

# Smuggled Plea from Spain

THE SPANISH Director-General of Prisons, Don Jesus Gonzales del Yerro, has given orders, in order to terminate the unsavoury reputation acquired by Burgos Prison, that three special prisons be constructed.

Soria, at eleven hundred metres above sea level, with 20,000 inhabitants and capital of the most uninhabited province of Spain, has been chosen to house the most dangerous political prisoners. Jaen and Palencia are the two other centres which have been chosen, again because of their comparative seclusion from urban and industrial centres.

They are to have specially selected guards and warders, in order to discipline the political prisoners.

Prisoners are to be classified by a special 'technical' committee (consisting of a doctor, priest, teacher and a psychologist) after sentence, and then taken to one of the above penitentiaries.

Although these plans are already being carried out, there still remain in Burgos a number of political prisoners from before the 'whitewash' campaign, begun in 1965. In the Provincial Prison of Madrid are the largest number of prisoners awaiting trial for political offences by the Tribunal de Public Order (Tribunal de Orden Publico). Apart from these, however, there are always a large number of political prisoners awaiting trial in the Provincial Prisons of Barcelona, Malaga, Sevilla, Valencia, Bilbao and San Sebastian.

Though the new arrangement is intended to destroy the infamous reputation of Burgos Prison, it is also an attempt by the State to isolate the political prisoner, by putting the greatest number of difficulties in his way, from communicating with outside.

The communication halls are separated by two barred mesh windows at a distance of four-and-a-half feet. Letters are subject to strict control, and when there is any doubt, are sent to the Direccion-General of Prisons. On December 19 last, three political prisoners were informed that their letters had been held by the Direccion-General for a fortnight, and copies of the same had been included in their prison files (this can be serious, since this can cause subsequent refusal of conditional liberty even years later). In the 'cemetery' of Soria there are 24 political prisoners [14 orthodox Communists; 5 Maoists; 2 Basque Nationalists (ETA); 1 student; and 3 anarcho-syndicalists].

### 'CAT AND MOUSE' TREATMENT

The Spanish Criminal Code allows for prisoners reducing their sentence by a third, by working in the prison workshops or generally. Another quarter of the sentence may be served whilst on 'conditional liberty', outside the prison. In order to benefit from conditional liberty, the prisoner has to be of good conduct, and if he has committed any faults, he must be rehabilitated or pardoned by the Governor or priest for 'extra special' conduct; or this may come automatically after a given period of time if the fault was not serious.

Reduction of the sentence by labour only applies after the prisoner has been sentenced by the Supreme Tribunal, and the sentence has been communicated to the prison. This normally takes up to two years, and I know of cases where considerably longer periods have passed, even up to five years in one case, where the man had not even been tried, and had been released on the orders of the military judge.

In any case, when the judges and officers in charge of the files come to decide upon the termination of a sentence or its remission to conditional liberty, they always act to the detriment

of the prisoner, unless he has influential friends or the capacity to bribe. Should he be ill, for instance, and unable to work, he cannot reduce his sentence by labour. If he has been sanctioned and is working, he cannot reduce his sentence until the sanction has been lifted, however much he works. The redemption ('Redencion') of sentence is theoretically one-third of the sentence, but in practice it is rarely more than one-eighth. So far as 'conditional liberty' is concerned, although it has been juridically defined, it is referred to as an 'act of grace' and treated as such.

When the period referred to as 'conditional' is entered, after the completion of one-third of the sentence (with or without redemption), the Direccion-General examines the prisoner's file. Should it be accepted, it is forwarded to the Council of Ministers for approval and signature. As the Council meets once a fortnight, the prisoner who completes his sentence on a day which does not coincide can spend up to sixteen days over his sentence.

### OBSTACLES TO LIBERTY

Before the file can be taken to the DGP (Direccion-General of Prisons), the prisoner has to name someone who will act as his referee ('fiador') once he has been released. Once the 'fiador' has been named, the police make a thorough investigation of whomever it is, to such an extent that the majority of them withdraw their offers under coercion. This applies to almost half of the common criminals, who, unable to find a 'fiador', have to complete their sentence. This is not usually the case with political prisoners, as they are in the main able to find people convinced that what they are doing is right, and are in the main more difficult for the police to intimidate, but even so the police make life difficult for the 'fiadores' in other ways. This is despite the fact that the State expressly created the 'fiador' system and the 'Juntas de Libertad Vigilada' for the express purpose of allowing prisoners out on conditional liberty.

Even when all the necessary documents and all the requisites are fulfilled, the prisoner has by no means achieved conditional liberty; the DGP can still refuse it on the grounds that those concerned

Continued on page 2

# Demonstration in Aberdeen

AUSTRALIAN involvement in the Vietnam war, unlike that of America which stems directly from the logic of Imperialist strategy and economics, is more a product of that xenophobia which has afflicted Australian life in this century and of pressure exerted on them by America through SEATO and the enormous investments held in Australian industry by American capitalists. Direct action against this involvement, by anarchists in this country, is made difficult—there are no Australian troops here, no huge Australian firms, etc. However, the constant efforts by the Australian Government to recruit immigrants (who, of course, are never spoken to about the war and preparations to escalate it) offer a field for action.

It has been a freezing winter in Aberdeen; unemployment is rising (300 men were recently paid off at Russel's shipyard) and there seems to be no better prospects ahead. Because of this we expected a steady flow of inquisitive persons at a recruiting exhibition for con-

IN MOSCOW last week it was revealed that a law promulgated by Stalin made it illegal for a private citizen to hold a press conference without official permission, in Britain the *Morning Star* voiced doubts about the wisdom of the seven-year sentence on Yuri Galanskov and the five-year sentence on Ginzburg. In Moscow, too, Dr. Pavel Litvinov, grandson of Maxim Litvinoff, was dismissed from his lecturing appointment at the Moscow Chemistry Institute. These are all protests about protests and would seem to some, like many Committee of 100 demonstrations, to be infinitely regressing to be protests about protests about protests but it seems more like a train of goods-trucks where the impact from the engine repercusses down the whole length of the train. Another shudder, it seems, has shaken the mighty Soviet engine, it has again bumped over the wrong points.

The old legacy of Stalinism has not died out, some say, and these judicial excesses (some of them manifestly illegal) are a return to the bad old days of Stalin and give an excuse to stir up the old enmities of the Cold War era. However, it is said, whilst we may deplore the despatch of intellectuals to the salt mines (or wherever it is their labour is needed), what about the negroes in the Southern States of America?

In some ways Stalin was a great boon to Communism and the Soviet Union. It created a new political swear-word 'Stalinism' [the kind of communism one dislikes—see TROTSKYISM]—he has even met young communists who believed that Stalin was responsible for putting down the Hungarian rising. At the other end of the scale one meets Trotskyists who seem to imply that Stalin was responsible for the Kronstadt shootings.

In 1959, under the name of Abram Tertz, Andre Sinyavsky wrote an article 'On Socialist Realism'. It was published in Paris and in it, speaking of the Soviet revolution, he said:

'So that prisons should vanish for ever, we built new prisons. So that all frontiers should fall, we surrounded ourselves with a Chinese Wall. So that work should become a rest and a pleasure we introduced forced labour. So that not one drop of blood be shed any more, we killed and killed and killed.'

'In the name of the Purpose we turned to the means that our enemies used; we glorified Imperial Russia, we wrote lies in *Pravda* (Truth), we set a new Tsar on the now empty throne, we introduced

# Rotting Prison of State!

officers' epaulettes and tortures. . . . Sometimes we felt that only one final sacrifice was needed for the triumph of Communism—the renunciation of Communism.' In 1966 Sinyavsky and Daniel were sentenced to seven years' and five years' imprisonment respectively for publishing in the West matter hostile to the Soviet regime. Mikhail Sholokhov and other Soviet writers protested against the leniency of the court and asked for the death sentence.

A small group of amateur writers produced a duplicated account of the trial and sentences, for public distribution. They were accused of being financed by an emigré organization (NTS) but as the trial was held (after twelve months) in secret, and the NTS was reputedly behind Gerald Brooke, it is possible that the KGB is making political capital out of this allegation. Street protests were staged outside the courtroom and an abortive press conference for foreign journalists was attended by two only and the KGB who acted, just as they have done through history—whether the Cheka, the OGPU, the NKVD—as the midwives to the dead foetus of Soviet civil liberty.

There are those that believe that war is the accidental product of the State's errors in foreign policy, rather than the inevitable product of the State's existence. In a like manner it is possible to believe that a State can be run without infringing the citizen's civil liberties. The real civil liberties, the right to express one's views no matter how absurd or unpopular, must always clash with the aims of the State, and in a State as highly organised (if not actually monolithic) as Soviet Russia, Mao's China or Hitler's Germany, it is impossible for the thinking, imaginative, sensitive artist to express himself without clashing with the State at some point.

To protest about the excesses of one particular State at one particular time does not mean to condone the excesses of any other State. They do these things rather better in the democracies. Whereas under Stalin and the Czar recalcitrants went to prison or Siberia, under Khrushchev and Kosygin they go into labour camps, asylums or exile. In the democracies artists may either be starved out or, what is more efficient,

dined out and cease to be rebels. Soviet literary history is full of those who refused to conform with the views of 'Socialist realism' and chose suicide, silence or voluntary exile. Mayakovsky, Yesenin, Pasternak, Babel, Zoschenko, Eisenstein are great names that occur to one. But how many minor talents have been strangled at birth by the all-embracing KGB protection of Soviet culture?

George Orwell, in his bitterly pessimistic *1984*, the novel of a sick, disappointed man, spoke of a totalitarian state that could perpetually maintain itself in power by repression and conditioning. This is not so. We have seen in Hungary, in East Germany, and now in Moscow, that, despite all the vigilant care of Big Brother State, the students, the supposedly pampered darlings; the artists, the coddled *cadres* of the revolution, break away from the restraint and for a brief while show that the human being is not a thing to be bullied, conditioned, pampered or coddled by the State but issues a challenge. In the words of Yuri Galanskov

'Arise!  
Inflamed rebellious blood!  
Forward, destroy and finish  
it off—  
This rotting prison of State!'  
JACK ROBINSON.

# COME ON OUT!

OUR CONTEMPORARY, *Tribune*, has printed an appeal 'to all those who have given their support to the Labour movement', in which it asks that they 'stay in and fight'. It points out that the present crises in the Labour Party 'will generate the most terrible feelings of disgust and despair in the hearts of those Labour activists who have devoted their whole lives to the cause of Socialism'.

Socialism means many different things to many different people, but the Labour Party has never been socialist. It has always been a coalition of men with differing and contradictory views. In times of oppositions they get along, uniting to oppose the Government, but once in office, the cracks which have been carefully plastered over soon reappear.

The spectrum of viewpoint is so wide that really some would be more at home with the Tories, while those *Tribune* MPs and their supporters should really form another party, that is if they really believe socialism can be brought about by parliamentary means.

Of course many Labour Party activists will support the Government's cuts in welfare and social services as a necessary ingredient to strengthen the economy. They will deplore the attacks from other Party members and call them disloyal. But for those who have worked in the Labour Party with the illusion that they were helping to bring about an egalitarian socialist society, based on co-operation and needs, instead of competition and profit, I think that *Tribune's* appeal is so much rubbish. I hope that these socialists do leave the Labour Party, although not the Labour movement (by which I mean the trade unions, etc.) and consider the anarchist alternative.

To *Tribune* I say that they have not got a chance of getting control of the party machine. No 'left-winger' ever gets this far, and if he or she does, then by that time their teeth have been long since drawn. You never see those 'left-wing' Ministers on CND marches now. Perhaps *Tribune* and its MPs just do not want to recognise it and are prepared to assist in perpetuating the illusion. Most of their lives are based on it and possibly the comforts, the salaries and the illusion of power are too much to give up.

To those activists who have seen their ideals betrayed and dragged through and finally kicked out of the corridors of power, we would extend to you a fraternal hand of welcome and would hope that the anarchist alternative would fill the disillusioned political vacuum.

# CONSCRIPTION IN AUSTRALIA!

THE AMERICAN FORCES in Vietnam are suffering ever-increasing casualties; but few people seem aware that there are 8,000 Australian troops in Vietnam, and that these are also dying in their hundreds, in the swamps, jungles and mountains.

Immigrants are not told the full facts about Australia's conscription policy until it is too late. All Australians over 19 are liable to fight in Vietnam, this applies to immigrants and natives equally. As soon as you step ashore you will be a candidate for conscription, to be sent off to die in an unjust and brutal war. This applies EVEN IF YOU ARE ONLY GOING TO AUSTRALIA FOR A TRIAL PERIOD.

We agree with the advice given to intending immigrants by the Australian anti-war movement—STAY AT HOME!

Issued by Aberdeen Anarchists,  
c/o Dey, 142 Walker Road.

I. R. MITCHELL.

P.T.



# BOOKS ON ANARCHISM

## and kindred subjects

NEW BOOKS OBTAINED TO ORDER. POSTAGE EXTRA ON ORDERS UNDER £2.

- Political Justice: A Reprint of the Essay on Property** William Godwin 9/6
- Our Synthetic Environment** Lewis Herber 25/-
- Talks to Parents and Teachers** Homer Lane 10/6
- The Sins of the Children** R. F. Mackenzie 25/-
- A Question of Living** R. F. Mackenzie 18/-
- Escape from the Classroom** R. F. Mackenzie 18/-
- Reflections on Violence** Georges Sorel 30/-
- The Hawkspur Experiment** W. David Wills 24/-
- The Spanish Labyrinth** Gerald Brenan (paperback) 13/6
- The Political Philosophy of Bakunin** (paperback) 28/-
- A Hundred Years of Revolution** George Woodcock, Max Beloff, T. A. Jackson (Remainder) 5/-
- Homer Lane: a Biography** W. David Wills 40/-
- Character Analysis** Wilhelm Reich 63/-
- The Function of the Orgasm** Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 24/-
- The Murder of Christ** Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 18/-
- Listen, Little Man!** Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 16/-
- The Free Family** Paul & Jean Ritter 18/-
- To Hell with Culture** Herbert Read 21/-
- Love and Orgasm** Alexander Lowen 37/6
- Selected Philosophical Works** Alexander Herzen 10/-

## 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

are the publishers of the monthly magazine ANARCHY and the weekly journal FREEDOM specimen copies will be gladly sent on request.

