, the more human vision is that of a world without 'race', not one divided by a system of voluntary *apartheid*, with each group sealed off from, and despising, the other. In the United States, there has been at least multi-racialism, at most coalescence, between Slavs and Latins and Nordics; from this, Afro-Americans have been largely excluded. Can the situation in England of at least multi-racialism, at most coalescence, between Gael and Celt and Saxon, come to include the new wave of settlers of non-European stock? No one regards the term 'black-haired British' as one denoting a category of the population, or indeed as having any real meaning. Will the term 'black-skinned British' become similarly absurd?

That this is a more desirable state of affairs than *apartheid*, few readers of this journal will surely doubt. Mr. MacInnes will, perhaps, raise his usual point about how nasty it would be to see all those jolly West Indians becoming staid, 9-5 Englishmen, but if this is what any of them should want, it is not for us to play 'Darkies, sing a song oh de old plantation'.

How is integration to be achieved? Well, of course, we can wait for The Revolution, but 'pie in the sky by and by' has never been much use to those who are hungry here and now. Or we can start The Revolution (or 'insurrectionism' as Mr. Meltzer calls it in *Anarchy* 59: The White Problem)—any volunteers? Or we can try to achieve our end by working for integration, by trying to break the barriers that divide the host from the immigrant communities. Not all of these barriers are inherent in our socio-economic state; some can be removed without having to take on the larger, and slightly unrealistic task of scrapping the constitution of England and starting again. And, *pro tanto*, we will have created a more pleasant place to live in.

Voluntary Groups

Efforts to attain this are increasing; the end is regarded as desirable by people of all shades of opinion (and, without more, I am not prepared to question their sincerity merely because they do not fall in under the black and red banner). Up and down the country are appearing local, voluntary, race relations groups such as the Islington Friendship Council, the Oxford Committee for Racial Integration and the Camden Committee for Community Relations. Their efficacy in removing tension and promoting integration in their areas depends *a priori* on their approach and structure, *a posteriori* on their personnel; those who support their aims, and have definite views about means, might do well to join them, or at least set up ones of their own if the existing ones are too far gone in bureaucracy. If Camden is typical, however, the prevailing spirit is that of inquiry, not pontification. (Mr. MacInnes, again, has written (*Encounter*, September 1967) that the Negro struggle is only for Negroes; cannot one say that the human problem is for humans? In any case, Mr. MacInnes does see a rôle for the white integrationist in fighting the white racist—but is this not what the Negro is doing? Mr. MacInnes' usual lucidity of thought here seems to desert him. Moreover, he is talking about the United States; here, the situation is not really 'whites v. coloureds' (as my school football notice board used to say), but newcomers (Irish and Cypriots as well as West Indian and Indo-Pakistani) and established residents—though of course racial overtones do appear.)

On the national, and more remote, level are organizations like the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD) and the National Committee for Com-

monwealth Immigrants (Nicky) (*pace*, Mr. Meltzer, who apparently would like to see them called by offensive names like 'Society for the Poor Blacks'—*Anarchy* 59, p. 4). More powerful are the Race Relations Board, and, yes, the Government. Politicians, like the rest of the country, have divided on the 'immigration question', the 'colour problem'. Some have followed a consistently racist line, like the noxious Sir Cyril Osborne; others, perhaps not personally racist, have exploited the situation for grubby political ends—the Conservative campaign in Smethwick in 1964 being the *locus classicus*. Others again have avowed that racial discrimination is 'a blot on our national life' (the Home Secretary, quoted in the *Sunday Times* newspaper, 14.5.67).

'Mr. Jenkins is prepared to try to "outlaw" discrimination—hurray!—by legislation—oh!' This, I think, is roughly the reaction of anarchists who dislike legislation and Government activity *per se*, and of the Right, which dislikes this particular piece of proposed legislation. 'Freedom to discriminate' is, however, a rather tawdry freedom, to say the least; one we can well do without, like the freedom to rape schoolgirls. If, as a result of legislation, people are going to have jobs, houses and credit facilities where they did not before, it does not lie well in the mouths of those who have never suffered discrimination to complain.

Racial Equality

The Fabian Society has published a pamphlet edited by Anthony Lester, of CARD and Nicky, and Nicholas Deakin, of the Institute of Race Relations, the recommendations of which seem likely to be adopted by the Government with a speed that would have bewildered Shaw, the Webbs, Bland and the other original Fabian essayists (*Policies for Racial Equality*, Fabian Research Series 262, 4s. 6d.). In common with them, I suggest that the cause of racial integration can be furthered by Government pressure, or, as the editors put it 'There is very little time left to shape the future of race relations in Britain. . . . There will never be another period in which the situation will be as capable of being influenced by positive government action.' The pamphlet suggests what that action might be. There are two approaches to criticism; in the first, that legislation can only be mischievous, exacerbating the situation, I have never been able to find any force; the second, that legislation cannot be more than one factor in society's attempt to be free from racism, is my adopted one. I am also of the opinion that it is my brother, and not the Government, that is my brother's keeper, and I, not the Government, who must be my brother's helper.

The first essay in the pamphlet merely gives the background to, and some statistics of, the present communal constitution of the country; the student would, however, be well advised to prefer the excellent little compilation *Colour in Britain* (BBC Publications, 8s.). Next, Mr. Lester puts a case for legislation that anti-Parliamentarians would take issue with. Thus, he writes 'The voluntary approach, unaided by Government intervention, has been tried and found wanting. . . . Law encourages voluntary action.' It is true that the voluntary bodies have felt hampered by the ability of discriminators at the end of the day to snap their fingers at conciliation efforts: it is also true that employment patterns in the United States and Canada have been affected by legislation. Be that as it may, the denigration of the work of the voluntary bodies is misplaced, and those of them that see the path to racial equality lying, not in 'doing good works for the blacks', but in involving newcomer and native in community life, have a continuing rôle. Legislation, by removing race relations from the voluntary to the official sector, could discourage the former, and a fine movement would die out. It must be pointed out, however, that these bodies, without exception of which I have knowledge, favour anti-discrimination legislation, both to strengthen their hands and to reassure the immigrant communities that they are not being left to the wolves—or, at any rate, to those wolves who wear black shirts.

The legislation advocated by Mr. Lester, by the local bodies and by such people as Professor Marshall of Sheffield (article in the forthcoming issue of the *CCCR Bulletin*), has its emphasis on conciliation, not punishment. It is designed to create the mechanism for resolving disputes, and as such is, I believe, something new in legal practice. 'The law,' says Mr. Lester, himself a

barrister, 'should attempt to alter conduct, not to punish.' Penologists, of course, have been urging this for years; the Race Relations Act 1964 accepted it, and new legislation will certainly follow it. Making discrimination something between a crime and a tort is an interesting innovation, and one wonders if it will be adopted in other spheres.

Mr. Lester acknowledges that 'legislation is only the first step in promoting racial equality'. Actually, it comes rather late, but if, with non-discriminatory clauses in Government contracts, it represents what may be termed a turning of the public face against discrimination, and if it does indeed help discrimination on its way to becoming a hole-and-corner thing, practised secretly and furtively, at the last to be terminated by public disgust, then I shall have no quarrel with it.

Of course, we know that it would indeed be a remarkable law that achieved this, for though it might sap or even end racially discriminatory practices, it could not end racial prejudice, the disease of which discrimination is the pimply symptom. How can prejudice be ended, short of lobotomy? It is beyond the scope of this pamphlet to study the source of prejudice. Philip Ward in *Anarchy* 59 makes some contribution to this, but one really has to turn to the works of Drs. Storr and Stafford-Clark for the psychology of it—otherwise, how can one relate an understandable, but illogical, fear of economic competition, as propounded by C. H. Pearson in *National Life and Character* (1892), one of the earliest works on racism, to dislike of somebody for the degree of melanin in his pigmentation? For those, and they exist, who feel a physical repulsion toward 'coloured' people, no solution lies outside Harley Street.

General Recognition

The next category, those who repeat racist nonsense parrot-fashion, and who are often 'cured' simply by meeting the objects of their dislike, is numerically greater. Only a general recognition of the human dignity of non-Europeans—or of non-English—can resolve this. The average Englishman is chronically prejudiced, against the Scot and Frenchman, when not against the Jamaican or Pakistani. His insularity is a national joke; foreigners with comic accents are always good for a music-hall laugh. The nineteenth century has had no longer-lasting legacy than this. Time is probably the only thing that can change it, as increasing mobility of population, as workers or travellers, scrambles mankind into a more coherent omelette.

Another factor is the anglicization of immigrants, or their descendants, which is as inevitable as the anglicization of the French Huguenot and Russian and German Jewish settlers, and which ought to go hand in hand with an increase in cosmopolitanism in the community at large. How many people (to take a superficial instance) today eat food which they regard as being ordinary English fare, but has in fact been introduced by immigrants? Tomorrow, *baklava* may be as 'English' as porridge.

The parents and children of the host society are as much in need of education as the immigrants,' writes Mr. Bell, of the University of Lancaster, in the fourth essay in the pamphlet, on education. Unfortunately, this is not an aspect upon which he dilates. Of course, villagers from the back hills beyond Rawalpindi, cane-cutters from St. Kitts, goatherds from the Trouros, are sadly ill-adapted to the sophisticated urban civilization that dominates in England. They need help too in learning to live with the English. But we need help in our acceptance of them and our appreciation of what their different cultures

can contribute to ours, be it the Negro Theatre Workshop or curry; and this is more important than their learning how to furl umbrellas correctly. This aspect of integration, its being a two-way process, is sadly overlooked by the Fabians; one would like it not to be overlooked elsewhere.

Jack Jones, of that same TGWU that was 'neutral' in the recent dispute between a would-be turban-wearing Sikh 'bus conductor and his employers, next outlines how it can be difficult for anyone, let alone 'coloured' people, to get into, e.g., the London docks; deplores the closed apprenticeship system; and goes on to state that 'The outstanding need is for individual unions, the TUC, employers' federations, and the CBI, to take a firmer stand on the fair treatment of the immigrant worker'. As the Iron Duke said, 'If you can believe that, you can believe anything.' Even Mr. Jones seems to find his Utopianism a bit far-fetched, for he says later that, as a suggestion, it is no substitute for legislation—which the TUC opposes. I fear I can make nothing of all this.

Language Groups

Getting people employed is not the same as getting them promoted, nor is it the same as integrating them with the work-force as a whole. Non-English-speaking gangs under an English speaker of their own language group are perhaps inevitable, short of compulsory language classes (quite impracticable); it does mean that greater efforts are needed from shop stewards to get them as effective trade union members. The danger otherwise is that in any industrial dispute, either section may not be supported by the other. On the whole, English labour has not been undercut by immigrant labour, whether Polish, Hungarian or Commonwealth, but only effective integration on the shop floor can continue to ensure this. Solidarity at work may be one of the biggest factors in integration afterwards; integration afterwards is necessary to maintain solidarity at work. Neither Mr. Jones nor Mr. Hepple, of the University of Nottingham, who also write here on employment, touches on this: perhaps not surprisingly.