## 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

## PUBLICATIONS include

- Malatesta's ANARCHY** 1/- (post 3d.)
- Berkman's ABC of ANARCHISM** 2/6 (+5d.)
- Rocker's NATIONALISM AND CULTURE** 21/- (+4/6)
- Richards' MALATESTA: His Life and Ideas.** Cloth bound 21/- (+1/3); paper 10/6 (+1/-)
- Bakunin's MARKISM, FREEDOM and the STATE** 7/6 (+5d.)
- Berner's NEITHER EAST or WEST** 6/- (+9d.)
- Woodcock's THE WRITER & POLITICS** 7/6
- Voline's NINETEEN-SEVENTEEN (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)** 12/6 (+1/-) and THE UNKNOWN REVOLUTION (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) 12/6 (+1/-)
- Annual Volumes of Selections from FREEDOM 1952-1964** each year's volume 7/6 (+1/-) Full list on application.

**FREEDOM PRESS**  
17a Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6  
Tel: REN 3736

**BLACK POWER** and White Power may come to mean the same thing in the end. Black Power, which inspires fear, hatred, and stirs white passion to the white heat point, is merely the revival of the consciousness of a people; cultural consciousness, political consciousness and physical consciousness. When black people begin to reject white propaganda, they are fully grown. 'No longer,' says Franz Fanon, 'half monkey, half human beings.' Black Power, in fact, is the realisation by black people that they are people and not problems.

This realisation, Stokeley Carmichael calls 'the black consciousness'. It embodies a revolution. It is a revolt against prejudice, self hate, cultural masturbation, phony egoism, and lastly, a rejection of the imposition of white culture and attitudes, wherever it inflicts pain, suffering and spiritual dilemma on the black individual in the name of integration... or the discrimination bluff. Black Power in practice means the shaking off of slave values. It is inevitable therefore that the first battle that the black man will engage in, and one that he cannot help but win, is the battle to speak for himself, and not through the borrowed, or imposed voice of 'white liberals'. It follows also that the first battalion he will meet face to face will be those same white liberals who believe in their divine right to speak on behalf of 'coloured' people. White liberals fail to realise that the 'coloured' man is now the black man. Gone is the slave shame of the blacks true identity... being black.

A great deal of the reaction in Britain to black consciousness tends to be influenced by the debate of white liberals concerning their alleged right to integrate blacks into the false concepts of colour, race, embedded in white society; concepts which they themselves have never been able to see through, and with which the system captures and imprisons their liberalism. Stokeley Carmichael had a way of saying, each time a black man stood up to a white man, and enforced his right, not only to speak, but also to teach in order to correct the false concepts of liberalism... 'yeah brother blow his mind'.

Blowing a mind means standing up to a fascist, and saying, 'fascist you can't touch me ever again'; in essence reversing Kipling's false dictum, so frequently expressed with *New Statesman* logic. The white man is, in fact, the black man's burden, not the other way round. And what's more, the white man knows it, because it has always been the most convulsive of his shame.

The reaction of the established white press in Britain is to immediately call the black man a racist, arrest its speakers—Michael X, Roy Sawh, Ajoy Ghosi, Michael Oyornumu, Alton Watson—and sit back blindly and hope that the revolt will end there... the black man sits back and laughs; he knows what is coming, because he knows what he is capable of... but the white establishment has no idea because there are no white liberals around to meddle and the establishment has never in its existence related with anyone but those within it.

It seems therefore that we are left with one group of white people who may possibly stand a chance of getting near to Black Power, i.e., getting near enough to know where Black Power itself is at, and that means those people who have

# YEAH BROTHER, BLOW HIS MIND!

never been members of the establishment, never been fascists, or liberals or racists... these whites can only be identified as 'people'... and to be anywhere near Black Power they must obviously be either active, or the very least sympathetic to black evolution. These 'people' can in time become White Power in the white society. In order to do this they will have to start their own human revolution

**Continued from page 1**  
are considered dangerous. There are in fact a huge number of prisoners still serving their sentences even after their sentences have expired. In the women's prison of Alcala de Henares, for instance, Miguela Alonso, a political prisoner, who has completed all the conditions demanded of her, has been waiting three months for the signature which will release her. In Alicante, Manuel Soriano Sanleandro, political prisoner, was set free last month, six months after his sentence had expired. In the Provincial Prison of Madrid, Sabin Urrutia, Basque Nationalist, political prisoner (member of 'Solidarity of Basque Workers'), was released six months after expiry of sentence only after the threat of a hunger strike. Mur, militant member of the National Confederation of Labour (CNT), was obliged to go on hunger strike because freedom was denied him.

However, the worst case of all concerned Juan Busquets Bergés, member of the CNT, who, after eighteen years of imprisonment, was released in September last from Burgos Prison, three years after expiry of his sentence. The 'benevolence' of the prison system in Spain since the 'reforms' may be seen to be mythical. This was particularly heralded when I, as a political prisoner in Spain, was released after serving three years of a 20-year sentence; but in fact there are only three other comparable cases to this and in each case a foreigner was concerned (Pecunia, Batoux, and Ferre—all French).

When passing sentence, the judge takes these 'concessions' into account, and passes longer sentences accordingly; this despite the fact that the concessions are so difficult to obtain. Thus one fact adds upon another to prolong the period of detention.

Prior to the partial amnesty of 1962, prisoners could only redeem on one sentence—but rarely is only one sentence passed upon an offender. The unfortunate prisoner had to complete the rest of the sentences in their totality. The 1962 pardon permitted the prisoner to redeem on all sentences passed on him at the time of his sentence. The DGP published details of the pardon without mentioning its retroactive character; when in fact it should have been applied from the moment the prisoner was allowed to redeem his sentence. Thus one benefit pays for another: the period of 'redemption' comes off the period which should otherwise be the period of 'conditional liberty' (i.e. outside the prison).

And yet, despite all this, the Director-General of Prisons saw fit to point out that conditional liberty could not be

'white' people.

This, of course, is the crux of the matter; if White Power goes into white society and 'blows' the mind of white society, it will start a whole irreversible process. Freeing the people from their centuries of imposed lies, corruption and political deceit... Capitalist extraction of their blood, and their young blood... it will of course cause a blow up in the face of the white establishment. Who

## Plea from Spain

granted, especially to political prisoners, in those cases where it would be supposed that the 'beneficiary' would repeat his crimes during his period of liberty (i.e. return to his political activity). This has now been denounced by the College of Lawyers of Barcelona, which (according to lawyer Soler y Barbera) has declared in a press statement that 'it is inadmissible juridically to presuppose a future crime'.

**MEDICAL ATTENTION IN PRISON**  
The medical service in all Spanish prisons is elementary. In Soria, there is no medical officer at all. A doctor from the town turns up four or five days a month. Recently, two prisoners suffering from intestinal trouble had to wait six weeks before the DGP in Madrid authorised them to be taken to the City Hospital, to be radiographed. During this time, these two prisoners (Luis Andres Edo and José Maria Gutierrez de la Torre) had no other sedative than large quantities of bicarbonate. Even today, after the result of the radiography being known (a stomach ulcer in the case of Edo, and defective functioning of the vesicula biliar in the case of Gutierrez), treatment cannot be undertaken as the Director of Soria has to apply to the DGP in Madrid for them to authorise payment of treatment. This means a wait of three to four weeks, whilst bicarbonate is all that is to hand, and the patients become worse.

The dentist comes if called, but the prisoner must pay for his services. Each extraction costs 100 pesetas. Recently a prisoner who had four extractions and a number of fillings had to pay 2,000 pesetas. (A prisoner earns 300 or 400 pesetas a month.) The same happens with the oculist. During the recent cold spell, a large number of prisoners suffered from influenza, but there were no medicine or aspirins to counteract. (When I was in Madrid Prison, 25 aspirins per week were supplied for a gallery of 400 prisoners, in the midst of winter.)

Prisoners rely on medicine sent from France by well-wishers, in the case of political prisoners, or from relatives, in the case of criminals. Those who could not buy medicine, went without. In the Prison Hospital of Yserias there is the central medical store for the whole of Spanish prisons, which should supply them all, but these are reserved for particular personal patients of prison doctors. Most of those medicines which find

could stop a revolution taking place? The true statement of Black Power is this. The black revolution can only be won in the end if black people and white people now face the common enemy with the true conviction to either change it or destroy it. The enemy is white racist capitalist society—as real and nasty, and distinct as it is from the people. Until 'White Power' shows its head, Black Power must carry on its work on its own... because black people are also conscious of the fact that six million Jews were slaughtered in gas chambers in Europe, it will only happen in England on a battlefield. This is one message the establishment should receive as it comes.

COURTNEY TULLOCH.

their way to prison from the central store are thus sold outside, to the detriment of the prisoners, who can only be sure of receiving alkaline and bicarbonate and an occasional aspirin out of the State supplies which go to the cabinets of the prison doctors.

**ECHOES OF THE INQUISITION**  
To the slogan 'There are no political prisoners in Spain' it may be retorted, 'There are still political prisoners who have served more than eighteen continuous years'. Miguel Garcia Garcia—now in Soria—60 years of age, militant of the CNT, is now the 'father' of the Spanish prisons. He was detained in Barcelona on October 21, 1949—the same date as Juan Busquet Bergés, who was judged by court-martial in the Military Headquarters of that city in February 1952 and condemned to death (being commuted at the last moment, on March 13 of the same year, with three others). Another five were shot in the Campo de la Bota, Barcelona, after the same court-martial. Now Miguel Garcia Garcia, half-blind and critically ill, is still languishing in the prison of Soria, hoping against hope that the authorities will allow him to die outside prison. Lately he has been suffering severe heart attacks and was saved only by a miracle—he was taken to Yserias, where he remained two months during which period he saw no heart specialist. The crisis over, he was returned to Soria at 1,100 metres altitude, where a new crisis would of necessity be fatal.

It is imperative that something be done, at least on behalf of Miguel Garcia Garcia. He cannot be left to die among the warders of Soria, a latter-day victim of the Spanish Inquisition. It may be true that in my own case, representations from abroad influenced their decision to release me after three years, but in the main the only language that seems to be understood by Spain's Torquemadas is that of force. They are deaf to appeals for mercy and justice and even to the need for respecting the laws made by their own State in its own interest. The only comparatively light sentences that have been passed were those following explosions abroad at Spanish Embassies, when for instance, Edo and others received the comparatively light sentences of nine years for Edo (who had been on their death list), and three years for the others, who, as Anarchists, might well have received a similar sentence to Miguel Garcia Garcia.

STUART CHRISTIE.

(The above article is based on a letter Stuart Christie received through Anarchist Black Cross.—Editors.)

## Anarchist Federation of Britain

General enquiries should be sent to the London Federation.

**LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS.** c/o Libra House, 256 Pentonville Road, London, N.1. Business meetings first Sunday of the month. For details apply to LFA. New Meeting Place, Marquis of Granby, Cambridge Circus, Charing Cross Road. Sundays 8 p.m. JAN 28; Jack Robinson Chicago Anarchists LEWISHAM. Contact Mike Malet, 61B Granville Park, Lewisham, London, S.E.13. Phone: 01-852 8879. EALING ANARCHIST GROUP. Get into touch with Ken King, 54 Norwood Road, Southall. KING'S CROSS GROUP, c/o Libra House, 256 Pentonville Road, London, N.1. S.W. LONDON LIBERTARIANS. Meet every Thursday, 7.30 p.m. at 14 Clapham Court, King's Avenue (Acre Lane end), S.W.4.

## OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

3rd Wednesday of each month at Jack Robinson and Mary Caspary'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 Room'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 (Finbury 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. **ABERDEEN ANARCHIST FEDERATION** (SWF local group, Folk Song Workshop and Committee of 100). Contact Iain MacDonald, 15 Cotton Street, Aberdeen. **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. **BOLTON.** Get in touch with Les Smith, 22 Grosvenor Street, Bolton, Lancs. **BOURNEMOUTH ANARCHISTS.** please contact John McCain, 14 Milton Road, Bournemouth (B'm'th 22279) or Tim Deane, Juliet, West Moors, Wimborne, Dorset (Ferndown 3588). **BRIGHTON.** Get in touch with 79 Coleman Street, Brighton, 7. Poetry readings every Tuesday in Archway 187 on the Seafrost. Admission is free and all poets welcome. 8.30 p.m. onwards. **FIFE LIBERTARIANS.** Contact Bob and Una Turnbull, 39 Stratheden Park, Stratheden Hospital, by Cupar, Fife. **GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP ONE.** Correspondence to Robert Lynn, 2b Saracen Head Lane, Glasgow, G.1. **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. Sunday, January 28, 8 p.m. at South View, Potters Heath, Welwyn. Meeting: John Retey: 'Short history of Freedom Press'. **IPSWICH ANARCHISTS.** Contact Neil Dean, 74 Cemetery Road, Ipswich, Suffolk. **KILBURN, LONDON.** Contact Andrew Dewar, 16 Kilburn House, Malvern Place, London, N.W.6. Meetings 8 p.m. every Tuesday. **LEICESTER PROJECT.** Peace/Libertarian action and debate. Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at 1 The Crescent, King Street, Leicester. **LSE ANARCHIST GROUP.** c/o Student Union, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, W.C.2. **NORTH SOMERSET ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Roy Emery, 3 Abbey Street Bath, or Geoffrey Barfoot, 71 St. Thomas Street, Wells. **NOTTING HILL.** please get in touch with John Bennett and Marilyn Paddy, Flat 4, 88 Clarendon Road, London, W.11. Tel: 727 9745. Meetings every Monday at 7 p.m. **ORPINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP.** Knockholt, Nr. Sevenoaks, Kent. Every six weeks at Greenways, Knockholt, phone: Knockholt 2316. Brian and Maureen Richardson. **OXFORD ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Simon Martin, Oriol College, Oxford.