Housing is even more fundamental a need than work, and in this sphere the immigrant has all the problems of the native with additional ones of his own. Legislation here would not create a 'privileged class', merely by removing a disability, and those who see legislation as perhaps exacerbating racial tensions should, as Mr. MacInnes indicates, get on with the job of drawing the teeth of the white racists. In the pamphlet, Professor Rex gives a digest of the views he expounds eloquently and at greater length elsewhere, while Mr. Warren Evans, also of CARD and Nicky, gives an answer dear to syndicalist hearts: Organize. Tenants' and housing associations are vitally necessary, for it would be unrealistic to look to housing authorities to make special provision for immigrants when they are sensitive to 'English first' cries. Voluntary associations may also be able to acquire special accommodation where needed, e.g. homes more suitable to the social pattern of the 'extended family' than the decayed dwellings of the Victorian bourgeoisie. In this way a valuable social concept could be preserved.

The Camden Committee for Community Relations does sponsor a housing association; it is up to other organizations to do the same. Even if we follow American example and burn down our slums, which may be no bad thing, housing has still to be provided for those displaced, and this is a bit more difficult. Arson is not, however, advocated by the Fabians, and I am

sufficiently old-fashioned to advocate violence as a last, and not as a first, resort.

Mr. Warren Evans also has a list of other palliatives, like cheap mortgages, but these anyway are a national, not just a sectional, need.

Finally, Dipak Nandy, of the University of Kent and CARD, pertinently inquires 'Why should they conform?', and wonders if 'what [the immigrant] is asked to put up with is humanly worth putting up with'. Much of the English way of life is rather appalling, though it is as well to remember that even our ghastliest social *moeurs* (gin and Jaguar, or what you will) are voluntarily adopted by their practitioners. Those who reject them can help in several ways to change, whether through the agency of the anarchist movement or the Council for the Preservation of Rural England! Or, more to the point, by benefiting from the diversity of cultures at present in England. Yet it is to be supposed that there are Chinese and Turks and Tamils who cherish a wish to become suburban Englishmen; certainly for their grandchildren, it would be rather an affectation to be anything other than English (witness, again, the descendants of earlier arrivals from Holland, France, Russia, etc.). It is hardly for us, as I have indicated, to try and 'protect' immigrants from the Saturday car-washing parade or from becoming policemen or magistrates or burglars or beekeepers: it is too much like trying to preserve the noble savage. Yet conformism, like non-conformism, must be the choice of the individual (even if we think it the wrong choice); what is intolerable is the concept of 'educating' them to be like 'us'. Actually, most of those despised liberals are liberal enough to be aware of this, and if the *desiderandum* is a cosmopolitan society, tolerant not because it is uniform but because it is diverse, its advocates are more to be found in the 'liberal' ranks than in those of radical movements that are exclusively Negro.

No Despair

'We have a duty,' says Mr. Nandy, 'to be pessimistic, for an illusion of competence is, in the long run, costlier and more dangerous than simple incompetence.' To doubt one's competence is perhaps the best spur to greater activity, but pessimism sometimes leads to giving up in despair. The contributors to this pamphlet do not despair, but, for all their assertions of the need for individual action, place a rather naïf reliance on action by official bodies—the TUC, the CBI, the council, the Government. Should these bodies indeed adopt the policies outlined, things might turn out well, but meanwhile the best people to work for good race relations are those with the most at stake: the immigrants themselves, and those in sympathy with them as a matter of personal conviction rather than of administrative necessity.

D.C.R.

Subscription Rates

FREEDOM only (per year)
£1 10s. (\$4.50) surface mail
£2 16s. (\$8.00) airmail

ANARCHY only (per year)
£1 6s. (\$3.50) surface mail
£2 7s. (\$7.00) airmail
COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION

FREEDOM & ANARCHY (per year)
£2 10s. (\$7.50) surface mail both
£4 15s. (\$12.50) airmail both

U.S. - Two Letters in Search of a Movement

I WROTE the article 'Anarchism in North America Today' from what contacts I have made and the information I have collected. It is, I know, by no means complete nor correct in all its estimates and analyses. But no one else was apparently ready to light the fuse. I hope to stimulate replies from you. I am not prepared to act as a one man North American correspondence clearing house and information bureau but I can return acknowledgements, collect lists of names and addresses (is it all right if I list yours on a mimeograph list to be sent to other comrades, or not?) and turn it over to the group which is strong enough to undertake such a task (who volunteers?).

I hope that, out of the general interchange that may develop, correspondence will be supplemented by personal meetings and eventual regional and even continental conferences. Some of this may lead to one or more ad hoc committees, federations, and central service-exchange bureaux, a loose structure that might support some publishing activities for instance.

Incidentally my opinion on the proposed international conference is against an international federation of national federations. Since when are anarchists bound within the chains of 'their' nation states? In North America the ethnic national question is very confused. Even the very establishment, recent New Politics conference here made room for individual as well as group participation and voting. Would Anarchists do less?

But back to the main topic. If we are interested in anarchism, the radical analysis and revolutionary change of society toward anarchy, then we should want to see a movement with some content emerge to combat not just the present system and its war state but offer libertarian alternatives and public education in the general market-place of revolutionary activity. The centralist authoritarians among revolutionaries have walked off with the prize, that is the potentially free society, and counter-revolutionized it enough times.

At least one (indeed many) conscious and specifically anarchist, widely circulated periodical is needed here, as are bookshops, meeting-contact centres in the major cities, publishing centres and all which can give a general comradeship consciousness to all the scattered groups, communities, tendencies and isolated people; a fraternity in struggle and general mutual aid in activity. It's up to us.

Your fraternally,

ED STRAUSS.

R.D.2 Woodstock,
Vermont 05091

II

WHEN confronted for the first time with the history of Anarchism in America, the young activist is usually somewhat disturbed to realize that it tends to be an apocalyptic accretion to a series of blatant atrocities (and I use that word in the full sense of its meaning): the killing of the Anarchists after the Haymarket Affair, the newspaper campaigns of vilification against Johann Most, the manipulation of the McKinley Assassination by Teddy Roosevelt in order to create a Calvinist-Capitalist stereotype of Anarchists as diabolic entities (a stereotype which survives in healthy vigour and vulgarity throughout American society today), the brutal and illegal deportation of Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and scores of other Anarchist activists, and the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti, etc., etc.

Now, obviously, any social movement inflicted and paralyzed by such atrocities is in danger of producing a considerable psychological reaction: 'Social paranoia' (i.e., the creation of introverted, sado-masochistic communities of the

faithful who are primarily concerned with memories and moralism and quite definitely will not make any attempt to influence or change their larger socio-economic environment through direct action). Unfortunately, this is exactly what happened.

The trial of Sacco and Vanzetti provided the final mumbled bead of that rosary of apocalypse: many of the Anarchists were so horrified at this ultimate atrocity on the part of the State that they could not even bring themselves to continue the defence campaign. They resigned themselves to quietism. With the possible but pallid exceptions of Felicani, Hennacy, etc., the past few decades have not witnessed an activist Anarchist Movement of any importance in this country.

There is a slogan still muttered with slobbering regularity by Stalinists and Trotskyists in America: 'the Anarchists are the moralists of the Left'. I do not wish to deprecate the fact that Anarchism does provide a powerful perspective on moral issues in social action (which Trotskyism and Stalinism do not); but, even so, the historical sado-masochistic withdrawal from 'a programme of thoughtful action' (and an activist commitment to it) on the part of our antecedents (who were more interested in an intellectual ethical elitism) has created several serious problems for the American Anarchist Movement today: (1) a prevalent assumption (with many Anarchists) that Anarchists actually are the violent, diabolic entities of the Calvinist-

Capitalist stereotype and that, consequently, it is useless to be concerned with any positive aspects of libertarian theory... or any theory at all; (2) a prevalent assumption (with many Anarchists) that Anarchism is merely a doctrine of personalizing ethics and does not actually provide an alternative to the horrors of Capitalism and the State; and (3) a prevalent assumption (with many Anarchists) that, because (1) and (2) are true, there is no purpose in having a cohesive movement and no reason to support any libertarian publications.

These attitudes are not only suicidal and impractical, they are based only on illusions and stimulated only by the dead hand of the past. But, during the last year, these assumptions have come into open conflict with the unbridled activism of some of the younger Anarchists and have generally had a corroding influence: (1) I have met several wandering preachers of total violence, hatred, and nihilism who spend most of their time writing impassioned poetry about destruction, dragons, and drugs, and usually disappear when the people are in actualized revolt; (2) there have been at least half a dozen libertarian publications that have collapsed from lack of funds, lack of support, and lack of cohesion in the movement; and (3) the New York Federation of Anarchists, and several other important libertarian groups, have dissolved, it seems, into feuding, unproductive, unco-operative sects. (Why were there only two Anarchist groups listed in the recent

publication by the Central Committee of Correspondence of a mailing list of organizations opposing the war in Vietnam?) The movement is in danger of total disintegration.

The wholly negative quality of the American Anarchist Movement appears to be all the more unfortunate when we realize the extreme potential of revolutionary libertarian ideas in American society today: (1) there is a growing disgust and disillusionment among advocates of black liberation at the voter registration, civil rights legislation, and fake 'non-violent' methods of M. L. King, and the Blanquism and opportunism of Carmichael, Brown, and the Marxists; and (2) there is a growing commitment to resistance and direct action rather than mere dissent by those who oppose the war in Vietnam. The American Anarchist Movement, it appears, could be extraordinarily influential with its socialist, libertarian, direct action, and anti-war ideas... provided that it can overcome its nihilistic appearance and general disintegration.

I am convinced that something must be done. It would be futile, however, to propose another publication. It would be equally futile to confine ourselves to expediency and elitism. We must begin at the beginning. After discussing these problems with Anarchists in Minnesota, I have decided to convene a continental, libertarian, membership organization to be called Insurgency Anarchist Association. It will have three functions: (1) the formation of an adequate mailing list of Anar-

chists in North America; (2) the collection of funds to support a future Anarchist publication (something like FREEDOM) in America; and (3) the production and distribution of occasional pamphlets of interest to Anarchists in America.

Insurgency Anarchist Association will not initiate action nor pontificate on theory; it will not interfere in the life of any group or federation concerned with theory or action. Its only purpose will be to develop an extensive perspective toward the multiplication of Anarchist propaganda in America. It will exist as a service organization (membership being required to provide financial solvency and the involvement of isolated comrades). Participatory democracy and the federalation principle will be the basic guidelines. I shall act as secretary for one year. A Conference (and referendum) of the members will then decide the effectiveness and future of the organization. I am aware of certain disadvantages and dangers in this plan; however, I still believe that, with vigilance and solidarity, it is necessary.

I request that all Anarchists in North America write to me immediately for further information and/or dialogue.

Yours for the Revolution,

JAMES W. CAIN,
Secretary,
Insurgency Anarchist
Association,
323 Fourth Street,
Cloquet, Minnesota,
USA. 55720.

ANARCHISM IN NORTH AMERICA

WHERE IS ANARCHISM in North America? There seems to be a bit here and a bit there, and there does not seem to be much interest or caring of one bit about another. There is little fraternity, mutual aid or self-organizing beyond some isolated groups, no general co-operation or federative activity; at most a much broken web of contacts exists. There is apparently a growing interest in anarchism, especially in the New Left, as witnessed by a number of new books published on anarchism, a short-lived new magazine or two, new groups in several centres but there is no consciousness of a general movement.

It is over a decade now since *Resistance*, the last really creative periodical that bore the anarchist banner, folded. Lately *Views and Comments*, along with its originator, the Libertarian League, has gone the same way. There has recently been a 'Good Soup', some 'Rebel Workers', and even a short-lived anarchist sort-of-bookshop, the 'Torch', in New York. Groups appear and vanish regularly in the metropolitan centres. But there are somewhat stable groups still in existence.

PERIODICALS

There are several periodicals surviving from the heyday of 'foreign' language groups: *L'Adunata Dei Refrattari* (P.O. Box 316, Cooper Station, New York), the long-lived but still quite fresh Italian newspaper, *Die Arbeiter Stimme* (Room 808, 33 Union Square, New York 3, NY), a Yiddish language and introverted journal. There were once Finnish, Spanish and Russian periodicals. Here and there are still local groups of older people from these national traditions.

Among the current English language publications is the newsletter of the 'Seattle Group' (1815 18th Avenue, Seattle, Washington). From New York we have *Black Mask* (P.O. Box 512, Cooper Station, NY), put out by an activist group; *Comment* (P.O. Box 466, Peter Stuyvesant Station, NY), an occasional bulletin; and rumours of another magazine, *The Black Flag* (address same as *Comment*).

There are rumours of something new out of Chicago also. The Industrial Workers of the World (IWW, 2422 Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.) is still organizing anarcho-syndicalists and publishing monthly the wobbly *Industrial Worker*, which has recently shown some signs of freshening. Some claim *Manas* (P.O. Box 32112, El Sereno Station, Los Angeles, California) for the anarchist camp and there has recently appeared an occasional magazine of a group of intellectuals who have moved from the

old isolationist, libertarian right, to a new general libertarian position. *Left and Right* (Box 395, Cathedral Station, New York).

The School of Living, with its back-to-the-land, decentralist libertarianism, has a centre in Freeland, Maryland, and two publications, *A Way Out* and *The Green Revolution* (Jones' End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio). It has a fairly widespread group of sympathisers.

Finally, among those who would explicitly call themselves anarchists or libertarians, are recently formed groups or concentrations of comradeship individuals in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Seattle, Boston, Toronto, Montreal, Troy (NY), Hanover (NH), Ithaca (NY), Berkeley (Cal.), Cloquet (Minn.) and surely other places. There is one bookstore/book service, and sometimes publishing centre, Solidarity Bookshop at 1644 Meyer Ct., Chicago, Ill.

GROUPS

Among the radical pacifist groups is a consciousness and tendencies which would call themselves anarchist or so mightily fairly be designated. The War Resisters League (WRL, 5 Beekman Street, New York) is the oldest of these. The Committee for Non-Violent Action (CNVA, 5 Beekman Street, New York), which may soon unite with the WRL, publishes the excellent *WIN Peace and Freedom through Non-Violent Action*, which is, I would say, the best anarchoid publication here.

Both of these 'National' groups have a number of local affiliates. 'Liberation' (also 5 Beekman Street, NY) certainly

had anarchist foundations but many would say that many of those have slipped away. The 'Catholic Worker' (175 Christie Street, New York), even though some of the Spanish comrades have doubts, is both Catholic and anarchist (and militant!). Let me not conclude this list without mentioning Paul Goodman who is currently the most famous, but some would say too practical, anarchist personality.

The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS, Room 206, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill.), a national service organization and a federation of 250 local groups with 30-40 thousand members, has a large and at least a vocally conscious anarchist tendency (happily not a caucus). The SDS itself is based on decentralist, anti-elitist, direct action (participatory democracy), and personalist concepts. It is very broad, also including numerous types of Liberals, Social Democrats, Marxists and general Radicals.

THE HIPPIES

The hippy phenomenon (soon to be re-named or no-named as *Time Magazine* has already co-opted and commercialized the image) presents a sort of multi-hued anarchy, a mixture of individualist and communist schools, all rather consciously inarticulate. This can be as important as much formal anarchism which tends to be political, economic criticism. Hippysm is a kind of social, moral-cultural criticism in action.

There are also several Summerhillian schools and a growing interest in free (free of the state or church) education. The Summerhill Society is at 5 Beekman Street, New York.

Libertarian, Marxist-Humanist, Anarcho-Marxist and Bakuninist ideas in various permutations are found among

several smaller, neo-Trotskyist groups such as 'Facing Reality-Speak Out' (14131 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan), and 'News and Letters' (415 Brainard, Detroit, Michigan). Direct actionism, anti-parliamentarianism and even a certain rebelliousness against 'democratic' centralism is found among Muscovite, Pekinese or Havana CP or Trotskyist-derived groups. In some way the old battles of the First Internationale are being refought. Not a little anarchist recruiting has been done from such groups as these last ones.

BLACK POWER

Within the Black Freedom-Black Power movement are also heavy strains of direct actionism, resistance (violent and otherwise), anti-elitism, all of which are a kind of Fanon-Bakunin re-birth-through-fire phenomenon. Interests in group autonomy, community self-control are mixed with nationalism and even racism. But the whole situation is very confused and supporting blacks against oppression doesn't depend upon their anarchist purity.

Out of the Anti-Vietnam War movement are emerging resistance activities directed against the draft (conscription), tax paying and other forms of anti-statism. These very actions are self-educating and raise much broader questions of the role of the state, legalist politics, etc., in the minds of people new to any kind of social consciousness.

It is among the first-mentioned, more specifically anarchist, publications, groups, tendencies in broader organizations, and scattered individuals (and individualists) that there exists anarchism and even, if still vague, a kind of theoretical-activist movement in North America.

ED STRAUSS.



October 1917—NO REVOLUTION AT ALL

This is the fiftieth anniversary of the 'Great October Socialist Revolution', which did not happen in October, and was not great or socialist or a revolution. On November 7 (October 25 in the old Julian calendar still used in Russia), 1917, the Bolsheviks began the counter-revolution by seizing power in Petrograd (then the capital, formerly called St. Petersburg, now Leningrad). How did this happen, and what was the result?

IN MARCH 1917, the February Revolution took place in Petrograd. Mass demonstrations on March 8 were followed by a general strike on March 10 and the fraternisation of the garrison with the demonstrators on March 12. The Tsar abdicated on March 15, and a Provisional Government was set up by the bourgeois politicians to stop things going any further.

The February Revolution was popular in both senses; it was made by the people of Petrograd, and it was welcomed by the people of Russia. The left-wing parties—Social-Revolutionaries (peasant socialists) and Social-Democrats, split between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks (moderate and extreme Marxist socialists)—and the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists not only did not begin the Revolution but were surprised when it happened.

The February Revolution was also libertarian. The important point was the destruction of the old regime rather than the establishment of a new one. Even before the bourgeois politicians had set up the Provisional Government, the workers and soldiers of Petrograd set up their own Council (Soviet, in Russian), and this example was followed all over Russia. The Provisional Government had official power, but it could do nothing without the Soviets.

Things went further. During the February Revolution, police stations were burnt and prisons were opened, and immediately after it a social revolution began, just as it had been described by anarchist writers for half a century. While the politicians quarrelled about what to do, the people did it. The factories were seized by the workers, and put either under the supervision or into the control of workers' committees. The land was seized by the peasants, and either divided among individual proprietors or put into the control of peasant communes. Production, distribution and exchange were in many places taken out of private hands, and put into the control of co-operatives. The army, which was mostly composed of peasant conscripts, was deserted by the soldiers, who carried out the greatest mutiny in history and returned to their homes and the revolution.

The liberals who led the Provisional Government did their best to prevent this revolution. Most of the left-wing parties supported the Provisional Government, even though they obstructed it through the Soviets, and therefore helped to obstruct the social revolution as well. The anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists hoped that the Provisional Government would go the way of the Tsarist regime, and in the meantime they worked for the social revolution. So did some left-wing Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and, after a time, the Bolsheviks.

LENIN'S RETURN

The Bolsheviks had supported the Provisional Government at first. But when their leader, Lenin, returned to Russia in April 1917, he quickly convinced them that the replacement of the Tsarist regime by the Provisional Government should be followed by the replacement of this bourgeois regime by the dictatorship of the proletariat—and not after a long interval, as in orthodox Marxist theory, but at once. In practice, this dictatorship of the proletariat would of course be the dictatorship of the Bolsheviks, though it was to be exercised through the spontaneous organs of the proletariat, the Soviets. The Soviets were dominated by the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks were not strong enough to seize power yet. They therefore prepared at the same time to win over the Soviets and to take over the state.

The Bolsheviks therefore adopted demagogic policies in order to gain the popularity which would enable them to win majorities in the Soviets and to obtain acquiescence in their seizure of power. They supported the workers who took over the factories and the peasants who took over the land; they supported the soldiers who took over their units or deserted the front; they supported the whole social revolution. These policies brought them close to the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists, as well as the Left Social-Revolutionaries, but the difference was that they supported the social revolution not as the last step but as a step on the path to political revolution.

One of the main reasons for the growing popularity of the Bolsheviks was their opposition to the war. Because of this the German government had given them money, and had also helped Lenin and other leaders cross Germany to Russia. It was the Provisional Government's attempt to continue the war which sealed its fate. In July an unsuccessful offensive on the German front led to an unsuccessful left-wing rising in Petrograd; the time was not yet ripe.

In September an unsuccessful right-wing *putsch* by General Kornilov led to a left-wing reaction, and the Bolsheviks won majorities in the Petrograd Soviet and then in other key Soviets. In October Trotsky became the chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, and a Military Revolutionary Committee of the Soviet was set up under him—and therefore in the control of the Bolsheviks.