**READING ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Alan Ross, 116 Belmont Road, Reading, Berks. **SHEFFIELD UNIVERSITY GROUP.** Contact Robin Lovell c/o Students' Union, Sheffield

## ESSEX & EAST HERTS FEDERATION

Three-monthly meetings. Groups and individuals invited to associate: c/o Keith Nathan, 138 Penny-mead, Harlow, Essex. Group Addresses: **BASILDON.** M. Powell, 7 Lingerolt, Basildon, Essex. **BISHOPS STORTFORD.** Vic Mount, 'Eastview', Castle Street, Bishops Stortford, Herts. **CHELMSFORD.** (Mrs.) Eva Archer, Mill House, Purligh, Chelmsford, Essex. **EPPING.** John Barrick, 14 Centre Avenue, Epping, Essex. **HARLOW.** John Deards, 184 Carter's Mead, Harlow, and/or Geoff Hardy, 6 Redricks Lane, Harlow, Essex. Monthly meetings in 'The Essex Skipper', The Stow, Harlow. **LOUGHTON.** Group c/o Students' Union, Loughton College of Further Education, Borders Lane, Loughton, Essex. **MUCH HADHAM.** Leslie Riordan, High Street, Much Hadham, Herts. **NORTH EAST ESSEX.** Peter Newell, 'Maybush', Maypole Road, Tiptree, Essex. Group meets first Monday in each month, 7.15 p.m. at 91 Brook Road, Tollshunt Knights, Tiptree, Essex.

## 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 'HIPPIE' MOVEMENT.** Gerry Bren, 16 Faulkner Square, Liverpool, 8. Meetings weekly. 'Freedom' Sales—Pier Head, Saturdays, Sundays, Evenings. Next meeting: January 20, 16 Faulkner Square. **MANCHESTER ANARCHIST GROUP.** Secretary: Dave Poulson, 9 Boland Street, Fallowfield, Manchester, 14. **MERSEYSIDE ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Pete Sacker, 22 Sandon Street, Liverpool. Meetings: First Thursday of month, 8 p.m.

## SOUTH WALES ANARCHIST FEDERATION

**CARDIFF ANARCHIST GROUP, SWANSEA ANARCHIST GROUP.** All correspondence to: Julian Ross, 111 King Edwards Road, Brynmill, Swansea. Weekly meetings. Freedom sales and action projects.

## PROPOSED GROUPS

**EDINBURGH** anarchists contact Konrad Borowski, 13 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh 3. Tel: WAV 7459. **TAUNTON LIBERTARIANS.** Contact Jill and John Driver, 59 Beadon Road, Taunton, Somerset. Meetings alternate Friday evenings. **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.** Gøthersgade, 27, Viborg, Denmark. **VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA.** Anyone interested in forming anarchist and/or direct action peace group contact Derek A. James, 1844 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. **SWEDEN:** Libertad, Allmänna Vägen 6, Gothenburg V. **CANADA: WINNIPEG.** Anybody interested in Direct action/anarchy contact G. J. Nasir, 606 Matheson Avenue, Winnipeg, 17, Manitoba. **BELGIUM: LIEGE.** Provos, c/o Jacques Charlier, 11 Avenue de la Laiterie, Sclessin-Liege, Belgium. **EAST AFRICA.** George Matthews would like to make contact. Secondary school teacher from UK. PO Box 90, Kakamega, Kenya. **USA:** James W. Cain, secretary, Insurgency Anarchist Association, 323 Fourth Street, Cloquet, Minnesota 55720, USA. **GROUP-TREASON.** Australian Anarchist, c/o Melbourne University or Paddy Evans, c/o the same.



# Chinese Anarchy

CHINA IN THE PRESENT ERA is the focal point of contradictions in the world, the storm centre of the world revolution. The Chinese anarchists are on the rampage and the progress of Communist centralization and subordination to the Party hierarchy has come in doubt. The Red Guards have been thwarted in their attempted takeovers of Canton and Shanghai harbour installations and their attempt to take over the factories of industrial Wuhan was repulsed by workers who were aided by the army.

The anarchists preserve the unity, or sometimes they create it. In unity we find the difference between the possibility for a revolutionary movement and the certainty of a hopelessly divided set of alienated factions.

Chinese anarchy maintains that the end is subordinate to the means and what is achieved in the end will be the result of the means chosen. It is rare that a social project get results identical with the end result as it was conceived by the persons who initiated the project. End results cannot always be determined in advance but we are free to choose who we will go with and who we will kill, if we will kill anyone.

The Chinese anarchists have never shrunk from creative violence and they were ready to go when Sun Yat-sen called for insurrection and revolutionary action to overthrow the Manchu government. When Mao and the Communists broke with the Kuomintang none of the anarchists stayed behind with Chiang Kai-shek, but many of them went with Mao up into the hills to fight. The Chinese anarchists refused to participate in the Kuomintang government when it was organized by Sun Yat-sen so they were not involved in any of the corruption which soiled every member of the Chiang Kai-shek regime.

## THE RISE OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

In 1927, Chiang Kai-shek decided on a 'final solution' to the 'communist problem'. Mao and the other Communists in government were forced into rebellion for the sake of survival. Communist history and Nationalist history both have their versions of what happened during the years before and after the Japanese war, until 1949 when Mao came to power, Chiang fled to Taiwan, and Communism was installed in China.

As power corrupts them all governments lie, and some of these lies have insinuated themselves into the Red Chinese ideology. The proletariat is either the lowest social and economic class in a society or it is the class of workers who must sell their labour to live. In many urban industrial societies the two overlap. The Communist notion of the dictatorship of the proletariat is self-contradictory and has never operated in practice. In fact the leaders of their revolutionary governments have always been radical intellectuals who lead the workers but do not have their origins among them.

The Chinese student class has been put on vacation for one year with orders to lead the Cultural Revolution while the school system is being reformed. These students, 110 million of them according to one estimate, are supposed to hold high the great red banner of Mao Tse-tung's thought and denounce all those who take the capitalist road. They attack with words and gestures proud bureaucrats, petty officials and just about anyone else they don't like.

Most of the Red Guards' posturing has been non-violent, but in Shanghai two different groups of Red Guards fell to fighting each other and fighting also against workers, soldiers and port officials. There was some bloodshed, and in the aftermath, one young student was executed and thirteen others sentenced to life imprisonment.

In Honan, Red Guards complained that soldiers stood by while anarchist workers beat them up. Automobile workers in Manchuria attacked schools which Red Guards were using as bases for their operations. In Hantan, near Peking, '... evil elements encircled the revolutionary rebels, sabotaged production and cut off the water, the electricity and the food supplies'. The situation was bad enough for Wang Li, propaganda director, to go to Kunming and Chungking to see what was going on. Chou En-lai went to Canton and disorderly Shanghai received a visit from Mao himself. On their return each of the leaders proclaimed that he had found 'unprecedented excellence' in the zone of his personal visit.

## DISORDER IN WUHAN

Wuhan is a hub which ranks as the fifth largest city in China. It is really three industrial cities and the centre of internal communications

for the whole nation. The industrial workers of Wuhan are organized in a self-defence group called 'the million heroes'.

When the Red Guards came to Wuhan, and tried to take over the factories and centres of communication, the 'million heroes' drove them out of the factories and off the streets. The Red Guards complained of the ill treatment given them by the workers. Director of propaganda, Wang Li, and another high government official were dispatched from Peking to see what was wrong. A mob of workers met them at the airport and kidnapped the two high officials. The Peking government had to use some tact to persuade the army (whose local commander supported the workers) to use its good offices and make sure the officials were returned safely to Peking. Since then Wang Li has gone on another inspection tour, but no more high party officials have been sent to Wuhan.

When the Western anti-Communist press got the news, its wires tingled with joy and everything was reported on the front pages. 'CHINA NEARS CIVIL WAR.' Chiang Kai-shek announced the beginning of 'final preparations' for his long-talked-about counter-attack on the mainland. This was wishful thinking, for there will be no civil war in China while American boys in Vietnam are nearby.

The Chinese anarchists complain that the Red Guards are trying to destroy the revolution in the revolution which took hold in the years following Chiang's defeat. The 'little generals' are a newly-emerged political class, educated in the lore of Mao Tse-tung and released from school for an entire year so they may 'exchange revolutionary experiences'. The Red Guards have been most effective in Hong Kong where there are independent activists to unite with and the British to oppose.

The workers and peasants do not like the parvenu student revolutionaries Mao wants to integrate into the ruling structure of China. The workers do not care much for the rigorous living implicit in Mao's policies and care less for the personal ambitions, ego and selfish interests of Mao's followers.

Most Western observers are unaware that it was Chinese anarchists, not Maoists, who shelled Indian soldiers who were fortifying the 14,000-foot-high Natu Pass on the Himalayan border. Old China hands are often unaware of the strong threads of anarchism which underlie the Chinese Revolution and of the influence which Chinese anarchists possess even today.

## 1848

The Taiping rebellion was more successful than most of the other uprisings of 1848. It was not snuffed out until 1865. The programme of the Taiping rebels was an anarchist one but it was not derived from any knowledge of foreign social doctrines. The Taiping uprising was a mass movement which attempted to overthrow the Manchu emperor.

The followers of the son of heaven destroyed the old titles, opposed slavery and concubinage and abolished foot-binding and wearing the queue. They set forth a land reform programme based on 'complete redistribution' and advocated equality of the sexes fifty years before the Western suffragettes. They destroyed Taoist and Buddhist idols. The Taiping were only suppressed when 'China' got on brought in a bunch of European mercenaries to 'maintain order' for the British Empire.

## CHINESE ANARCHY

The philosophical anarchism of Lao Tzu is as old as Confucian legalism, the ideology which propped up China's traditional order for so many centuries. Chinese anarchists prefer to forget the age-old Chinese anarchist tradition and concentrate on what is new in modern anarchism.

After 1902 Chinese students began to travel to Europe for study and sometimes to work and learn applications of Western technology. A group of anarchists established a school in Paris and France became a haven for radicals. The anarchists set up the 'frugal work-study programme'. By 1906 local authorities in Wuhan were sending student 'activists' abroad to get rid of them. The Paris group sent for more students and taught radical anarchism to all those who arrived.

The Chinese anarchists presented the earliest attacks on the institution of the family in Chinese society. Hsin Shuh-chi called for 'ancestor revolution' and said that veneration of ancestors is a breach of reason and a denial of science. He argued that social revolution had to begin with the family because the family was the primary instrument of subjugation and inequality. The anarchists introduced the idea that a massive peasant-worker coalition might provide the political forces needed to overthrow the central government.

The anarchists attacked Confucianism as the work of 'crafty men'

Fu said: 'We have no work except that of overthrowing the present authority. We are not like other political parties which have plans and policies. Following the overthrow of governments and the attainment of anarchism there will be no anarchist party.'

The Chinese anarchists accepted centralized power, authority and coercion only so long as they were needed to do away with militarists, landlords and various 'feudal remnants'. Hsin Shih-chi condemned those revolutions conducted by the few as dangerous. **If the majority of the people did not appreciate the need for revolution and did not support it, its progress would be slow. Only when a revolution had the support of the great majority or the whole of the people could it be considered a true social revolution.** The Leninist concept of elitism, of tutelage, was totally foreign to anarchist theory. The anarchists wanted no oligarchy, no inner circle of powerful men to guide the ignorant masses. They said: 'All governments are the enemies of freedom and equality.'

The old Mandarin theory of tutelage was a comfortable one for Chinese intellectuals. Many of them saw no reason to get rid of this part of their role. Leninism, unlike anarchism, could be reconciled with elitism just as it could be joined with nationalist fervour and patriotic appeals against alien invaders. The success of Leninism in Russia seemed to many anarchists to point the way to successful revolution. It also permitted political intellectuals to accept posts in government, something anarchism frowns upon.

The Chinese anarchists opposed the communist theory of Ch'en Tu-hsiu which justified tutelage to shape and guide the common man until he can be trusted to guide his own destiny. They invented the idea of radical infiltration of 'mass organizations' and used it with success against the 'secret societies'. Chinese students in Peking (1919) used the anarchist tactic of the 'General Strike' during the May 4



who pretended to be sages and were worshipped by simple people. Later generations, they said, tried to turn Confucius into a saint and insisted that his every word be treated as law without regard to changing times and events.

In 1911, the year of revolution, the anarchists supported Sun Yat-sen and his Kuomintang since it was anti-Manchu and hence anti-authority. They held that social reform had to accompany political change if it was to be meaningful. The reason for the corruption in the government was due to the corruption of Chinese society. China must build a new morality attuned to the new society that would be created.

When offered participation in Sun's Kuomintang government, the anarchists refused. Their philosopher, Shih Fu, criticized Chang Chi, a member of an anarchist society, for getting himself elected to parliament. In 1913 Chang became parliamentary president of China. Shih

movement and effectively brought the central government to its knees within ten days.