In November the Bolsheviks decided that the time was ripe, and on November 7 the Military Revolutionary Committee overthrew the Provisional Government in Petrograd. This was not

COMMUNISTS CRUSH OPPOSITION

Once the Communists (as the Bolsheviks now called themselves) had got power, they crushed every other political organisation in Russia. They began with the Liberals and Right Social-Revolutionaries, and continued with the Mensheviks and Left Social-Revolutionaries. At the same time, the state, which had been taken over by the Communists, took over the economy. Workers' committees were forced into the trade unions, and the trade unions were subordinated to the state. Peasant communes were subverted by poor peasants' committees, and the poor peasants' committees were subordinated to the state. The Imperial Army was replaced by the Red Army. The *Okhrana* was replaced by the *Cheka*.

The Constituent Assembly, which had been intended to settle the political future of the country, was the result of the first (and last) more or less free election in Russian history, but when it met in January 1918 it was forcibly dispersed by the government. The reason was simple. The Bolsheviks had received only a quarter of the votes, and a clear majority had been won by the Social-Revolutionaries. No wonder that in the Civil War of 1918-1920 the Communists were fought not only by foreign interventionists and reactionary 'whites', but by liberals, socialists and anarchists as well.

The anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists, who had taken an active part in the social revolution of 1917, were the first group on the extreme left to be destroyed by the Communists, beginning when their Moscow headquarters was attacked by the *Cheka* in April 1918. When the anarchist army of Nestor Makhno finally defeated the Whites in the Ukraine in November 1920, it was immediately attacked by the Red Army under Trotsky's direct command, and the libertarian republic which had been established under Makhno's protection was wiped out.

Peter Kropotkin, who had returned to



Petrograd in the Early Days

PURGES

But appetite grows with eating, and in the absence of any other victims the Communists began to persecute Communists. First the leaders turned against dissident groups in the Party, such as the Workers' Opposition and the Democratic Centralists. Then, after Lenin died in 1924, the leaders turned against each other. Stalin, Kamenev and Zinoviev drove out Trotsky; Stalin, Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy drove out Kamenev and Zinoviev; Stalin drove out Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy; then there was one.

When Stalin became supreme, in 1929, the Communist tyranny became worse than the Tsarist tyranny. The five-year plans meant the forcible industrialisation of the Russian economy, and the forcible collectivisation of Russian agriculture. No one knows how many people died in this process, but they are counted in millions.

The Communists set up labour camps, concentration camps and even death camps in Russia before the Nazis in Germany. The first known death camp, at Kholmogor near Archangel, began in 1921—under Lenin. (It was pointing this out that first got Mihajlo Mihajlov into trouble in Yugoslavia in 1965.) During the 1930s, the Moscow Trials disposed of most of the Communist leaders still living in Russia who had taken part in the Revolution, and the accompanying purges kept the camps full. No one knows how many were imprisoned, but they too are counted in millions—and thousands of them, like Lara in *Doctor Zhivago*, 'died or vanished somewhere, forgotten, as a nameless number on a list which was later lost'.

The Communists talked a lot about the threat of Fascism, but they betrayed the socialists and anarchists who fought Fascism in Spain, and in August 1939 Stalin actually made an alliance with Hitler. At the beginning of the last War, Russia helped Germany to conquer Poland, went on to conquer Bessarabia, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and tried to conquer Finland. At the end of the War, when Germany was defeated as a result of attacking Russia, Russia took the rest of Poland, half of Germany and Austria, and the whole of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Lenin had called imperialism the last stage of capitalism, but 20 years after his death the greatest imperialist power in the world was Communist Russia. In 1949 Russia became the second country to make and test the Bomb.

Everyone knows that things are better since Stalin died in 1953—but how much better are they really? The Russian empire is a bit smaller than it was, and so is the Russian army, but Russia is still the second military power in the world. Russian soldiers smashed the East

German rising in June 1953 and the Hungarian rising in November 1956, and they would do the same again if the need arose. Communists support disarmament by the West, but Russia still has the Bomb—the 'Workers' Bomb'—and exploded the biggest one ever in October 1961. Russia is one of the few countries which has universal conscription (with no provision for conscientious objectors).

The Communist Party is still the only political organisation allowed in Russia, as in all Communist countries—including Yugoslavia. There are still no free elections, and the Soviets still have no power. There are still no free trade unions, and in the workers' paradise strikes are illegal. The peasants are still serfs, for they are tied to the land and may not leave their farms or villages without official permission. All Russians must carry identity papers, and may not leave the country without official permission. There is still strict censorship, and nothing may be printed without official permission. Writers who defy the censorship are at best ostracised (like Pasternak) or exiled (like Tarsis), at worst put in lunatic asylums (like Yesenin-Volpin) or labour camps (like Sinyavski and Daniel).

WHAT WE NEED TO TELL PEOPLE

Russia is one of the greatest countries in the world, but also one of the greatest tyrannies. When we are asked to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution let us remember that it destroyed one tyranny only to put another in its place, and let us remember the revolution which tried to destroy tyranny altogether. Let us celebrate the fiftieth anniversary not of the successful *coup d'état* of the Russian Communists, but of the unsuccessful social revolution of the Russian people. And let us look forward to the day when we can celebrate a successful social revolution in Russia.

In the meantime let us learn the necessary lessons from what happened in Russia 50 years ago. We don't need to tell anyone about Stalin any more, since his own friends have already told everyone. But we still need to tell people about Trotsky, who gave the orders for the Bolshevik *coup d'état* and later gave the orders for the attacks on Makhno and on Kronstadt. And we also need to tell people about Lenin, who lied to the Russian people and established the Bolshevik dictatorship, censorship, *Cheka*, death camps and all. And we need to tell people about the Communists, who in Russia and every other country have done what Bakunin said they would do a century ago—worked for a revolution which would (and could) only lead to their own dictatorship, a revolution which was no revolution at all.

N.W.

BETRAYERS OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION



Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Molotov, Bukharin and Beria

great—it was a petty battle for power. It was not socialist—the Soviets exercised no more power than before, and they soon exercised less; the socialist decrees which the Bolsheviks issued after seizing power simply confirmed the social revolution which had already taken place, and they were soon changed. And it was not a revolution—the new government, the Council of People's Commissars, which was set up on November 8, was entirely composed of Bolsheviks, and soon this one-party government became a one-party dictatorship; it was a counter-revolution.

When the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks left the Soviet Congress in protest against the Bolshevik *coup d'état* they were consigned to 'the dustbin of history' by Trotsky (who later joined them there). Many anarchists had believed that the Bolsheviks were sincere when they opposed the Provisional Government in the name of the social revolution, some had helped them overthrow the Provisional Government, and a few went on trusting them to the bitter end. But Kropotkin, who had been so wrong about the war, was right about what happened on November 7. 'This buries the revolution,' he said. And it did.

Russia after 40 years of exile to support the Revolution, died under virtual house arrest in February 1921; his funeral in Moscow marked the last anarchist demonstration in Russia. Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, who had been deported from the United States for their revolutionary activity in December 1919, had to leave their native land for the same reason in December 1921. Some anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists were released from prison at the insistence of foreign trade unionists, but they were the lucky ones. The survivors of the once great Russian anarchist movement died in exile, or disappeared in the great purges of the 1930s.

The final victory of the Communists was celebrated in March 1921, when the Kronstadt rising was drowned in blood by the Red Army under Trotsky's direct command. The Kronstadt rebels had called for power to be restored to the Soviets, for land to be restored to the peasants, for factories to be restored to the workers, for the political prisoners to be released, for freedom of speech and assembly—for socialism. After Kronstadt there was no excuse for not knowing what Communism meant. After Kronstadt there was no challenge to the Communist regime.

FREEDOM IS NOT A GIFT FROM CAPTAIN FINK

THE HIPPIES have become victims of their own ideology. In their rejection of the grand spectacle — Hollywood/Madison Avenue/America — they have accepted a spectacle no less destructive, one which substitutes synthetic play for real life, while at the same time they have become tools of those against whom they have supposedly rebelled. They have been added to the rostrum of 'stars' who entertain the corpse of the bourgeoisie, a corpse which seeks to remake the world in its own image.

Baby, you haven't dropped out—you've been forced out because this goddamn system is rotten. But what they will never allow is for us to remake our lives, because that will signal their end: they must instead attempt to either recoup

our revolt by making it into a spectacle which reaffirms their vitality while it drains ours or they will seek to crush us. And we must fight either. The one by refusing to 'play their games' while real life is denied, the other by open struggle. 'If they want to play Nazis, we ain't going to play Jews.' And so our struggle crosses that of the blacks and together we can tear this shit down.

The American Indian was forced onto reservations (concentration camps); he did not retire there to smoke and groove. Life cannot be limited to a 'reserve' specified by those who seek to control us. We must decide where and when we will live, play or die, otherwise our freedom is a lie.

New York

BLACK MASK.

COMMISSARS versus YOGIS

ALL KNOWN or recorded history reveals that most countries have enjoyed periods of relative sanity, meaningful construction and true progress. They have also suffered terrible interludes of national insanity, sustained destruction and evolutionary regression. China is presently undergoing an extreme psychosis which, perhaps as a desperate psychological reaction against the serene stability of a proud tradition which embraces Taoism, Confucianism and Zen Buddhism, presently manifests itself in compulsive hatred and mindless violence.

The prevailing *Red Guard* generation is utterly conditioned, brainwashed from the cradle, and its individual representatives seem more machine-like than human. They function as computerised robots, trained animals, walking dead. The current Chinese Communist (or fascist, it gets increasingly difficult to differentiate) regime, directed by the wicked, stupid, albeit cunning, Mad Mao, is highly skilled in advanced indoctrination techniques. Nevertheless, occupied Tibet is peopled by a hardy peasant race whose inherent strength of character, deep religious conviction and superior philosophy has protected them from proposed mental annihilation and Chinese thought control.

Simple survival in harsh climatic conditions has helped develop Tibetan powers of physical endurance, and the high altitude, combined with various psycho-experimental practices or disciplines, serves to awaken latent intuitive spiritual faculties. Before the initial introduction, and subsequent adoption, of Buddhism, the Tibetan people were a savage and warlike race practising the primitive, sacrificial, Shamanistic Bon Po religion. This cult's ceremonial rites plumbed the very depths of human cruelty and degradation. Buddhism, over succeeding generations, transformed these bloodthirsty creatures into a gentle, kindly and peaceable people.

After the initial slaughter and suppression, China put into effect a continuous propagandist onslaught, intended to undermine and subvert the Tibetan religious and philosophical persuasion. Mao's little red book, however, hardly merits serious consideration from a people weaned on the *Bardo Thodol* and esoteric tantric yoga. The notorious fragmented thoughts met stronger competition and a tough critical evaluation.

China's hoodlum herds have now fallen back on crude force and cruel religious suppression. Ancient monasteries are destroyed, books burned and irreplaceable works of art mutilated. Lamas abused, persecuted and slain. Buddhist practices are banned, personal

ownership is treated as criminal and connections with cultural traditions forbidden. The peasants' waist-long hair is forcibly shorn until it resembles the currently-favoured puritanical *Red Guard* crop. They are forced to wear drab Chinese clothes and make a pretence of reading that notorious public evidence of Mao's undoubted mental confusion and intellectual bankruptcy.

An eminent scholar and thinker, Lama Anagarika Govinda, made pertinent observations in his recent autobiography. It is a statement displaying unusual insight into a complex situation, commendable profundity and the authority of personal knowledge and familiarity of the matter under discussion. 'We witness the tragedy of a peaceful people without political ambitions and with the sole desire to be left alone, being deprived of its freedom and trampled underfoot by a powerful neighbour in the name of "progress" which as ever must serve as a cover for all the brutalities of the human race. . . . Tibet has been overrun more than once by hostile powers and has gone through worse calamities than the present one. . . . But the Tibetans never bowed to any conqueror or to any tyrant. When the hordes of Genghis Khan drowned half the world in blood and Mongols overran the mighty Chinese empire and threatened to conquer Tibet, it was the spiritual superiority of Tibet that saved their independence, by converting Kublai Khan and his people to Buddhism and transforming this warlike race into a peaceful nation. Nobody has yet entered Tibet without falling under its spell, and who knows whether the Chinese themselves, instead of converting the Tibetans to Communism, may yet be subtly transformed in their ideas like the Mongolian hordes of yore.'

One can but hope that Govinda's hopes and aspirations are fully realized. If China emerges from its present nervous breakdown utterly and irrevocably mad, we are perhaps all destined to suffer the unspeakable consequences. Alternatively, China could grow more sane and a fluid, anarchistic philosophy, as held by the more profoundly practical Tibetan tantric yogic schools or teachings, could help it do just that. However faint such a possibility may be, it is surely time Chairman Mao revised, rewrote or condemned his disastrous, comic but dangerous little blood-red book.

DAVE CUNLIFFE.

**The Way Of The White Clouds* by Lama Anagarika Govinda. Hutchinson, 1966.

'Some of the students wanted to show Peter Watkins' films Culloden and The War Game, but when this was referred (for acceptance) to the Principal he refused.'

—Dudley College Student
Libertarian Teacher.

FEW READERS OF FREEDOM will be surprised to know that the above quote is from a brave woman student in a teachers' training college—officially called 'College of Education', though 'Mis-Education' would be more apt. Brave woman 'cause she belongs to The Left Society and actually believes in the right to organize what clubs and societies are requested—and a political one at that! The College is Dudley, where the castle stands overlooking the town and the Zoo attracts the caged-animal lovers.

Colleges of Education have few political or social groups, or societies, though such organizations as International Voluntary Service and Simon Community seem to be springing up. The general atmosphere, having visited about a dozen in the past months, is one of a super boarding school where the mass of residents sit bored-to-pettiness and where the relationship of most staff and students is still that of officers and men as in the army or police force; though more gentle and therefore more difficult to overthrow.

Another difference from University life is the almost sterile intellectual atmosphere. Although few university societies show much awareness of our Society, without-the-walls, at least they do have multi-numbered groups organized by and responsible to fellow students. Yet all the professional Educationalists must be aware of the immature and irresponsible climate of so many colleges for drilling future teachers. A major cause must be the extremely narrow background and withered experience of our child-minders and child-guiders, who go from sixth form debating into a study of child psychology into a classroom as a certified teacher: more-the-worse for their authority without having experienced much but school—college—school atmospheres.

I have only visited schools and colleges; not been longer than one week in any school, three days in a college; and I see everything with fresh eyes: the ugly regimental classrooms; the clouded classrooms and dull, glazed tutorial-faces staring at well-disciplined children. I want to throw open the doors and windows, push back the chairs and dance—but is this a fit way to inform and conform our future citizens? No. Seemingly everything conspires to reduce any relationship or experience into a recognizable lifeless act: co-ordinated, emotionless and rigid: rounded and moulded to standard values of undisturbing non-provocative movement:

EDUCATION MANUFACTURERS

sounds and ideas. The spontaneous and creative; the anarchic and loving; the non-violent and gentle: all, all suspect and not amenable to examination syllabus, in the main.

So all I attempted was reading poems like the *Magic Roundabout*, written after watching Florence and Dougal and Zebadee; *Song About Mary* by Adrian Mitchell, the only poem that individual children asked to be allowed to read themselves, with verses like: *For if Jesus came to Britain / He would turn its dizzy head / You'd see him arrested at the next sitdown / And he'd raise the poor from the dead. / So if you have a little baby / Make sure it's a legitimate child / Bind down his limbs with insurance / And he'll grow up meek and mild . . . meek and mild . . . meek and mild . . .* And a variety of poems by children and/or poets like e. e. cummings—*May I Feel Said He, I Sing of Olaf, A Politician*, etc.—Lawrence Ferlinghetti's *Underwear and Come Lie With Me And Be My Love*; Walter Raleigh's *The Lie and On Gambling At Cards And Dice*; Peter Porter's *Your Attention Please and Made In Heaven* . . . songs included Pete Seeger's music to the Welsh poem *Bells of Rhymney*, Bob Dylan's *Desolation Row* and *Chimes Of Freedom*; Ewan McColl's *Shoals Of Herring, Travelling People and First Time Ever I Saw Your Face. We Shall Overcome and If You're White It's Alright, If You're Brown Stick Around But . . . If You're Black Git Back Git Back Git Back*.

I've been in every sort of school bar the free and progressive (there aren't many) and although most are prisoners of souls and minds, a few, from public to grammar school, allow and encourage spontaneity and responsibility; are delighted to find groups like ours² and eager to find ways to bring live poems and songs into our educational establishments.

However the initiative is with us. If we have the insanity to travel the county and country reading poems—without Arts Council Grant or Ministry of Education cushioning—we shall find some individuals within this existing state system willing to allow creative people of every sort into their institutions of decaying vitality, stagnant morale and blatantly bourgeois and superficial values.

The worst and most sickening effect

of our present lecturers in Educational Establishments is their very personal values they bring to their students. By their posture of non-controversial manners and acceptable opinions—particularly religious and political—they convey the impression of impartiality, or a non-political, uncommitted stance. But this is bringing their personal values into teaching, just as every teacher is bound to do. Far better they be biased for some idea and belief than committed to the very trivial and sterile doctrine of ideas and commitments often created by their authoritarian college lecturers and their respective families.

If poets are 'killed' by their poems being used for literary criticism, they are also reduced to lifeless exam status by the very values and approaches used by many English lecturers. For what Henry David Thoreau said about philosophy³ is true of Literature and Education.

As well as reading in schools and colleges we make a deliberate effort to get into even more closed establishments like hospitals and prisons: approved schools and remand homes; and various places like folk clubs and universities, pubs and youth clubs; cafes and theatres. All these societies are in various ways part of our stubborn, autocratic and authoritarian Society: a require breaking down; shaking-up and subverting with ideas and ideals: myths and utopias: educators and entertainers, anarchists and non-violent revolutionaries.

Beyond such establishments we are eager to read and sing in open places and to public audiences (we have done several readings to various peace and freedom groups) so should any reader want to know more, or to book *Whisper and Shout*, please write. There is no set fee, only travelling expenses or just a meal if it's for raising money (We also put on jazz and poetry readings and poetry/besides 'poets reading') We be pleased to travel and visit/enter you.

DENNIS GOUL.

¹See Paul Goodman's *Compulsory Education* and A. S. Neil's *Summer* and Michael Duane's articles.

²*The Whisper and Shout*—c/o 56 Jackson Avenue, Mickleover, Derby.

³There are nowadays professors of philosophy, but not philosophers.' H. D. Thoreau—'Walden'.

The Pope and Deadly Anarchy

ON APRIL 6, 1951, Pope Pius XII reminded delegates to a World Government Congress of what 'catholic freedom' (!!!) meant. 'Individual liberty,' said His Holiness, 'in reality is only a deadly anarchy.' It is clear that those of us who favour this deadly anarchy must oppose the Roman Catholic Church. Yet, incredible though it seems, there are members of that institution who claim to be anarchists. I want to show that they must choose between one and the other.

The Vatican has been saying for centuries that it has the truth, and that error has no rights against truth. 'Truth alone should fill the minds of men', and the Church is 'the greatest and most reliable teacher of mankind', so it follows that 'there is no reason why genuine liberty should grow indignant at having to bear the just and necessary restraint of laws by which, in the judgement of the Church and of reason itself, human teaching has to be controlled' (Leo XIII, *Libertas Praest*).

Every Pope, past, present and no doubt future, favours censorship. 'The unrestrained freedom of thinking and of openly making known one's thoughts is not inherent in the rights of the citizen' (*Immortale Dei*). Furthermore, it is 'quite unlawful to demand, defend, or grant unconditional freedom of thought, speech, writing or worship as if these were so many rights given by nature to

man. . . . It always remains true that the liberty which is claimed for all to do all things is not, as we have often said, of itself desirable, as such, as it is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights' (*Sapientiae Cristianae*). 'The experience of every age teaches, and even remotest antiquity clearly demonstrates, that the cities which most flourished in opulence and glory came to ruin from this cause only: that is, from immoderate liberty of thought, licence of meeting, and the mania of novelty' (*Bull. Mirari, Gregory XVI*).

Gregory goes on, 'All liberty is a delirium and a pestilence. There is no healthy man's delirium, all delirium is that of a sick man. There is no praiseworthy and harmless plague; every plague is deadly. . . . Hence it is never a decent thing to introduce liberty into a civil community. It is only permissible to tolerate it in certain circumstances in the same way a pest is tolerated.'

Any nonsense about a Catholic being able to choose for himself which papal pronouncements to obey is out. 'In defining the limits of obedience owed to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, it must not be supposed that it is only to be yielded in relation to dogma. . . . Catholics must allow themselves to be ruled and directed by the leadership of bishops, and above all, of the Apostolic See. As regards opinion, whatever the Roman Pontiffs have hitherto taught, or shall hereafter teach, must be held with a firm grasp of mind, and, so often as occasion requires, must be openly professed' (*Encyclical, Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens, Leo XIII*).

The extent to which the Church puts its ideas into practice depends upon its relative power in a particular time and place. The ideal, of course, is the totally Catholic country. Where this is not possible, the Catholic must sometimes

say one thing and mean another. Lying is a sin. However, the Church in its wisdom has provided—mental reservation, or typical Catholic dishonesty.

This is what Catholic theology calls *Restrictio Mentalis*. It falls into two categories: (a) equivocation, and (b) mental reservation proper. The best textbook on the subject is *Moral Theology* by Alphonsus Liguori, canonised in 1835, etc., are little more than extracts from it. Pope after Pope has quoted Saint Alphonsus. Here are some examples which the saint gives of the legitimate use of equivocation or double-speak:

(1) When words have a double sense; for instance, 'Volo' signifies to wish, and also to fly.