The anarchists oppose militaristic solutions to social problems although they place no limits on the means which may be used to strike down the enemies of freedom and equality. Hsin Shih-chi writes: 'Militarism is that by which the strong sacrifice the lives and money of others in order to preserve their own power and that of the state. Thus it is unfair and should be eliminated. Revolutionary assassination, on the other hand, is the sacrifice of the individual to eliminate the enemy of humanity.'

After 20 years the Chinese Communist Republic is secreting, almost naturally, a superabundant and omnipresent bureaucracy which resembles the Russian bureaucracy. There is a growing danger that new political or technical elites may crystallize, monopolize power and behave as if they were a new bourgeoisie. The mere fact that they

were once revolutionaries will not shield the Chinese administrators from being corrupted by power.

The Chinese revolution was based upon the idea that 'to rebel is justified'. The Chinese anarchists do not believe that the right to rebellion disappears after the victory of the revolution, although they would deny reactionaries the right to restore old forms of power. Mao and some of the others would like to institutionalize disobedience of superior authorities and erect a permanent barrier against the men in power.

Here is the daring innovation of the Cultural Revolution. To be able to criticize a Communist leader in power without immediately being accused of having attacked the Party itself is unique in the Communist movement and constitutes a disturbing innovation in the eyes of many Communists. But this is exactly what has happened in China. Liu Shao-chi, leader of the Communist Party apparatus, has been criticized in *Remin Ribao* and *The Peking Review* for taking the capitalist road back to semi-colonial, semi-feudal society. 'This is the bourgeois reactionary line pursued by Ch'en Tu-hsiu.' One of Liu Shao-chi's crimes consists in publishing the statement: 'A Communist must obey everything which has been adopted and fixed by the majority, by the higher ranks or by the Central Committee of the Party. He must obey even what is incorrect. At this very moment it is particularly important to observe discipline, to obey the higher ranks and the Central Committee, whether they be right or wrong. When truth is on the side of the minority and the majority supports what is incorrect, the minority must nevertheless obey the majority in everything. . . . To submit to the organization, to the majority and the higher ranks, all this is absolute and unconditional.'

The victories of 1948-49 were won over Chiang Kai-shek by the People's Liberation Army, not the Chinese Communist Party. After the war, anarchist units dissolved into local communities and anarchist influence in political matters vanished.

The anarchists are not an organized party in China, but their ideas wield great influence. The head of the Communist Party will soon be deposed and the continuity of government will be broken by bringing in a new National Assembly without asking for the consent of the old one. Leninist ideas of submission to authority and iron party discipline have been brought in question and even the notion of tutelage for the masses is being juggled and changed. The results of the great Cultural Revolution have already startled observers in the West who are used to looking for purges of counter-revolutionary anti-party forces. But landlords and capitalists were long ago ejected from the social structures of New China and what we see now is another social revolution from the left, this time against the Party for having become an establishment. The anarchists are challenging the authoritarian structure of the Party from within and are raising hell with the bureaucrats and their settled ways.

FRED HOFFMAN.

Reprinted with kind permission of the Editors of 'Provo', Los Angeles.

## ANARCHY 84

ON SALE NEXT WEEK  
DISCUSSES

## POVERTY

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



# ENGLISH LOAM AND FOAM

A TREE ON FIRE by Alan Sillitoe. Published by Macmillan. 30/-.

THERE are some—The Beatles, John Berger, Alan Sillitoe—I find are just too good. 'You had to go yourself, right in, right down through the eye of a needle, and into many mansions, queer street and rotten row, shit creek and blind alley'.

Alan Sillitoe, he grewed in the rain-grit of raughting Radford, Nottingham. Trained at the Raleigh. Arthur Seaton of a Monday, ten years older, in the Sahara with the FLN. 'Calmly manipulating trigger and bolt as if on piecemeal at his old job in the engineering factory, still as always keeping up the quality of articles sent out.' Shoot them down and know they have mothers. Uproot with energy, intelligence and imagination sufficient to be sad at the obscenity not only of napalm. No: it takes weeks for flame to retreat from a tree yet it never totally destroys it. Obscene it is to destroy engines, machinery made with precision and effort. Not care. That does not matter. Precision. To know when the patrol comes searching that your psyche is as tangible as your body. Sense to see—'Moslem youths marching down the Tangier Boulevard, shouting for independence in Algeria, who would never be like their fathers because they too hoped the smoke flags of industry might one day drift over olive-groves and carob farms, when they would also wear the ratchet faces until all nobility and peace froze out of them.'

This is not Camus, but a very English book. As subtle and as cruel as a cat. 'Tis the long march and the deep search. We laid an empire down: we can tear it up, not the branches but the root. 'Nothing ever came of going into the desert to avoid your fellowmen. You go there to find them, find yourself, by seeking one to find many. Revolutions are initiated by those who, in order to

inspire themselves, have to prove to the wretched of the earth that they, too, can be inspired. It is a search by those who want to prove to themselves and the world that they are not spiritually dead, but such effort changes everything. In their crude simplicity they may not see themselves as the makers of a new world, because such striving begins without philosophy, and there is no name in the beginning for what is to become a prime mover of people.'

He's very good, is Mr. Sillitoe. 'High all the time on the powders of my own brain, the tadpole blood of my veins.' Critics reviewing *A Tree on Fire* were split. Half said no good is Sillitoe when he writes of Algeria and the FLN. No good, the others wrote, when he describes the artist. It is good is this book. Both the Algeria part and the artist—subtle, independent and perverse. The artist—when they tell him to do y hoping he does the opposite: K they're wrong. No idea how subtle. The artist he'll do x. Don't bet on it. The artist in *A Tree on Fire*, he makes it. Fashion. A rich man, investing £5,000 in industrial shares and using the dividends to finance gifts to trouble-makers. Invest in the system to destroy it.

In England invest. Don't fight. Yet. Why, why, it makes me so sick, do we flatter our rulers so. The thoughts of chairman what is his name? Let 'em be, like last year's fallen star. Where's the Dave Clark Five—forgot. Don't criticise so. Don't waste energy fighting the brothers H. Don't fight 'em—yet. Make love not war. A tribal bond against the world. A mansion in Weybridge. Live on an ice floe. When it melts find another. Take the Rambler American car. Big house: kids, wife, mistress, mad brother, mates: a tribe in a laager of caravans around Ye Villa Back-to-Back: stenguns under the garage floor and grease them every week, a couple of Land-Rovers and stores of food and petrol

and radio transceivers. 'How can you start here? You can't. It'll be so desperate though when it does start, that you'll need the training grounds of Algeria to stand any chance at all.' One hundred Vietnams, and an artist's palate. Green is for envy, the angel with death and Lincolnshire grass and the leaves on the tree.

RAY GOSLING.

## INSURRECTION

SEVERAL anarchists will no doubt have heard somewhere before, and have dealt with some of the views expressed in Peter Cadogan's article 'Insurrection in England' (9.12.67); but when such views are aired so prominently in FREEDOM they cannot be allowed to pass uncriticised, even if many of the objections to them may seem obvious.

In the first place, Cadogan does not define 'insurrection'—whether he means a popular revolution, or the 'art of insurrection' as exercised in, for example, the Bolshevik coup d'etat, or any kind of rising, in general, 'agin the government'. On the whole he seems to employ the term rather vaguely, but in any case it can hardly be described as a 'forgotten word', at least in revolutionary circles, nor I think in English (or any other country's) politics. Of course, as he says, insurrection is not an un-English subject; it exists as a threat or a hope, according to which side you're on, in any state. Its potential, varying with economic, social and political circumstances, was present in England much more constantly and for much longer than Cadogan's sparse examples might suggest, although it clearly did become more prominent at certain times.

I shall refrain from picking academic quarrels with the background part of the

article, although tempted by some of the more unhistorical assertions, by the selection of 1647-48 as England's model for insurrection, and by the date of c.1649 as the beginning of prime-ministerial government. But a word of dissent is demanded by the statement that 'It is much more important for us to know [does he know?] what happened in England in 1648 than . . . what did or did not happen in Petrograd in 1917'. Surely the division of history into national compartments, each exclusively relevant unto itself, is artificial and misleading, adopting the establishment prejudices of orthodox text books; surely the stage of historical development, industrialisation, class conflict and consciousness, and revolutionary ideology in Petrograd in 1917, as well as the potential and actual development of the revolution, bring it much more vitally close to us than the dim and distant New Model Army of 1648. By all means let us study both, but in their separate historical contexts.

Cadogan's philosophy of history becomes clearer when he considers a selection of revolutions—English, American, French and Russian—and decides that in each case war made them happen. This over-simplification leaves large questions un-answered. Why did the wars happen? Why have so many wars not brought revolutions? How and why were the revolutions different? etc. Similarly the army of the revolution is described as acting by and for itself, and later stifling opposition to its own regime, with no mention of any class composing, directing and shaping the attitudes of the army, nor of divisions within it, nor of the cases where it did not head post-revolutionary administration. The trouble with Cadogan's analysis is that he confines it to the military-political superstructure, ignoring basic social and economic factors, and this glaring fault inevitably distorts his view of contemporary society. The currents of revolutionary thought seem to have passed him by; or is his rejection of them so complete and confident that he does not think them worth even mentioning?

Without pointing to all the contradictions in Cadogan's survey of the

present and of future prospects, one or two points must be taken up, e.g., 'No Revolution can ever achieve ultimate success in a caste-ridden society, and our century is the first in which that condition is possible'. Does he really believe there are class divisions in modern Britain? Any student of elementary sociology (which here, as usual, states the obvious) could tell him different. Even if there are a million people around who would not hitherto have got past the elementary stage of their education, there are many more who still do not, precisely because the system does not permit otherwise. And this one million, apart from a few alienated individuals, are hardly likely to destroy a system which will give them key positions after training them in its service. Even if they were revolutionary, we are not told on what terms they will lead or guide the other 50 millions.

Who are the 'we' who 'must take up the challenge'? And how are we to do it? It seems we are to construct a heterogeneous alliance of extremely divergent groups—professional people, the young, the old, coloured and homeless groups and small businessmen. (Would it be hopelessly naive and outdated to ask 'What about the workers?') This motley collection will presumably proceed to organise an insurrection, which Cadogan seems to visualise very much on the lines of a Committee of 100 demo. We must not be put off by the prospect of 'marginal violence', we must not be deterred or intimidated by the knowledge that some unruly elements will be disobedient enough to ignore the non-violent briefing which will no doubt be issued on the eve of the great Revolution. We can go on containing these elements; perhaps by restricting participation mainly to those on the Committee's National Mailing List who have treated the problem in such depth as has the National Secretary. And thus we will lay the foundations of a free non-violent society.

Unless we become irrelevant in the course of a people's revolution, how can such a society possibly result, instead of a further phase of elitism with Cadogan for Prime Minister?

E. A. SMITH.

# FREEDOM—WHY NOT?

Published by Essex and East Herts Federation, 9 Brook Road, Tiptree, Essex

And what shall it be, as I told thee before, save that men shall be determined to be free; yea free as thou wouldst have them, when thine hopes rise the highest, and thou art not thinking of the king's uncles, and poll-groat bailiffs, and the villainage of Essex, but the end of all, when men shall have the fruits of the earth of their toil thereon, without money and without price. . . . ('The Dream of John Ball' by William Morris)

Things cannot go well in England, nor ever will, until everything shall be in common. . . . (John Ball, 1381)

WHAT KIND SOCIETY DO WE LIVE IN TODAY? Is it 'for the best in the best of all possible worlds'? Does it function in the interests of the vast majority of the people? Is it a 'free' society? Indeed, what is it called? And what is it really like? These are a few of the questions I shall attempt—very briefly—to answer in this short essay.

Generally, the system of society in which we live is called capitalism. This is not a dirty word or term of abuse, although it has been used as such by Communists and others. Capitalism is world-wide; it embraces every country. Briefly, it is a social system wherein the means and factors of wealth production and distribution (i.e., the land, factories, transportation, etc.) take the form of capital, and are owned privately by individuals or the state to the exclusion of the majority of the population. And capital is nothing more nor less than wealth used to create more wealth through the legal exploitation of large numbers of wage and salary earners, most of whom own little or nothing except their ability to work for an employer. In such a society as ours, almost everything is produced for exchange, for sale with a view to profit. In the main, things are not manufactured, and services not rendered, solely because people desire or need them. If, like millions of people throughout the world, you have insufficient money to buy, say, food or fuel, you will almost certainly have to go without. Even in advanced capitalist countries like Britain or the United States, millions of people suffer from want and deprivation; some are, of course, extremely wealthy and others not actually living in abject poverty usually find it difficult to 'make ends meet' most of the time. The

majority of us in Britain come within this category. At the same time, however, many of our so-called needs are artificially created by advertising. I shall return to this later.

Modern capitalism is in many ways very different from the *laissez-faire*, every-man-for-himself capitalism of the last century. Many small businessmen and shopkeepers have been crushed or bought out by vast trusts and combines. Competition has largely given way to prearranged varieties of the same. In very many countries the state has now become the largest and most powerful employer. As workers and consumers we have very little choice. This, indeed, is the much-vaunted freedom that we are continually called upon to preserve and defend!

In the second half of the twentieth century man has reached a remarkable degree of mastery over nature, and yet he is not in control of the very forces he has created.

### ALIENATED

The increasing concentration of ownership and control has tended to restrict individual initiative and responsibility. It has weakened the 'self' and has stifled individuality and creativity. For the rationality of the system in its technical aspects is accompanied by increasing irrationality and irresponsibility in its social aspects. I need not detail the terrible waste, destruction, slaughter and misery brought about by the last two world wars, or the bestialities of the conflict in Vietnam, or the physical and mental suffering caused by racial prejudice and discrimination. War and racism are only two, albeit extreme, manifestations of increasing irrationality in the world today. Another is alienation.

Originally, alienation meant insanity. Nowadays, it means estrangement or loss. It is, however, a useful word to describe certain aspects of what I—and many others—consider is a sick society.

Today, then, man has become alienated and estranged from his means of livelihood, from the very things he has produced and from his fellow-man; indeed, even from himself. He has become self-estranged. Alienation in production has led to individual powerlessness and a general feeling of isolation and frustration. In most firms the worker has become a mere cog in a vast impersonal machine. Alienation is almost complete, almost total, whether we live in the so-

called private enterprise capitalism of the West or the spurious 'socialism' or 'communism' (i.e., state-capitalism) of the East. And it makes precious little difference to you or I whether we live in a 'democratic' country like, say, Britain or Holland, or a 'totalitarian' one like Poland or Yugoslavia. This alienation and domination naturally weighs most heavily on the workers. They have for the most part become economic atoms, dancing to the tune of atomistic managements and governments.

Capitalism has completely changed man's attitude to work. It has destroyed craftsmanship and a joy in work. The last thing that most of us want to do is to get up in the morning and go to 'work'. Of course, what we really mean is not work at all: it is employment. Generally, our jobs are repetitive, uninteresting and, from our point of view, purposeless. We have little or no control over what we do or what we produce. The division of labour is now so extreme that none of us ever make a complete article. In fact, in many cases, factory workers often never see the finished product. I am not, however, suggesting a return to the hand-loom or the potter's wheel; but I do say that our work should be as varied as possible, that it should be worth doing, that it should be done in the very best possible conditions, and that it should be controlled and determined by the producers (i.e. society) themselves. Under such conditions it would lose its stigma.

### BUREAUCRACY

An important aspect of modern society is bureaucratisation. Capitalism is becoming more and more bureaucratic every day. This applies to both state and non-state institutions. Indeed, the state has become increasingly powerful in all countries. Here in Britain, for example, the state, national and local, accounts for over 40% of the Gross National Product and employs more than 25% of the country's labour force. Although it appears to be less overtly coercive and repressive, it in fact pervades our lives to a far greater degree than ever before. Its tentacles spread far and wide. Moreover, successive governments, both Tory and Labour, have given greater and greater power to the police, curtailing individual freedom.

Modern society is largely organised by bureaucrats. And bureaucrats are, or at least are supposed to be, specialists in the

administration of things and men. The bureaucrat's relationship to people is one of complete, or almost complete, alienation. It is entirely—or, again, almost entirely—impersonal. This is not due to some inherent wickedness of the bureaucrat (although he is often an authoritarian type), but is a symptom of a sick society.

Bureaucratisation affects almost all organisation. Political parties, many Trade Unions, even Friendly Societies and motoring organisations, are run by 'professional' manipulators and specialists. There is very little democracy as the word is generally understood in any of them today. And the last thing that the bureaucrats and manipulators want is for the mass of the people to run their own affairs in their own interest. That would be anarchy!

### CONDITIONED

Alienation also permeates social and individual consumption. For in our society, unlike all former ones, we acquire almost everything we possess through the medium of money. We are, of course, so conditioned that we take this for granted. But actually this is a most curious way of acquiring the things we want. If a person has sufficient money he can purchase anything he wants—whether he has worked for that money or not. Not only that, but quite often (particularly if we are so-called middle-class) we acquire things in order to just have them, because it is 'the thing' status-wise. We are continuously being conditioned through advertising into wanting a new car, TV set, washing machine or suite of furniture every couple of years or so, not because the new is better than what we already have (it usually isn't!) but because we are pressurised thus. Moreover, we mortgage our wages and salaries up to the hilt through hire purchase agreements just to get them. Truly, we have become slaves of the admen.

Today, then, we consume as we produce, without any concrete relatedness to the objects to which we deal. All this results in a situation where we are never really satisfied, never really happy or contented. This, naturally, pleases the manufacturers. Indeed, they encourage it. It sustains and increases their profits. Our craving for consumption has lost all connection with our real needs. For consumption has become not a means to greater individual and social happiness, but an end in itself. It has become merely compulsive. This, moreover, has affected our whole lives, our whole existence, our whole being. It has increased our passivity. Many of us still have hobbies and interests, but to a large extent, compared with the past, we have become largely 'watchers' and 'listeners' rather than 'doers'. We leave the doing to professionals.

Again, community life and a feeling

of comradeship—a feeling of 'belonging'—particularly in cities, has declined. The centres of many of our large cities such as London or Glasgow are completely dead (except for a few theatre areas and 'red light' districts) after 7 p.m. And such suburban dormitories as Ilford or Orpington are hardly less so. Of our present dilemma, E. A. Gutkind suggests that 'Life is not a shuttle-service between the sleeping-berth in a suburban desert and the work-place in a factory or office. The resignation with which innumerable people tolerate that their life is reduced to this miserable dullness and drudgery is pathetic—but excusable. Our civilisation has not understood to free the creative impulses and the imaginative spontaneity in the common run of men. It has let them become stunted. It has cultivated more than anything else a superficial familiarity with things, and the lop-sided knowledge of experts. Our most cherished ambition is to save time. But we have no clear idea what to do with it when we have saved it. The docile acceptance of the shuttle-service between home and work as the dominating factor of life is another form of escapism avoiding the responsibility to think for ourselves, and to experience ever anew what life in the fullness of spiritual re-creation and in unending stream of transformation and manifoldness can be. The conservatism of humanity is its curse.' (*The Expanding Environment*, Freedom Press.)

### LIBERATION

Unfortunately, however, most people are hardly aware of the prevailing alienation, domination and unfreedom of modern capitalist society. They do not really know what is going on in the world around them. They do not seem to realise that they are no longer real people but mere numbers or signatures on an ever-increasing pile of forms in an ever-increasing stack of files. Today, it is almost impossible to do anything without licences, permits or signatures on little bits of paper (in triplicate, of course!), entailing endless wearing down by waiting in anonymous rooms, or for answers to letters only to be passed on to someone else. But liberation from the present state of affairs is, in my view, still possible if we really want it and are prepared to struggle for it. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has not yet arrived—quite! Freedom and responsibility, a free society, is still within our grasp.

The anarchists do not put our trust in politicians, in political parties, in leaders or anyone else for that matter. We trust only ourselves. I have no intention here of listing the promises made by political leaders and aspiring leaders. Memories are short, but most readers will agree that promises are made to be broken

Continued on page 5



# An Irish Kropotkin

THE LIFE OF MICHEAL DAVITT by F. Sheehy Skeffington. Published by MacGibbon & Kee. 38/-.

MICHEAL DAVITT IS PERHAPS the most attractive human being in all Irish history. He has a great deal of competition for that real honour, notably from Robert Emmet and John Middleton Singer, and Irish history is basically the attempt of the Irish to stop the British ruling class from stealing from them. He was born in a Famine year, 1846, in the county Mayo in the far west of Ireland, where hunger and its fiendish ally typhus were worse than in most other parts of Ireland, and the Famine 1845-49, the Great Hunger as we Irish call it, was the worst natural calamity in Modern European history.

You know how people talk about bacon and eggs and fish and chips; well, in the world that Davitt was born into, people talk about potatoes and touch. What this meant was that when things were not too bad (oh not during the Famine itself, there was no food at all then for anybody!), if one family in the village had a bit of meat they always allowed the others to bring their potatoes and to put them into the saucepan next to the meat to give them a bit of flavour.

When Davitt was six years old, in 1852, his family moved to Lancashire, where, when he was only eleven, he lost his right arm while working in a mill. He was made to do a job that the law said should not be done by anyone under 16, when his arm caught in a machine and was so badly mangled that it had to be amputated.

Yet this accident got him his education for, without his arm, he was of little or no use to the factory owner. Yet the fee paid was higher than they charge at Eton.

Later he joined the Fenians, a secret terrorist organization, pledged to the ending of British rule in Ireland. When he was 24, in 1870, he was sentenced to a term of 15 years hard labour in Dartmoor. Now the grandeur of Micheal Davitt's mind and decency of soul and courtesy of his heart begin to show themselves.

A letter was produced in court written by him to a comrade in the movement agreeing to his killing a third Fenian, who the second one, but nobody else, believed to be a traitor. It was this letter that got Davitt sent down for 15 years hard labour, the maximum sentence in the power of the judge to give. What the reality was was this, but if he had said so in court his comrade in the movement would be caught and sent to prison too, so Davitt remained silent. His letter to his comrade was meant to be, and was successful in being, a delaying agent. He pretended to agree with the young man in theory but asked him to wait until he had gotten permission from the Grand Council of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. If he had disagreed with the idea of the shooting outright, he was afraid his comrade would go ahead on his own. He used the time gained in getting the intended victim out of the way. This is a recorded fact of history

and it can be proved, as you can prove that Sacco was a friend of Vanzetti.

Also in the dock alongside Davitt on that cold London November morning in 1870, there stood another prisoner whose name was Wilson. He was not a Fenian at all really, he was a fellow-traveller, but he got caught. Davitt, from the dock, asked the judge to add this man's sentence to his own. This must be the one time that any judge anywhere, ever received such a request.

The grim determination of the British Government to hold on to Ireland at all costs is illustrated by the desperate cruelty meted out to anyone challenging that right. It is hard to understand today when the political atmosphere is so different. But at the time, it is only 98 years ago, the mad tide of Imperial ruthlessness was sweeping the Country.

So in Dartmoor Davitt was treated far more cruelly than the other prisoners. The British penal system has never recognized the existence of political prisoners. In other countries, more backward (in British opinion) than England, political prisoners are treated more humanely than 'criminals'. In Dartmoor, however, in the 19th century, it was the other way round. The human, non-religious holiness of Micheal Davitt's character put up the backs of the bullies in the prison service and equally of some of the gangster-type convicts in the Moor.

He had to do the same work as men with two arms. He did not receive the same minor privileges as another one-armed convict. He had to take his exercise alone, the others could do so with a companion. During the whole seven years and seven months that he was in prison the first time, he was not allowed a visitor. The treatment of Kropotkin



Micheal Davitt

in a Czarist prison at about the same time was considerably more civilized.

After Gladstone, now Prime Minister, made the Kilmainham Treaty with Parnell, Davitt was released on ticket-of-leave in 1877, he was now 31. This is the beginning of the real work of his life, the founding of the Land League, which, in 30 years, changed Ireland from the last feudal society in the Western world to a land of small peasant proprietors. Because of this his work for Ireland was more successful than that of any Irish patriot until the establishment of the Irish Free State in 1922. Strongbow was at last using his return ticket.

But Davitt himself dreamed of turning Ireland into a nation of kibbutzim. He would have been positively delighted that anyone would use this word while talking about his work, for he was deeply interested in Zionism as early as during the life-time of Theodore Hertzl. He was even more deeply involved in the struggle

of the working classes in Britain, and while in the United States he championed the cause of the Negro. These factual statements don't really convey a true portrait of him. He is indeed a rare bird, unfortunately for the world. He had the same kind of heart as Vanzetti, the balance of Kropotkin and a mind almost the equal of Rosa Luxemburg.

The generous amount of space given me by your editor is running out. Read the book for yourselves.

A word about the author. He was a sort of minor Bernard Shaw. But you never know what he might have developed into, for he was put up against a wall and shot during the Easter Rising. He was unarmed as he was a professional pacifist. He was watching and helping the wounded of both sides. All his public statements, whether written or oral, were completely against using force to gain freedom for Ireland. The man who gave the order was only a captain, there was no question of a court martial; in the British Army, in any army for that matter, a captain and certainly not a captain alone, is never allowed to preside at a court martial. The officer was a pro-British Irishman. He was sent to Broadmoor, but after a few years he was released and lived on in Canada until 1965. Two other journalists were also shot with F. Sheehy Skeffington. His son is today a senator of the Irish Republic.

Someone once called Sheehy Skeffington a crank, which indeed he was. To which he made the perpetual reply—yes I know, he said humbly, but you know a crank is a small tool which if inserted in the right place will cause a revolution.

There is no statue to Micheal Davitt anywhere in Ireland; unlike James Connolly he is not on a postage stamp. But in the little cabins of the west he means more to people than even John Fitzgerald Kennedy. But, ironies of ironies, one of his sons is or was, if not a ruthless, then a very strict judge, in an independent Ireland.

PAUL POTTS.

## FREEDOM—WHY NOT?

Continued from page 4

anyway. Politicians aspire for power over us, and the plums of office. They are not in the game for our benefit, whatever they might say. I am not suggesting that the Tories are worse than the Labourites, or that the Liberals (or the Communists) are worse than the others. They are all very much the same. When in power they all run the system (or let it run them) in very much the same way. All parties have increased the power of the state; indeed, both the Labour and Communist Parties have, as their avowed aim, the state ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange. This is the complete negation of freedom, of a free and classless society.

How, then, can we achieve a free society? In fact, what kind of society do anarchists and libertarian socialists want? Not all anarchists are in complete agreement on either of these questions. I shall, therefore, only mention my own views and attitude towards a free or freer society and the way, or ways, that I think it may be brought about. My views generally coincide with those of many other anarchists whom I know in East Anglia. Although an optimist, I am far from certain that I shall ever see the kind of society that I want.

As I have already indicated most people accept, with perhaps a few reservations, the world as it is. But for some time now there has been a certain ferment, particularly among many younger people. About ten years ago, opposition to 'The Bomb' began to develop. First, we had the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament whose aims were extremely limited; then the Committee of 100, whose aims were somewhat wider. Both these organisations tended to grapple with effects rather than causes—and both were infiltrated by political pressure groups. Fortunately, however, some of their members and supporters began to question not only the manufacture and use of thermonuclear weapons, not just the war in Vietnam, but war itself, the causes of war, and the complete futility and inhumanity of our whole system. Some of them became anarchists and libertarian socialists; no doubt others will do likewise. I hope so.