(2) When an expression has a double meaning, e.g. 'This is Peter's book' can signify that Peter is either the owner or the author of the book.

(3) When words have a double meaning, one more and one less common.

A good example of mental reservation proper occurred in Italy under Mussolini. The official Catholic Party was dissolved on the orders of the Vatican, and its members 'advised' to join the Fascists. But this meant taking an oath of allegiance to Mussolini, which could be taken to place him above the Pope. Pius XI solved this by telling his subjects to add the silent reservation 'excepting the laws of God and His Church'. The whole theory of *Restrictio Mentalis* was summed up by St. Alphonsus—'Although it is not lawful to lie, or to deign what is not; however it is lawful to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words, or other ambiguous and doubtful sign'.

Mental reservation is used mainly in countries where Catholicism is not the dominant force. There are some countries, however, where the Church can say more clearly what it means. One example is Spain, where all schools are

controlled by the hierarchy. Children are taught 'a brief and simple explanation of the Catholic Catechism'. Here are some of the questions and answers:

Q.—What of Communism, Socialism, Modern Democracy, Anarchism and the like sects?

A.—They are contrary to Catholic faith, to justice, and to all virtue, and as such condemned by the Church.

Q.—Do not they say that they want to root out from the world the abuses of the rich and to regenerate society?

A.—They say so; but their doctrines and their works prove the contrary.

Q.—To what do they pertain?

A.—To Luther and other arch-heretics who, with the pretence of reforming the Church, teach and practise all kinds of vices.

It isn't just Anarchism and 'like sects' which are contrary to Catholic faith. The catechism deals very extensively with liberalism.

Q.—What are liberal principles?

A.—Those of 1789; so-called national sovereignty, freedom of religious cults, freedom of the press, freedom of instruction, etc.

Q.—What consequences result from these?

A.—Secular schools, impious and immodest periodicals, civil marriage, heretical churches in Catholic countries, abolition of ecclesiastical immunities, etc.

Q.—What does the Church teach about these?

A.—That they are most disastrous and anti-Christian.

Q.—What more?

A.—That they never can be accepted as good, and may be tolerated only for as long and in so far as they cannot be opposed without creating a worse evil.

Q.—Then there is no grade of Liberalism that can be good?

A.—None; because Liberalism is mortal

sin and anti-Christian in essence.

Q.—Then whoever is Liberal in politics sins?

A.—Certainly. Liberal politics are condemned by the Church.

Q.—And if by 'Liberal' is understood something not condemned by the Pope?

A.—Then he sins in calling himself Liberal knowing the Pope condemns Liberalism. . . .

After that lot, Catholics can protest their innocence till they are blue in the face. Any institution which even lends itself to such interpretations is the sworn enemy of freedom. I know the present Pope is making gestures of reform, but he is probably practising *restrictio mentalis*, or *coitus interruptus*, or something. As any Catholic will proudly tell you, it's the same Church through the centuries. The Catholic Church is founded in obedience. Liberty is founded in disobedience. 'Union of minds requires not only a perfect accord in one faith, but complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff as to God Himself' (*Sapientiae Cristianae*).

So what becomes of that mythical creature, the Catholic Libertarian?

Three possibilities. (1) If he's a Catholic, he's not a Libertarian. (2) If he's a Libertarian, he's not a Catholic. (3) If he gives the impression of being both, then he is a hypocrite, and his commitment to one is pretence.

Roll on the day when we dance amongst the smouldering ashes of the Vatican!

DAVE COULL.

WE GO TO PRESS ON MONDAY.
LATEST DATE FOR RECEIPT OF
MSS., LETTERS, MEETING NOTICES
IS THE MONDAY IN EACH WEEK
OF PUBLICATION.

**Catholics! Cancel
your Subscription
here!**

THE PRESS

BOTH THE HEAVY SUNDAYS

Offered us an analysis last week of the 'Red Plot To Destroy The Economy' announced by the workers' friend Ray Gunter:

'There is now little doubt that the Communist Party are plotting to make this a winter of disruption. They now, unhappily for the well-being of the nation, have entered into an unholy alliance with elements of the Trotskyist Party. Their aim, to destroy our hopes of economic recovery and thereby they hope to bring ruin to the Social Democratic Movement.'

This somewhat fanciful claim received little support from the *Sunday Times*. After noting the obvious fact that Communists and Trotskyists are active in unofficial strikes, sometimes working together, the paper said:

'But there is no evidence that the Communist Party is co-ordinating their activities, and none for the "unholy alliance" either.'

But 'evidence' the *Observer* managed to find:

1. A meeting of the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trades Unions last December was attended by a number of Communists and no fewer than one member of the International Socialism Group.
2. Another member of the group 'closely associated with Mr. Lewis and Mr. Hiles in the Barbican dispute' was named in the militants' journal *Rank and File* as the man in the London area to whom letters should be sent. 'Communists,' said the *Observer*, 'are active in its publication.'
3. Yet a third IS supporter (Paul Foot) wrote *The Anti-Cameron Report* circulated by *Rank and File*.
4. A fourth—an LSE student—was arrested at the Barbican.
5. Posters were displayed at the LSE inviting students to join picketing. Plotting on an impressive scale!

After marshalling its evidence, the *Observer* delivered its judgement:

'What is not clear is how closely the efforts of the Communist-Trotskyist liaison are directed from party headquarters in King Street, London, and how far they are produced by a local community of interests.' Which means: we can't prove it but we'll say it anyway.

Having been ordered by their news editor to prove Gunter right, the two *Observer* reporters credited with the story were only able to come up with the obvious—that Communists and Trotskyists are active in unofficial strikes, sometimes working together.

This failure to find the two Reds locked in an embrace under the Bed—with one on top of the other—didn't stop the *Observer* sub-editors from producing the headline 'Trotskyists and the Party agree to bury hatchet'.

Perhaps it's as well that Stuart Christie's story appeared in the *People* and not in the 'liberal', 'responsible' *Observer*—we'd have probably been told that Stuart was the pawn of an international conspiracy organised by Beaverbrook newspapers and the Vatican.

Telegraph reporters are having a bad time. First London Airport: last Sunday Genocide Square. Let the man tell his own story:

'Unfortunately, everybody was regarded as "the enemy" by the police. After being asked to join "my friends" on the other side of the police cordon, I produced my Press card, issued by Scotland Yard, and pointed out that I was there as a reporter.'

'This did not appear to satisfy the constable concerned. As I tried to explain that I was not in the way, another constable took a running leap and pushed me in the back with both fists, shouting "Do as you're told, and get out of the way!"'

John Grigg writes Lendennis in the *Observer* and has a weekly column in the *Guardian*. He is very funny.

Ten days ago he did a piece on Heath which included the following sentences:

'In politics, integrity must always be a relative term. No successful politician can be entirely frank with the people all of the time.'

But it gets better: 'An honest politician is one who hoodwinks the people only when he has to, and for their own good.'

If you're stuck next week Mr. Grigg you could try:

'A pacifist soldier is one who kills people only when he has to and for their own good.'

WYNFORD HICKS.

BECAUSE SOCIETY has submitted itself to the rule of law, that which is made legal is presumed to be approved by society. However, the State often makes legal anti-social institutions (organised murder, for instance); or it makes illegal perfectly harmless activities (the laws against witchcraft were repealed in England exactly 21 years ago). The difficulty is often found that some forms of behaviour have for one reason or another been made illegal; it has then been found that treating them as illegal is harmful, but that making them legal would seem to be condoning them.

In English law, suicide was until recently a crime. This did not make sense to many foreigners (some of whom assumed that, as the English were so law-abiding, the mere fact of making suicide a crime prevented them from committing suicide). In practice, of course, only attempted suicide was punished (though for years the State had practised ritual punishment on the corpse and confiscated property, or vitiated insurance policies). It took many years to persuade our legislators that it was pointless to persecute those driven to suicide. In this case it was not, however, assumed that those who wished to abolish the law were actively advocating suicide.

In the case of laws against sexual offences, this allegation has always been

made. Because of this, politicians have been reluctant to tackle the laws against homosexuality until recently. Now, on a line with Continental practice, the association of consenting males is not illegal, over a certain age. It hardly needs reiterating that although in this sense it is therefore legal, neither the State, nor the majority of people in society, have made any decision as to its desirability. Certainly the medical profession have proved that homosexuality and other sexual offences, ranging from non-punishable masturbation to still-criminal incest, between consenting parties, have no dire medical consequences such as the Victorians believed and threatened the young with.

In the case of abortion, nobody for one moment believes it is desirable; what is advocated is not, I understand, abortion itself, but the abolition of the conditions in which illegal abortions are performed by enabling them to be performed legally.

Laws do not give freedom; they only circumscribe its boundaries. When we hear, as Anarchists, the plea 'Legalise Pot'—now so favoured in certain quarters—we know that any Act of Parliament will merely be a means for controlling the sale of drugs in the same way as alcohol and nicotine is controlled and made profitable. While this can hardly interest us, we must of

course accept that we are for the abolition of the restrictions upon drugs of all kinds, quite as much as upon anything else, and we are for freedom of choice of the individual. Having said that, we do not have to go on to advocate that which is at present illegal.

Is the smoking of drugs harmful or not? This seems to be a major question for the present generation. Granted that the present hypocritical laws must go, should we fight against hopheadism or accept that it is harmless? Anarchism is an assertion of life: we are for sexual expression and against conventional morality. What, however, is our attitude to drugs? Most of the younger generation have a favourable attitude—some may even think that drug-taking was invented by Alan Ginsberg, just as a recent writer in *FREEDOM* thought that direct action was invented by CND.

It was a prominent feature of the twenties; those who grew up in the thirties have, as a result, a strong aversion to it (remember the 'Bright Young Things?'). But this is admittedly prejudice.

The anarchist movement can play a major part in this, by establishing its own commission of enquiry. It has the scientists of talent that could participate; it has the chance of co-operation with many youngsters who have been on the

hard stuff as well as on ordinary pot. I would suggest, for instance, gerontologist Alex Comfort; practitioner John Hewatson, with years of militancy as an anarchist as well as years of practice; brain surgeon Chris Pallas, whose ideas are close to ours; and several psychologists, doctors and research scientists who have been active in the libertarian movement; together with a representative number from the 'drugs 'n' jazz' fraternity. One of the teaching hospitals could well afford to back us in this scheme. It would not be an impartial enquiry. It would be an enquiry starting off with the premise that there should not be any restrictions upon the individual's free choice. If it came to the conclusion that there was nothing whatever to fear in any drug-taking, nobody would be in the least surprised, or likely to alter their ways accordingly. But it would be a tremendous blow to drug-taking if such a tribunal came to some of the conclusions that any orthodox Establishment-aided medical enquiry would come to, viz. that the 'drug scene' was harmful. Even so, some would want to carry on, just as some people like committing suicide; but it is reasonable that everyone knows what risks he or she takes and is not at the mercy of specious slogans, for or against.