### FLOWER POWER

The last two or three years have seen the emergence of a number of new 'movements', all rejecting in varying degrees the norms and 'values' of the Establishment.

Early in 1965 a Dutch group began publishing a journal called *Provo*. Amsterdam youth, bored and fed up with the conventions of bourgeois society, began to be attracted to Provo ideas in increasing numbers. Smoke bombs thrown into the Parliament building, harassment of, and attacks on, the police, together with such 'creative' vandalism as the painting of public buildings that had been left undecorated for years, were all as-

pects of Provo activity. In their war on traffic chaos the Amsterdam Provos provided, quite freely, white bicycles for anyone wanting transportation within the city. Indeed, spontaneous activity to mock established institutions has been a Provo way of life. When forced to face the power of the bureaucracy, Provos use the bureaucracy's own red tape to ensnarl it causing complete confusion. They literally carry out every order to absurd lengths; they demand that all rules and regulations be applied that can be applied, and they exhaust all possible appeals. When faced with the military call-up board's rule that the board be kept informed of changes of address and conditions, Provos send daily postcards and long letters to the authorities providing minute details. A significant number of such people soon tie a bureaucracy in knots!

Largely without leaders, the Provos have become world-famous (or notorious) and their movement has spread to America and elsewhere. Unfortunately, however, without any positive anarchist or libertarian alternative to offer in place of the very society that they abhor, their movement will probably wither and die—if it has not already begun to do so.

Far more bizarre is the Hippy or Flower Power movement. This appears to have originated in San Francisco with the Pretty People. Its adherents are noted for their colourful clothes, long hair, flowers, bells, and to some extent the taking of soft drugs. It is largely a revival of the Aesthetic Movement of the nineteenth century, its greatest exponent being Oscar Wilde. Hippy gatherings have a distinctive pre-Raphaelite flavour. The Hippies and Flower Power People are in gentle—very gentle!—revolt against the ugly conformism of modern capitalist society and the estrangement of the individual. They are, however, almost entirely a consumer group: they are not particularly interested in the means of production and who control them. They are not concerned with theories of the class war, or with radical change, but with that rather uncertain quantity, 'love'. With the Beatles they claim that 'All You Need Is Love'. They have borrowed, together with the Young Liberals, that admirable anarchist slogan 'Make Love, Not War' without, unfortunately, really understanding its implications. According to a BBC TV report by John Morgan, 'They withdraw from protest against Vietnam; they set their face against any role in the Civil Rights movement.' And of them, Manfred Mann says: 'These people are as harmless as they seem, and represent a very gentle rejection of society.'

### DIGGERS

Of somewhat tougher calibre are the Diggers. They are also more practical. They have much to teach 'theoretical' anarchists and so-called scientific socialists; and something to learn as well. The Diggers take their name from an utopian

Christian communist movement that emerged in seventeenth-century England during the Revolution against the Stuart monarchy. Their leader, the 'True Leveler' Gerrald Winstanley, argued that 'When mankind began to buy and sell, then he did fall from his innocence; for then he began to oppress and cozen one another of their creation birthright.' Moreover, 'This buying and selling did bring in, and still does bring in, discontent and wars which have plagued mankind sufficiently for so doing. And the nations of the world will never learn to beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and leave off warring, until this cheating device of buying and selling be cast out among the rubbish of kingly powers' (quoted from *Cromwell and Communism*, by Eduard Bernstein). Winstanley called for a society, 'a commonwealth', where '... there shall be no buying and selling. . . . If any man or family want grain or other provisions, they may go to the storehouse and fetch without money.' All land would be held in common, and all 'officers' of the commonwealth would be elected annually.

The new Diggers, although influenced by the ideas of Winstanley, are an outgrowth of the American Hippy movement. They reject the market economy and denigrate the money system. They give away all useful wealth that they can beg, borrow or steal. They provide free distribution of food to poor kids and the destitute—and with no strings attached. They attempt, where possible, to provide free lodging, and distribute free clothing from their storehouses. In the words of *The Western Socialist* (Boston): 'The Diggers, unlike the "do-gooder" groups, do not offer "alms" to the "deserving" (and to the "undeserving"). They make a point of saying that wherever there is a human need and the means to provide this need, the needy have a right to the wealth. They even go further and indicate that all society must be organised on a basis of the satisfaction of human need without buying and selling. Symbolising their rejection of a money society, they have publicly burnt money and given it a mock funeral. In other ways too, they challenge accepted theories. They make clear that they oppose the implications of "leadership". They insist that they have no leaders, that their actions are based upon an understanding and that leadership is unnecessary where there exists an understanding. On the question of war there also seems to be a realisation that mere demonstrations will not succeed in ending it. As long as a war-producing society exists there will be wars, many contend. They have no brief for the political state; they feel that men should work at tasks that give satisfaction and should not be compelled, in order to survive, to work at meaningless tasks. Finally, they believe that the world, along with everything that is in and on it, should belong to those who

inhabit it.'

Of all the groups that have recently emerged, the Diggers are, from the libertarian point of view, the most refreshing. Even so, they also have their weaknesses and limitations. Their activities are largely 'experimental', rather like the many utopian communities that have come and gone over the years. They are very much a minority; and, as such, have been harassed by the police. Moreover, they have tended to underestimate the powers of the state. But unlike so many 'professional' revolutionaries of the traditional Left, they do attempt to achieve something here and now. They are pointing the way to freedom. And that at least is something.

### FREEDOM

Freedom is not possible in isolation, to be attained by a few individuals in a vast sea of alienation, coercion, domination and unfreedom. Anarchists want freedom for all. The emancipation of one man necessitates the emancipation of all men. It must be the conscious aim of the mass of society. Each person, however, will have to achieve his or her own mental revolution first. This will, in my view, be partly achieved by example and demonstration (by Provos, Diggers, Anarchists and, no doubt, by others yet to come); but it will probably be achieved largely through propaganda and education, followed by democratic (in the real sense of the word) and non-authoritarian organisation. It cannot be brought about 'for the masses' by a 'politically conscious' minority or élite as has been claimed by Communists and the like. The history of China and Russia has more than demonstrated that. A free society cannot be established by political parties or leaders, however sincere. And the suggestion that the emancipation of the working-class will be brought about by the masses getting control (through a political party of course!) of the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, and converting these into an agent of freedom (as is advocated by one political group) is ludicrous in the extreme. If we really want freedom then we must do the job ourselves. We shall have to struggle continuously in every way possible against all the unfreedom of present-day society. We must work for a new society and way of life without war or the threat of war hanging over our heads like the Sword of Damocles; we must aim for a world without want, economic insecurity and deprivation, and without bureaucracies, governments and states.

Anarchists do not want a Utopia or a perfect society. That would be impossible anyway. Nor do we intend to plan or 'organise' society in advance. We leave that to the politicians and professional manipulators. People, once liberated from the trammels of domination and exploitation, will organise their society—quite freely—for themselves.

Freedom, therefore, does not consist in dreams of independence from natural

laws, but in the knowledge of them, and the possibility this gives of systematically making them work towards definite ends. Freedom, therefore, consists in organised control over external nature and ourselves. It necessitates, not imposed discipline, not external authority, but internal authority and confidence in oneself. Real freedom can only mean the attainment of both the collective and individual well-being, the fullest functioning of each individual in relation to every other individual. It can only mean the freedom of men collectively, living together as harmoniously as is humanly possible. For man can never be a law unto himself: that would be the negation of freedom.

Freedom, then, implies the elimination of all forms of alienation, domination and exploitation of man by man. It can only mean the protection of the whole of society against the rapacity of special, dominating interests. Put quite simply, as Alexander Berkman observed in his *ABC of Anarchism* (Freedom Press), freedom '... means that you should be free; that no one should enslave you, boss you, rob you or impose upon you. It means you should be free to do the things you want to do; and that you should not be compelled to do what you don't want to do. It means that you should have a chance to choose the kind of life you want to live, and live it without anybody interfering. It means that the next fellow should have the same freedom as you, that everyone should have the same rights and liberties. It means that all men are brothers, and that they should live like brothers, in peace and harmony.' That would be freedom.

The choice is ours. And only we can make it.

P. NEWELL.



A NEW  
SUBSCRIPTION  
FOR A FRIEND?



# HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL

**HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL, 1914-1943.** By Julius Braunthal, pp. xi + 596. 16 plates. Published by Nelson, 1967. 126s.

IN this massive second volume (see FREEDOM, 24.6.67, G.O.'s review of the first volume), Julius Braunthal completes his definitive history of the Socialist Internationals, taking the story down to the dissolution of the Comintern in 1943. The scope of the work is broader than the title might suggest, since narrating the story of the Internationals inevitably involves describing the complex developments in the various national socialist movements in Europe. As a history of European socialism in the inter-war period, Braunthal's work, in its depth and range, bears comparison with the later volumes of G. D. H. Cole's monumental *History of Socialist Thought*. For this reviewer, the comparison is not all to Braunthal's advantage, the main reason being my preference for the perspective from which Cole wrote. Cole, as he made clear in his concluding volume, was neither a Social Democrat nor a Communist but belonged to that third and sadly attenuated category of Libertarian Socialism. As such, Cole was able—or so it seems to me—to achieve a greater degree of detachment than is apparent in Braunthal's work. Braunthal writes as a committed Social Democrat of the old school and, at various points, this perspective colours his judgment of events. It also leads him to ignore, except in the case of Spain, any manifestation of libertarian socialism—so much so that the formation of the Syndicalist International in 1922 is not given even a passing mention. However, within the limits of his chosen perspective, Braunthal presents a reasonably fair account of events and, one must hasten to add, he is much too competent and conscientious a scholar to gloss over the manifest weaknesses of various Social Democratic movements.

## THE CONFLICT

Braunthal's central theme is, of course, the conflict between Bolshevism and Social Democracy which split the labour movement and destroyed its unity and effectiveness in a period of revolutionary change. The seeds of this split took root in the crisis of August, 1914, when, with a few honourable exceptions, the socialist parties of the belligerent countries proclaimed their duty to national defence and supported their governments in the conduct of the war. The sustaining ideal of the Second International, the belief in the international solidarity of the working classes, was immediately shattered. All the pre-war notions that the proletariat has no fatherland and that, by combined action, the working class movements could prevent a major war or at least bring about its speedy termination, were exposed as no more than hollow verbiage. The strategy, pursued by the socialist parties, aimed at making the workers, in Marx's

phrase, 'the leading class of the nation', achieved its inevitable outcome: the nation took over the workers. Even if they had wanted to, the socialist leaders could not in 1914 have resisted effectively the mighty wave of nationalism that swept over the working classes of the major European countries when war finally broke out. As Alfred Merrheim, the French trade union leader who opposed the war, observed: the workers 'would not have left the job of shooting us to the government; they would have shot us down themselves'.

## ONLY FOUR OPPOSED WAR

Of the ten socialist parties in the eight warring countries, only four refused to give their government moral and political support. These were: the Serbian Social Democrats, the ILP, and the two Russian parties—none of them mass parties. But even among the socialist opponents of the war, there was at the outset only one prominent leader whose aim was something more than the ending of hostilities. This was Lenin, the exiled leader of the Bolsheviks. Rejecting the call for a 'struggle for peace' as mere Sunday-school chatter, he coined the slogan of 'revolutionary defeatism' and proclaimed the idea of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war. He saw the war as providing the great historical chance for a world proletarian revolution and by November, 1914, he was already demanding the creation of a new International as the instrument of this end. The Second International, he argued, had been able to organize the working masses during the period of peace. But it had been undermined by reformism and opportunism and was quite incapable of fulfilling its duty in the new period of war and revolution.

Lenin pressed his ideas on the various left-wing anti-war socialist groups that gathered together at the Zimmerwald Conference of September, 1915, and at two subsequent meetings. But without success, for 'the Zimmerwald movement' remained fundamentally a pacifist and not a revolutionary socialist movement. He began to despair of ever witnessing the decisive struggles of the coming revolution. Then, in the Spring of 1917, the Russian masses, in a spontaneous outburst of anger and despair, overthrew the Tsarist autocracy and provided Lenin with his long-sought opportunity.

The Russian Revolution, it should be emphasized, did not conform to Lenin's theory of revolution. Lenin believed—and in this lies the charge that he was the greatest Marxist heretic of all time—that revolution could not be left to the process of historical evolution but must be consciously striven for, organized and planned by a small, tightly disciplined party of professional revolutionaries. But it was not Lenin's Bolsheviks who made the revolution: the revolution was the work of the Russian people; and when it came it took the Bolsheviks, like everybody else, by surprise. However, having fashioned

his band of professional revolutionaries and subjected them to his indomitable will, Lenin was able, in the chaotic conditions of Russia in 1917, to capture and to hold political power. For this essentially counter-revolutionary purpose, the Bolshevik party proved to be a most effective instrument.

## ORGANISATION

Not surprisingly, Lenin did not view the events in this way. He believed that his theory of revolution and of revolutionary organisation had been thoroughly vindicated and all others falsified. It thus rapidly came to be put forward as the theory which all genuine revolutionaries must needs adopt. On the basis of his success in creating 'the first workers' state', the Communist (Third) International was founded in March, 1919. Constructed on Leninist principles, it was designed to be the instrument to achieve on a world scale what had been realized in Russia—the dictatorship of the proletariat, in practice the dictatorship of the self-styled party of the proletariat. The federal type of organisation of the earlier Internationals was rejected in favour of a unified and centralized body in which the affiliated parties were regarded as member sections, subject to the binding directives of its 'General Staff'—the Executive Committee.

With this new instrument, Lenin worked deliberately to split the European labour movements. Only by splits did he believe that the influence of the reformist socialist leaders of the Second International could be destroyed. He assumed that the European working classes were in a revolutionary mood and that, by attacking and exposing the chauvinists and social traitors who had led them into war, he could rally the workers to support the newly-formed Communist Parties under the direction of the Comintern.