A. MELTZER.

Why Bother?

Comrades, I noticed this week that Slough anarchists have joined Liverpool in going 'hippydom' to their list of actions. Although there is much I approve of 'hippy' philosophy—love, freedom, rejection of materialistic values—and I am not unaware that they carry out a certain amount of radical activity (see recent issue of *Solidarity*), I think that there is a basic difference between hippy anarchism, based on Taoist-Buddhist philosophy and anarchist radicalism, more politically orientated, though the two obviously meet at times. Hippydom is more than the wearing of a flower shirt, it is a philosophy (in part only half-hearted, true), but it must be accepted by a person can call himself a hippy. I should think there are few real 'hippies' in the USA and even less in Britain. Are the Liverpool and Slough

comrades suddenly converted to Taoism? Do they take LSD? Are they prepared to love their neighbour and their enemy? Or are they merely trying to collect recruits by being more with-it, jumping on the band wagon? I should think that most serious anarchists, radicals and pacifists would be put-off by the adoption of the added title 'hippy group', and it would attract very few real hippies either. So why bother?

Incidentally the term 'hippy movement' seems a little strange; there is a hippy movement in the sense there was a beat movement, but individual movements or groups contradict the essence of an idea that is individualistic and purposely disorganized—regimented hippies?

This is not to say a hippy is a hippy, and an anarchist an anarchist and ne'er the twain shall meet, only that the jumping on topical (but perhaps fleeting) band wagons will not help the anarchist movement one bit.

Coventry DAVID PROBERT.

Letters

Garmichael and Black Power

Dear Comrades,

I hope I am very far from the 'doggy adulation', attributed to me by Tony Gibson, on Stokeley Carmichael—but since he has called my own feelings into question I'd like to clarify them. I certainly do not think that calling him a 'big mouthed twit' is very helpful either; it reduces an important issue to the level of pub vulgarity, and is more likely to make supporters more 'reverse-racist' than it is to persuade them of his faults, though I like the openness with which Tony states his opinion otherwise.

It may be that my drop-out loathing of this so-called civilization, which I see as a permanent potential nervous breakdown that I don't want to participate in, inclines me to be more sympathetic to violent movements that threaten it with disintegration than detached reasoning would allow—but another vital point has been missed. Some of us arrived at our present anarchist position by going through a series of beliefs, Communist, mystical, pacifist—or even, in retrospect, fascist, etc. INTELLECTUALLY because we LIVED the comfortable routine of a regular home, job, college, what-have-you: Oppressed groupings like the enslaved negro did not have this comfort—they had to make, and have to make all their mistakes, EXISTENTIALLY by supporting a series of movements out of immediate social desperation—the evolution from civil rights to Black Power in the USA is an obvious example of this. Thus, the Haitian revolution was historically both inevitable and necessary, whatever its tragedies. Our own acclaimed French revolution wasn't exactly a 'love-in' but where would our ideas have been without it?

Thus Black Power (and Stokeley Carmichael himself perhaps) are a mixture of deep social grievances and tribal gangsterism—I too have read of the inflated pictures of him on the walls of meetings, but the apathy of which this fascism is the offspring, as Tony suggests, is going also. He may well be a politician but negroes believe that he can help solve their social grievances (to some to insult him is to deny their demands)—in which case it's up to us to help analyse the causes of those grievances and overcome them, so that negroes can decide for themselves whether Carmichael is good for them or not—otherwise Tony Gibson's objections are so much sterile reasoning, to which noisy and powerless movements are often subject—like talking of 'democracy' to empty stomachs.

Another weak point in Tony's argument is the mythical 'American people'—American peoples would be more correct—the United States is a disintegrating society, a hotchpotch of groupings (from the start) that never, thanks to brash Yankee Capitalism, integrated, but rather were exploited, Negro, Mexican,

Puerto-Rican, Amerindian, etc., which turn in on themselves as a reaction—add to this the drop-out movements like the hippies, the rival radical movements with no common ground in any 'socialist' labour movement—the myth is exploded. Black Power exploded it! There always WAS racial strife and hatred—first you acknowledge it, then, I would suggest, the dividing line between acknowledging and advocating violence of this nature can be very thin, human solidarity does the rest.

I wish to understand Black Power, not to worship it, but I would like to understand it as much as possible from an existential rather than an intellectual point of view, from the standpoint of men involved rather than detached Olympian mental godhead—because revolutions are made by feelings, emotions however crude, and we want revolution—don't we? When men are MOVED, surely we all marvel at POWER of some kind?

Hate, love, alike are life-forces possessing our minds and bodies—it was this that Dostoyevsky had in mind when he taxed the Russian revolutionaries with naïveté in regard to what makes people's minds work.

Fraternally,

Manchester DAVID STRINGER.

CIRA Library

Dear Editors,

I hope I may be permitted to correct a 'howler' of the first order, perpetrated by 'Paddy Fields' in his report of the AFB Conference.

'Manchester,' he says, 'reported upon the contact it has made with the projected formation of an international library in Switzerland.' Now, leaving aside the question of how one makes contact with 'the projected formation' of anything (somebody's grammar needs brushing up), this statement is ridiculously inaccurate. I went to great pains to point out that during this summer I worked for the second year in succession at the Centre International de Recherches sur l'Anarchisme (described in a letter in *FREEDOM* last July), and helped them celebrate their 10th birthday.

The point that should have been made, and which I specifically asked to be included in the report, was the fact that CIRA are fortunate enough to have an immense amount of duplicate material there, which I rescued from a damp cellar under the impression that someone would be interested in it. This stuff, some of it 50 years old and more, can be had for the asking—and the payment of postage. Any anarchist bibliophiles, collectors, historians, linguists and librarians, are invited to contact me for further details.

Yours fraternally,

Manchester, 14 DAVE POULSON.

FREEDOM PRESS IS ON

The Move

Our Moving Fund and our Promises Fund need your HELP!

GET COMMITTED!

DOCK STRIKE ISSUES

Continued from page 1

has started the process by asking Mr. Gunter 'if by taking part in an unofficial strike the dockers placed themselves outside the provision of the Scheme'. He said Mr. Gunter has promised to look into it. The employers are also trying to get automatic suspension from work for men who take part in unofficial action.

Also Mr. Cayzer wants a proper contractual relationship between employer and employee, with industrial disputes to be settled by industrial courts. Lord Geddes (Vice-President of UK Chamber of Shipping) has also jumped on the bandwagon and says Britain's unions should be run on the same lines as those in the United States where 'the Jack Dashes are sorted out'. (Communists are not allowed to hold office in the dockers' Transport and General Workers' Union anyway.)

On the unions Mr. Gunter made an

interesting comment: 'Their leadership both nationally and locally has lost control, indeed the official leadership is met with derision and contempt. . . . If the gap is so great between members and leadership that anarchy is let loose, then of course someone must bring order.'

'Order', in Mr. Gunter's eyes, will probably mean even stronger curbs and interference with the trade unions than the Government has already introduced. It is also interesting to note that he recognises that the 'leaders' are supposed to control the union—because the dockers are always being told the TGWU is a democratic union controlled by the members.

This is so obviously untrue, and Mr. Gunter is obviously right, because (i) the officials are not elected by the members they are supposed to represent but selected from above, (ii) the lay delegates are not mandated by members and can vote exactly the opposite way to what their members ask and often do, and (iii) the long constitutional procedure means many resolutions get lost in the administration (from the branches they have to be accepted by the Division, then the Regional Docks Group and then the National Docks Group).

Because of these three points most dockers have no faith in the union and only join because it is a closed shop. They consider their union cards as nothing more than licences to work and rely on Unofficial Liaison Committees to ginger up the union. This is proved by the difference in attendances at union branch meetings and unofficial meetings.

Although the dockers' revolt against all this has lasted so long it is unlikely to have much success because there is little solidarity among them—only about 15,000 out of 65,000 are on strike. And, as London docker Ernie Rice pointed out, this means ships are just moved to docks where the men are working. For instance the men of Sheerness and other places are not blacking ships diverted there from the Royal Group of docks in London which are on strike. This will obviously undermine the strike and doom it to failure.

M.P.

£117 DOWN!

WEEK 42, NOVEMBER 21, 1967:

Expenses: 42 weeks at £90: £3780

Income: Sales and Subs.: £2772

DEFICIT: £1008

Shrewsbury: J.G. 4/-; Bristol: P.T. 4/4; Stevenage: J.C. 10/-; Colemans Hatch: D.M. £1/1/-; Harlow: K.N. 2/6; London, W.2: D.B. 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; J.L.* 3/-; London, S.E.17: D.S. 2/6; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* 10/-; Wellington: J.P. 10/8; Wolverhampton: M.B. 10/-; Purlight: E.A. 5/-; London, N.W.1: R.G. £2/10/-; Woodbridge: C.P. 6/-; California: Los Gatos £35; London: R.S. 13/-.

TOTAL: £43 4 0

Previously Acknowledged: £848 3 1

1967 Total to Date: £891 7 1

*Denotes Regular Contributor.

The Barbican Struggle

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, saw a new phase in the struggle to get the six Myton stewards their jobs back on the Barbican site. Failure to get the site open by any other means led to the police being called in to escort the 'scabs' onto the site. This is the extent to which the authorities were willing to go in order to succeed in their object. On that morning, the Myton picket line had been reinforced by workers from the Turriff site, who had been sacked the previous Friday for leaving early to join the same picket, and men from Laings. During the weekend 100 police had been on duty round the site and this number was more than doubled on the Monday.

Four pickets were arrested in the morning when two vans brought in about 14 'scabs', but it was in the afternoon when the pickets were marching back from a meeting, at which proposals for a settlement had been agreed upon, that the police finally took off the kid gloves

and used their truncheons. The last time they had done this was during the Camden Town rent demonstrations in 1960.

The police waded in and arrested anyone, but they also made certain that they grabbed a number of known militants. Photos in the papers are an indication of the amount of violence used by the police. The *Morning Star* wrote, 'It was not pleasant to see several huge policemen frog-marching a struggling worker into a waiting Black Maria, arm twisted up the back or a forearm round the throat; not pleasant to see a policeman grabbing at a young man's testicles in order to get him off a wall.'

One picket, Dave Leadbetter, had his wrist broken and was taken to hospital. The National Council for Civil Liberties took a statement from him. In all 24 men were arrested, mostly charged falsely with not only insulting behaviour, but assault.

The proposals put forward at the meeting, which were later taken to the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives, were that national union officials should call a meeting of all Myton operatives, that all Myton men should be re-employed, including five plumbers who worked for a sub-contractor, and the six stewards and three steel-fixers, whose sacking started the dispute, be offered employment elsewhere. The Federation's General Secretary, Mr. Weaver, was asked to address the men the next day and give his answers to these proposals.