## NEW INTERNATIONAL

At the outset the new International did operate more or less according to Lenin's original conception of it as the instrument of world revolution. In these early years the Bolsheviks were convinced that only a world revolution, and above all a revolution in Germany, could save the Russian Revolution from being crushed through imperialist intervention. They encouraged revolutionary uprisings, wherever possible, in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy and elsewhere. But as each uprising ended in defeat, it became clear that Lenin had misjudged the situation. In the countries of the defeated powers and in Italy, conditions in the immediate post-war period were potentially revolutionary; but the hold of the reformist leaders over the working class movement was too strong to be dislodged. Committed to the parliamentary road to socialism, these leaders failed to make use of the opportunities to introduce radical changes which would destroy the power of the ruling classes. And the splitting tactics of the

Comintern served only to exacerbate the situation. Nenni's later observation on the events in Italy which preceded Mussolini's seizure of power in 1922 holds good for European socialists generally: 'They were not discussing action, they were cataloguing factions. Like the founding fathers of the Church, they argued over details of Holy Writ while their world was collapsing in ruins about them'.

With the failure of Lenin's strategy of world revolution, the Bolsheviks turned, under Stalin's leadership, to the task of building 'Socialism in One Country'. The forces of capitalism in Europe re-established themselves and at the same time the Social Democratic parties succeeded in refashioning their own reformist International—the Labour and Socialist International, launched at Hamburg in 1923. At this juncture there would have been some sense in re-uniting the fractured European labour movement. But all efforts to this end came to nought: the reformist socialist leaders would not countenance any departure from parliamentary democracy even at the expense of achieving their socialist objectives, while the Communists remained convinced that their main immediate task was to oust the Social Democratic leadership which stood between them and control of the mass labour movements.

## ROLE OF COMINTERN

As the 1920s progressed and the vision of immediate world revolution faded, the role of the Comintern was transformed. The more difficult it seemed to Communists to capture power in their own countries, the more firmly were they forced to rally to the Soviet Union. From being internationalist revolutionaries, they were transformed into super-patriots—the only difference between their patriotism and that of the orthodox bourgeois kind being that, for them, not their native countries but Soviet Russia was the holy fatherland. Under Lenin, Russia's interests had been subordinated to the interests of the workers as a whole, as he understood those interests. He regarded the Soviet Union as the vanguard of world revolution and as an organ of the Communist International. Under Stalin's direction, however, Russia's foreign policy was no longer aligned to that of the Communist International: instead the policy of the CI became aligned to that of Soviet Russia, with the result that it was transformed into an instrument of Russian state power.

In this situation the rift between Communism and Social Democracy widened and deepened. It deepened still further in the period 1928-1935 when, abandoning its previous tactic of 'United Front from below'—a tactic designed to separate the rank-and-file Social Democrats from their leaders—the Comintern proclaimed the tactic of 'Class against Class'. According to the new line, Social Democracy no longer represented

the right-wing of the labour movement but was to be seen as the left-wing of the bourgeoisie, as 'social fascism'.

Thus, as European capitalism plunged into economic crisis and the threat of Fascism mounted, the labour movement found itself hopelessly divided. In Germany the end result proved catastrophic. While the Communists continued to preach that the decisive struggle must be directed against the Social Democratic Party and that 'Social fascism' must be overthrown before Hitler's forces could be tackled, the Social Democrats themselves were paralyzed, waiting for Hitler to breach the sacred constitution before they would act. In the event, both parties surrendered to their fate without a struggle.

## POPULAR FRONT AGITATION

It was only after Hitler had consolidated his counter-revolution and had liquidated all sections of the German labour movement that the Comintern revised its assessment of the nature of the Fascist menace. Then followed the period of the Popular Front agitation during which the Communist Parties were prepared to co-operate not only with the erstwhile 'social fascists' but also with 'progressive' bourgeois parties. But, as Braunthal makes clear, the new line from Moscow was not so much a result of the recognition of previous error as a policy which fitted the Russian state's changed interests. Hitler's departure from the Rapallo policy—based on the German-Russian treaty of 1922 under which, incidentally, Russia secretly supplied arms to the counter-revolutionary *Reichswehr*—forced Stalin to seek an alliance with the Western Powers. The French Popular Front which resulted in the Russo-French treaty of 1935 was a calculated manoeuvre on Stalin's part to win the support of the French people for Russia's new policy.

Moscow's new line led to renewed attempts at a rapprochement between the Comintern and the Labour and Socialist International. The leaders of the latter, however, were far too suspicious of Moscow's intentions to respond very positively to these overtures. Disputes within the Social Democratic parties over co-operation with the Communists served only to weaken further the LSI. Its member parties were also divided over the question of how to meet the looming Fascist menace of war—by armed resistance or by appeasement. The Munich Agreement of 1938 found the LSI in complete disarray, its Executive unable to adopt any clear attitude. After Munich, it simply disintegrated, expiring ignominiously in 1940.

## FARCICAL END

The end of the Comintern was to be even more farcical. In August, 1939, Moscow's line once again changed abruptly. Hitler and Stalin concluded their pact to carve up Poland, thereby setting the stage for World War II. Slow off the mark, the Communist Parties of France, Britain and Germany had come out in support of 'the just war in defence of democracy'. Called back into line, they switched to opposing 'the unjust war of rival imperialisms'. This line lasted down to June 22, 1941, during which period the Communist Parties acted as faithful instruments of Hitler's psychological warfare, campaigning for a negotiated peace. The German invasion of Russia soon altered that. The Communist fatherland was now in peril and overnight 'the imperialist war' became a peoples' war to the death against Fascism. Communists could now safely combine their native patriotism with their Communist patriotism.

The wave of pro-Soviet enthusiasm that followed the welcoming of 'Uncle Joe' as an ally of the Western Powers gave a great boost to Communist Parties. But in May, 1943, Stalin decided that the Comintern had become an embarrassment to his new allies. He ordered its dissolution 'to expose the lie' that Communist Parties acted on orders from Moscow and not in the interests of their own peoples. But, of course, as Braunthal observes, 'the dissolution of the Communist International was irrelevant as regards the relations of the individual Communist Parties with Moscow. They remained as they had always been—faithful, reliable, devoted servants of the Soviet Union, ready to carry out any duty which might seem to serve its interests, even to the point of self-destruction. The Communist Parties, accustomed as they were to submit to Moscow's decisions without question, allowed Stalin to throw away the heritage of Lenin with as much indifference as if it had been the dissolution of a workers' chess club. No tears were shed over the grave of Lenin's creation'.

# Isolated and Crushed

**THE Hungarian Workers' Revolution,** a Syndicalist Workers' Federation pamphlet of 17 pages,\* is a good introduction to the story of the uprising of the Hungarian people in the autumn of 1956. It was, as the pamphlet shows, more than an uprising, for it was revolutionary in content.

The press at the time were, of course, full of the details of the fighting, but even these reports contained news of the revolutionary change which was taking place in the country. The students demonstrated in Budapest and their demands, which were drawn up in a 14 point manifesto, although not revolutionary, would, if carried out, have meant the end to Matyas Radosi's reign of tyranny over the Hungarian people. The students demanded a change of party leadership, a new government under Imre Nagy, a former premier who had been expelled from the Party for deviationism, withdrawal of Soviet troops, free elections with other parties taking part, and freedom of speech and of the press. However, it soon became clear that the only thing that kept the regime in power was the Soviet troops.

What had started as demands for reforms soon became a revolution. 'The Revolution spread like a bush fire across the length and breadth of Hungary. In Magyarovar, where the AVH (State Security Police) machine-gunned a de-

monstration of 5,000 men, women and children, massacring more than 80 people, the people took terrible revenge, lynching all the officers who survived the battle which followed.'

As in the Russian February Revolution, the Hungarian troops sided with the people and even a large number of Soviet troops joined them in the revolt.

'Revolutionary committees of delegates elected by factories and mines, colleges and military units, took over the administration of almost every town in Hungary. From some, freedom radio stations broadcast caustic comments on the political manoeuvrings in Budapest. Gyor radio described Nagy as a "tool of the Communists" and Miskolc radio urged

the Budapest students to disregard Government exhortations to give up their arms.'

For eight years Hungarian workers had been organised in State-controlled trade unions, yet as soon as the revolt started, these same workers were playing their part and had formed their own councils of delegates. These were their own organisations and they linked up with other councils, first in the same industry, then throughout a district and finally on a national basis.

The workshop committees did more than organise units of the Freedom Fighters. They organised essential supplies. Miners dug coal for hospitals and workers' homes, bakeries and flour mills



\*Direct Action Pamphlets No. 2, second edition, revised. 6d.



Dear Sir,  
Not only do you refuse my answer to Arthur Moyses's unwarranted, unresearched, vindictive and totally inaccurate attack on Indica but now you publish a further attack by Arthur Moyses's publishers who, as far as I know, have never even visited Indica. Dave and Tina Cunniffe are laying down the most sickening form of self-congratulatory bullshit by saying that Indica chooses not to stock their publication "because they are harmful and irresponsible". We have NEVER chosen not to deal with them. In the same way as I stocked their publications when I managed Better-Books' avant-garde department, I wrote to them twice when I opened Indica requesting copies of their books to stock here. I received no reply, nor had I heard of or seen them since and naturally assumed that their small press was dead.

I notice in the same issue as Dave and Tina attack Indica (as usual with inaccurate facts) Arthur Moyses gives a beautiful review of Tina's latest book, what a beautiful love-hate relationship! Arthur loves Dave and Tina because they don't question why he has grown old and fat and done NOTHING to change the world but TALK, and Dave and Tina love Arthur because they are preparing to sit back, live vicariously from other people's action in the form of little mags and correspondence, and also do NOTHING but talk. Arthur must be a great inspiration. The whole little clique can then criticise anything and anyone that does not conform with their rigid adolescent way of life where protest means writing 'Fuck' on the wall and justifying it with high-minded principles.

Trendy, lucrative Indica still sells *International Times*, (the comic they did not name in their letter) and would maintain that *IT* has done more to change things in Britain in the last year than Screeches Publications has done in the last three, both starting equally with no money. You will also find FREEDOM in Indica, still breathing the sour and tainted air to quote from lovable Arthur Moyses. The *Golden Convolutus* case was years ago, baby; if that's all you're going to do then you're history and rightly so.

(Indica.) MILES.  
Two comments: 1. We did print a long (but interesting) letter from Indica's manager (in preference to Miles's contribution) which put Indica's case with force and charm. 2. He writes 'bullshit' and 'fuck' forgetting that *International Times* is afraid to print these (in this case) misused words.  
We like to acknowledge other letters—but the correspondence is now closed.—EDITORS.

In Peace News  
this week:

Interview with SATISH KUMAR: 'Revolution in India'. Australia and the Vietnam War by ROBIN GOLLAN. ROBERT HURNITT on Lyndon Johnson—'The triumph of Uriah Heap'. Price 1/- from Newsagents or Housmans, 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

PRESS FUND

FINANCIAL STATEMENT	
Estimated Expenses:	
3 weeks at £90:	£270
Income: Sales and Subs.:	£302
SURPLUS: £32	
Northem: E.G. 14/-; Anglesey: G.B. 9/11;	
Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; J.L.* 3/-;	
Los Gatos, Calif.: C.M. 10/-; Oxford:	
Anon* 5/-; Sheffield: Anon £2/2/-; Man-	
chester: M.S. 5/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.*	
10/-; Swansea: J.R. 2/6; Calgary: D.J. £1;	
Winchester: E. £2; London, S.W.18: J.P.	
10/-; Edinburgh: K.B. 5/-; Washington:	
W.M. £2; St. Cloud, Minn.: M.A. £1/18/4;	
Newcastle-upon-Tyne: B.P. 9/-.	
TOTAL:	£13 5 9
Previously Acknowledged:	£36 19 1
1968 Total to Date:	£50 4 10
Balance B/F Surplus:	£32 0 0
TOTAL SURPLUS:	£82 4 10

\*Denotes Regular Contributor.

MOVING FUND

Target is £500.  
Received to date—£318 4s. 4d.

PREMISES FUND

Target is £1,000 per year.  
Pledges received to date—£379 18s. 0d.  
Pledges honoured to date—£204 3s. 9d.

Spanish Refugees  
Aid Inc.

Dear Friend,  
To keep alive during the winter—this is a terrible problem for many of the Spanish Civil War refugees living in France. Without your help, Christmas and New Year will be very bleak for many of them. Each year, more and more of them are turning 60. Their needs are increasing, but so is the cost of living. And their tiny pensions are only \$35 a month, half of the minimum amount needed for a decent standard of living. \$13 goes for coal each month (last year it was \$10). A pair of pants costs \$10. An overcoat is out of the question, unless SRA provides it.

The Foyer Pablo Casals in Montauban, France, is now giving out food packages every month to 270 refugees over the age of 60. This winter the rolls will probably rise to 280 and the monthly cost of running the Foyer to \$950. The cost per person comes to \$3.40 a month, or \$40.80 a year. Can you help one of these ageing veterans?

Perhaps you can give a \$240 scholarship for an excellent student like 14-year-old Christiane V.? She needs one for the next two years to finish her studies. Her father, who fought and was wounded on the Ebro front during the Spanish Civil War, is tubercular.

Can you solve the problems of one refugee by 'adopting' him or her? \$10 a month, which may seem like very little to you, can go a long way towards saving a human being. Can you help a Republican like Salvador P., who writes 'as a believer in freedom and the rights of man, my conscience didn't permit me to stay in a country where a regime was being installed with the help of the German and Italian fascists'. They ask for very little and we have a lot to give.