AID FUND

Mr. Weaver did not turn up the next day and lied when he said that he never received an offer to speak. At a midday mass meeting, pickets did accept certain proposals put forward by stewards representing a number of jobs. The main proposals were that an aid fund should be set up to pay the fines of those arrested and to assist families if any of the men go to prison, and that a demonstration be organised for November 2, when the 24 arrested pickets appear again at Guildhall Magistrates Court.

Lou Lewis, one of the six stewards refused re-employment, said that 'Provocations and attacks by the police make this dispute the property of the Labour Movement of this country', and 'You are a long way from provocation by building workers when you get six coppers on one man'.

The NFBTO condemned the pickets and described the 'scabs' as 'loyal trade unionists'. It seems that the national union officials would rather have these 'scabs' than proper trade union organisation on sites, for following the disbanding of the Works Committee on the Brunel University site, the Federation have done the same on the Turriff site and are also threatening the same action on the Laing job.

The Executive Council of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers has also called upon Lou Lewis and Rolfe Langdon to explain why they are still picketing. The ASW has already expelled them once for this, but they were re-admitted following an appeal. It seems probable that they will be expelled again and that the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers will do the same with Mike Houlihan. The executives of the building trade unions and the Federation will stop at nothing to smash any militant shop stewards. The Federation will probably be setting up an inquiry into the unofficial activities of members of

affiliated unions. The Cameron Report recommended a similar scheme, but the Federation will be 'naming names' and actually keeping a dossier of when and how often members have stepped out of line. The information would then be given to the members' union, who would then either expel or take some disciplinary action.

AGAINST UNION EXECUTIVES

From the moment the Myton men rejected the union-management agreement for the opening of the site in February, the struggle has mainly been against the union executives. The vote taken at that time said that the NFBTO did not represent them. An editorial in the *Guardian* put it plainly: 'To suggest that the NFBTO represents the workers on the Barbican site is like saying that General Chiang Kai-shek governs China.'

Union executives are taking more and more decisions that do not represent the views of their members. To the employers, stewards are a nuisance. They are always interfering in management affairs, but they do bring the grievances of the men before the management. Unlike union officials, if stewards fail to carry out these tasks, they can be easily replaced. With the union officials, they have a real stake in their job, for they do not want to be back on the tools again. They have become detached from the struggles of their members and the agreements they make often go completely against the members' wishes, who are expected to honour them.

Fear is making the union executives and the Federation take these actions. They fear any organised expression of discontent from their members and so they are disbanding the works committees on these sites. This detachment has increased with the Government's wage policies and, at the same time, it has encouraged the managements to be tougher.

The task of getting the six stewards re-employed at Mytons does indeed seem an impossible one. The site is now being prepared for the commencement of building. A labour force is likely to be moved in at any time. The Cameron Report recommended that all of the original labour force, with the exception of the six, should be re-employed. However, certain operatives have not been asked back by Mytons, who are therefore breaking the agreement.

It is essential that the demonstration on November 2 is successful. This dispute is, as Lou Lewis says, 'the property of the Labour Movement', and it should see that they are not intimidated by the violence of the police. For it does seem to me that the violence on Monday was a deliberate show of strength against dissident rank-and-file members. It was meant as an example to other workers who are at odds with their executives. Massive support on November 2 is essential, but even this will not get the six stewards back. Support from other industrial workers, over a much longer period, seems to be the only answer if Lou Lewis and the other pickets are going to get back at Mytons.

P.T.

Freedom For Workers' Control

OCTOBER 28 1967 Vol 28 No 33

SUPPORT FROM PRINTWORKERS

We are printing this leaflet issued by the 'Printworker', which is the publication of the Association of Rank and File Printworkers, because we feel that solidarity extended by other industrial workers will help the Barbican strikers in their struggle.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16—the Battle of the Barbican! Hundreds of police surrounded Myton's building site on the Barbican to escort scab labour brought in by the employers to break an eleven-months-old dispute. When the scabs and the police escort appeared, the building workers inevitably—and heroically—tried to stop them entering the site.

The police moved in with batons waving. Twenty-four arrests were made. That night the evening papers carried large

NUR CAVE IN

THE DECISION, by 17 votes to 7, of the executive of the National Union of Railwaymen to call off the ban on guards doing second man duties, is a victory for the tough attitude taken by the British Railways Board and the Government. In the past, the NUR executive has managed to wring some small increase out of BR, but all they have got from this is that the Minister of Labour, Mr. Gunter, will chair the meeting between them and the Board.

Mr. Green, the NUR General Secretary, was against the ban in the first place and was all in favour of accepting the findings of the inquiry. His executive thought otherwise, but now, in the face of the threat by Mr. Gunter that the Government would introduce emergency powers (using troops) and the threat of the Board that it would suspend the guaranteed weekly payments to men laid off because of the ban, the executive has thrown in the towel.

Both the Board and the Government have taken a much tougher attitude towards the NUR than they have in the past. For example, the last (and first) time the guaranteed week was suspended was in 1924 during a dock strike. Having succeeded now, it will be so much easier to run the present labour force down, a procedure that the Board thinks is so essential if they are to eliminate their financial losses.

The NUR has really been fighting a losing battle for years now because they have accepted, in principle, the necessity for this run-down. They have never said that they do not accept this and fought for the jobs of their members. Because of this failure, the railwaymen are demoralised and although they have followed their executive, and in some areas taken unofficial action in support of the ban, I doubt if railwaymen will carry on the struggle themselves.

They will, I think, fight further redundancies, but they need support from other transport workers. This will not come about by the action of the union executive, but only by transport workers getting together and working out a joint policy of mutual support if jobs and conditions in either section are threatened.

P.T.

pictures showing building workers being punched, beaten, dragged along the gutters and half-strangled by hordes of burly coppers.

Here was the 'law' in action. The law as it really is. Organised violence in blue uniforms protecting the employers and forcing working-men to accept the employers' terms. That these building workers stood up to this assault and fought back is a fact which should be dear them to every trade unionist who is worth his salt.

Now they face charges which carry prison sentences and/or large fines. They and their families are confronted with real hardship because they have fought to improve their wages and working conditions.

WHAT THE DISPUTE IS ABOUT

Some may ask what has all this to do with us as printworkers? It has plenty to do with us. The men at Mytons have been on strike—or locked out—for eleven months because they have refused to accept the salary of their elected site stewards following a dispute over a bonus payment.

Despite appeals—and threats—from the employers, from their own Trade Union officials, and from the Government's Court of Inquiry under Lord Cameron, they have refused to go back to work without the men they had elected to be their spokesmen on the job.

They have refused to betray the stewards. This is the very stuff of which good trade unionists are made. This is REAL trade unionism. Without such loyalty the trade union movement is a paper tiger.

WHAT IT MEANS TO US

Where is the FOC who wouldn't want men like the Barbican builders in his Chapel? Men whom he knew would stop work till kingdom come if the employers dared to victimise an elected representative for voicing the demands of the members.

And don't imagine it couldn't happen. Right now the printing industry is involved in a dispute over wages. There is an overtime ban in the provinces. It could lead to lock-outs and attempts could be made by the press barons to sack chapels and recruit scab labour. If this happens wouldn't you get angry? Wouldn't you have a go at the scabs? Wouldn't you expect your members to stand loyally by the elected chapel representatives? Of course you would.

That is what the Barbican workers have done. They have refused to be intimidated. They have stood by their elected stewards.

That is why we in the print must show our appreciation and our solidarity. They didn't leave their stewards in the lurch. We, in our turn, mustn't desert them.

An appeal has been launched to set up a Defence Fund to aid the arrested men and their families. We appeal to all printworkers to give generously to this Fund. There is also to be a mass demonstration in the City on November 2, when the arrested workers appear at the Magistrates Court in the Guildhall.

We urge printworkers—and indeed all workers—to do everything possible to attend this demonstration, in support of trade union principles.

It is estimated that £500 will be needed for the men's Defence Fund. Please do all you can to get support in chapels and branches, as well as individual donations, all of which will, we feel sure, hearten the building workers now facing these charges as a result of their solidarity.

Please send your donations, and offers of support to:—

Bro. G. Gordon,
Defence Appeal Secretary,
20 Goldsworthy Gardens,
Silwood Street,
London, S.E.16.

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Concert in aid of Greek (and English) political prisoners. November 2, 3, 4, 7.30 p.m. Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1. Tickets: 10/-, 15/-, 25/-.

Arts Festival anyone? Salford Art Gallery. Provisional date: January 20, 21, 1968. Contact David Stringer, c/o International Centre, 64 George Street, Manchester, 7.

Libertarian Prisoners' Fund. To send money and food to anarchists in prison. Secretary: Stuart Christie (c/o Freedom Press).

Green Revolution? New book, 'Go Ahead and Live!' Tells how. \$4 from The School of Living, Brookville, Ohio 45309.

Work Wanted. 19-year-old male seeks employment. Anything considered. Liberal boss preferred who will allow absences for major demos. Phone Brian at GAL 1130.

International Anarchist Camp 1969. Proposed to hold it in S.E. England—offers of assistance, suggestions for suitable sites to Jim Huggon, 173 Kingshill Avenue, Northolt, Middlesex.

'Save Greece Now' Defence Fund. Donations for Terry, Mike and Del to Brett Carthey, 8 Vincent Square Mansions, Walcott Street, London, S.W.1.

Correspondent. Young anarchist wishes to correspond on anarchistic philosophy and principles. J. Weissmiller, 802 W. 12th, Topeka, Kansas 66612, USA.

Pirate Press. In spite of savage sentence passed on Terry Chandler, the Pirate Press is still going, under the management of Mike Seaman and Neill Collins, 116 Whitfield Street, W.1. 01-387 8864.

Going East? Lift offered to young man overland to India-Nepal. Leave UK November 6, 1967. In return share petrol. Apply G. Parker, 2 Talton Road, Wavertree, Liverpool, 15.

Just off the Press. Anthology of protest-poetry by Flemish, Dutch and English poets, with many drawings and photo-collages. 125 pages, only 10/-. To be had from Freedom Bookshop or direct from Gerda Ides, Post Box 772, Haarlem, Holland (send Int. M.O. in latter case). A Dutch anarchist publication.

Books Hand-bound and Engraved to Order. De-luxe Leather Bindings—Mosaics—Full-leather Parchment—Half-leather Bindings. All books hand-sewn and repaired. Designs for Parchments, Mosaics, are original. For further information contact Mr. J. B. Wagner, c/o American Consulate, Calle Serrano 75, Madrid 6, Spain.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

Support Barbican Strikers!
MASS MEETING - November 2
7.30 a.m. onwards - Myton Site
(opposite Aldersgate Tube)