Our warm thanks for helping before and please help again.

DWIGHT MACDONALD,  
Chairman.  
Spanish Refugee Aid, Inc.,  
Room 406, 80, East 11th Street,  
New York, N.Y. 10003.

Educational System

Dear Editors,  
John Thurston, in his interesting letter (FREEDOM, 13.1.68), has tried to expand a very short, perhaps over-factual, article that appeared in FREEDOM on the recent teachers' dispute into an article about libertarian attitudes to education in general, a topic that the original article never set out to cover at all, but fair enough.

Although the original article merely intended to give the facts in a dispute, it is obviously vitally important that the wider aspects of education should be discussed so regularly as to provide a permanent commentary upon contemporary trends in education from an anarchist standpoint.

'Negotiation and (moderate?) strike action' may improve basic pay and conditions—surely these are elements that should have some place in teacher activity. No one pretends that they will do the vital job of changing what all libertarians agree is a far from perfect educational system (understatement of millennium?).

Revolution is needed in education just as it is needed in every other facet of society. The place of the teacher as regards his permitted relationship with his pupil (permitted i.e. by most headmasters, Local Education Authorities, and environmental circumstances) is pathetically lacking in real understanding of the needs of the child and the young adult.

I am not sure that I agree totally with J.T. about Newson and Nuffield maths, although I certainly agree about the falsity of the comprehensive idea (see FREEDOM, 23.9.67).

Improved pay is important to me, improved status is not, although there are those in teaching who need the latter tagged on to any attempt to improve the former.

Of course the NUT is shockingly reactionary, but until the LTA replaces it, it's all we have got; I certainly have no illusions about the NUT. Also I did not say that a compulsory levy would sort out the men from the boys, J.T. makes too much of my attitude to this. There are many teachers who would not even bother to 'satisfy their sense of duty' by 'donating' to a compulsory levy. A greater financial commitment would at least signify some kind of hazy awakening to the realities of the situation. There is, of course, far further to go than this before any real achievements in any educational field can be made. The outlook is perhaps a little depress-

ing.  
If all teachers demanded as much cash spent on education as we now spend on defence; modern buildings and equipment throughout the country; a greater independence from the LEAs; headmasters, if we must have them at all, who are not all-powerful but progressive in the libertarian sense (many of them are, many are not); a teacher-pupil ratio of approximately 1:12 (necessitating, incidentally higher pay for teachers); a teaching profession which is prepared to progress not only in terms of educational methods, but also in terms of creating new kinds of relationships—social and individual—with the child; to make greater use of experiment and imagination in the schools; and abandon for ever the 'image' of the traditional teacher; and if all the things I intended to mention but have not space to, happened as well, then we MIGHT be getting somewhere.

PADDY FIELDS (alias JIM HUGGON).  
Northolt.

Foot and Mouth

FOLLOWING ALAN ALBON's article on foot-and-mouth disease your readers might like to know more about the problems, and the way in which resourceful country folk solve them.

A report about the wild stag menace has appeared in the *Somerset County Gazette*. Owing to foot-and-mouth no hunting has been done recently and farmers are afraid that herds will increase in size and raid crops on their Exmoor and Quantock farms. Shoot them? Of course not. This is where the huntsmen come in. 'It is our job to control their numbers so that the herds do not disappear nor become unmanageably large,' said the Master of the Devon and Somerset Staghounds. He hopes to be out hunting with his horses, hounds, whipper-in, kennel-huntsman, huntsmen, members, footfollowers, and landrovers in March 'four days a week and sometimes five'.

J. M. DRIVER.

What Human Rights?

Dear Editors,  
I find the thought of Britain being associated with the International Human Rights year more than slightly amusing. Recently in the big, bold, booming city of Leeds, an old man died 'on waste ground, like an animal'.

The facts are simple. Seeing a fellow creature in obvious distress, a local businessman phoned the police, and reported that he appeared to be ill. Fearful that this 58-year-old man of no fixed abode, might die within the city limits, the police, after speaking to him, moved him on. Had he been a younger man, who knows?, he might have made it. The facts are that, in his weakened condition, he only made it to some waste ground, and there passed away. 'So much for Human Rights.'

I would like to say that this was the end of the story, however, it was not. The usual inquest was held. The coroner, in upholding the action of the police in moving this man on, threw so much whitewash on them that a special detail was laid on to wash the courtroom out after the inquest. I seem to recall that Pontius Pilate also washed his hands many years ago.

Perhaps people may say I should mind my own business. If however fifty persons can be found to support my contention, that this man should have been removed to hospital, the South Yorkshire Peace Centre will ask the Home Office to order a Public Enquiry.  
Doncaster, Yorks. D. J. ROGAN.

Meritocrat?

I AGREE with Jeff Robinson (see this page last week); I don't want to be governed by robots, administrators, Dr. Leach—or anybody at all.

Dr. Leach supports the idea of government but Jeff Robinson's letter overstates the case against him:

One of Dr. Leach's proposals, according to Jeff Robinson, is:

*It is a desirable and necessary thing that education should be geared to producing a class of social and scientific administrators who would be superbly efficient, contemptuous of the past and heedless of all moral and ethical criteria and thus be quite at home in the dynamic, expanding, highly organised world of modern science and technology.*

But in one of his lectures, which I quoted on December 16, Dr. Leach attacked the State educational system for pretending to offer equality of opportunity:

*In practice the State system is devoted to the needs of a meritocracy in which all the rewards go to the most able.*

WYNFORD HICKS.

IN HIS REVIEW of Carsten's *The Rise of Fascism*, N.W. lists the essential features of fascism as nationalism, anti-semitism, dictatorship of party and leader, militarism, corporatism and fake socialism. I think that there are two other important aspects of fascism that often get overlooked.

The first is the tremendous power of its emotional appeal, at certain times. Fascism, given the right moment in the history of a country, can sweep to power on a great wave of popular support in a very few years. It has an especial appeal to that large section of the population which is normally apathetic towards politics, has no clear understanding of economics and is at all times more or less patriotic and law-abiding. Hitler, in his *My Struggle*, wrote that the most effective propaganda is that which is couched in emotional terms and directed at the average intelligence level of the masses. Hitler did not make speeches at such a low level as to appeal to outright morons nor did he attempt to indulge in intellectual subtleties, in order to appeal to the intelligentsia. Hitler knew that once the Nazi bandwagon started to roll the morons would climb aboard because of the opportunities for violence and that most intellectuals would climb aboard to save their skins.

The common Marxist idea that living standards are always everybody's first consideration is erroneous. There are plenty of people about who value such things as religion, family life, personal honour and what not higher than material things. Fascism, in its developed form, is of course, contemptuous of these things but it poses as their champion in order to win support from old-fashioned people. There were plenty of people in Germany, Spain, etc., who supported Hitler and Franco, etc., not because they believed they themselves stood to gain anything materially from fascism, but because fascism seemed to defend and uphold things like religion, tradition, family life, etc.

But to give the Marxists their due, it is true that about half the population put economic considerations first. When a large scale economic crisis occurs, and living standards fall, two sets of agitators make their voices heard. There are those on the left who promise utopia if only the capitalist-fascist conspiracy is smashed. And there are those on the right who promise utopia (for those of the right race) if only the red-Jewish-Negro-beatnik menace is first smashed. So far as most people are concerned the appeal of the right propagandists is much the most attractive because it is unfortunately true that among the mass of the population nationalism, xenophobia and outright racialism are much stronger than feelings of internationalism and class solidarity. The emotional appeal of the fascists is much greater than that of the left so far as most people are concerned.

And the economic arguments of the fascists are superficially convincing too. Reds do encourage industrial unrest, there are a lot of beatniks about who consume but do not produce, freemasons do meet in secret, Jewish financiers are greedy (so are Gentile ones but this is conveniently overlooked), the influx of Negroes has aggravated the housing shortage. If the masses had any sense they would see through such specious arguments but unfortunately, urged on by their tribalistic emotions, they swallow them. This is why any large scale breakdown of Western society will inevitably result in victory for fascism. People like Michael Malik and the Maoists and the lunatic fringe of the anarchist movement will have the effect, should their ideas show signs of making progress, of stampeding large numbers of fundamentally decent, ordinary people into fascism.

The second aspect of fascism not mentioned in N.W.'s review is the obsession of fascists with what I call hygiene in the grand sense. I mean the preoccupation with the purity of the nation's blood, the killing off of sex deviates and the mentally sick, the apparently frantic desire that the trains shall run on time, the keep fit mania, the short haircuts and pressed trousers nonsense, the fascination with the minutiae of national boundaries, the plethora of organisations, initials and symbols. These things are by no means only explainable in terms of war preparations or as cunning contrivances to divert public attention from the failure of fascism to fulfil its grandiose economic promises.

On the contrary, I think that the fascist obsession with orderliness, regimentation, punctuality, abbreviation, etc., is another indication of the basic driving force of fascism which is an urgent psychological desire to root out, control or destroy all wildness and all non-conformism. In other words, sheer lust for power in its most pathological form.

JEFF ROBINSON.

Immaculate Abortion?

LAST WEEK'S *Catholic Herald* included a full-page report on Catholic teenagers based on more than 1,350 replies to a *Teenage Questionnaire*. The *Herald's* intention was to contradict the findings of a poll on teenage attitudes conducted by NOP for the *Daily Mail*.

Not surprisingly sex was mentioned. 21% favoured 'sex before marriage', 77% disapproved and 2% didn't know. The *Herald* announced proudly:

*These figures are a flat contradiction of the feeling among the teenagers as reflected in the 'Daily Mail' poll. In reply to a similar questionnaire over half said they approved of 'sex before marriage'.*

But in answer to the question: Do you agree with abortion under any circumstances? the Catholic teenagers replied as follows:

Yes	40%
No	59%
Don't know	1%

As the *Herald* put it this is an extraordinary result.

You might think therefore that it would be more newsworthy than those results which followed Catholic rules and regulations. But not if you were the editor of the *Catholic Herald*.

A front-page introduction to the report was headlined—

VOTE AGAINST NATIONAL TREND ON SEX, DRUGS

and featured liberal views on immigration and illiberal views on drugs and sex. Not a whisper about abortion.

It is both sad and fantastic that though 40% of Catholic teenagers are prepared to agree with abortion hardly more than half this figure favour sex.

The only interpretation which occurs to me is that though only 21% of Catholic teenagers agree with sex many more practice it—but without contraception. Having committed one sin and avoided another some of them find themselves faced with the necessity of abortion and come to terms with it in their own rather tangled way.

One teenager was quoted as follows: *If abortion is carried out after the organism is given a soul, then this would be murder.*

*Yet if going right through pregnancy and having the child would do serious mental or physical damage to the mother then I think in this case abortion would be advisable.*

Uncompassionate Council

MY compliments to the *People* who introduced a story last Sunday as follows:

*From a tumbledown house in a derelict area of East London, a group of determined young men and women last week sent out a message of defiance.*

*'We'll barricade ourselves inside,' they said, 'and rely on public opinion to come to our aid.'*

The people who have turned to direct action are volunteer workers from the Simon Community. Their attempts to establish a home for meths drinkers have been disrupted by Tower Hamlets Council.

A member of the Council is reported to have said:

*We need compulsory treatment for the men outside the borough. We don't want the home in Tower Hamlets.*

To drive out the meths drinkers and the Simon Community the Council has issued an enforcement notice giving them until March to leave the street they are occupying.

Fred Harrison of the *People* comments:

*It is this final ultimatum that the trust has decided to resist. The volunteers have challenged the council to eject them.*

*If the down-and-outs are driven out, it will be a defeat for a group of realistic idealists who are facing a painful social problem that the Tower Hamlets council is not prepared to tackle.*

*There will be no glory for the councillors of Tower Hamlets if they win the siege of Sclater Street. Only shame.*

State Educated

IT is appropriate that the London Committee of 100 has at last dissolved itself (see this page last week). For years it has had fewer than 100 members.

When the Committee of 100 movement began it was in no sense dominated by anarchists. But the conflicts between anti-bomb demonstrators and the various agencies of the State educated the former about the function of the latter—and turned many Committee of 100 supporters into anarchists.

WYNFORD HICKS



# Cuts Hit the

# Lower-paid

THE GOVERNMENT'S CUTS in public expenditure once again illustrates that the Labour Party is far from being socialist and in the interests of capitalist economy continues to break the pledges it made at the General Election. Of course many people voted for Labour, not because they thought that Wilson would bring in the millennium, but simply because they thought they

would be better off under a Labour Government. However, it appears that Mr. Wilson and his Government seem determined to make themselves unpopular with the working people who put them in power.

It must be admitted that the cuts were expected and that the whole thing was cleverly put together so as not to eliminate all support. With an eye on the left wing of the Party, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Jenkins, the Chancellor, included substantial defence cuts, abandoning the East of Suez policy and withdrawing troops from the Persian Gulf by the end of 1971. These defence cuts will, in the long term, assist the balance of payments deficit.

## MAKING INDUSTRY PROFITABLE

The interests of those bankers and big investors must be satisfied. British industry must once again be made profitable enough to attract investors. The devaluation in November was part of this process and already the effects of this are being felt in rising prices. So far the Government has not brought in a wage freeze, but one is threatened if wages rise too quickly.

Left-wing MPs only offer an alternative capitalist policy. Britain is a declining nation and so the reforms envisaged on election are now jettisoned and forgotten.

The struggle against these cuts of the Government will not take place in Parliament, where left-wing MPs have only abstained, but at the wage-earner's place of work. Demands can still be won from employers if workers are determined to take the necessary action. Tenants' Associations can also organise a campaign to defeat the rent increases which will continue to be brought in by the GLC and the local authorities.

These economic struggles are important to defend not just the standard of living but the conditions under which we work and live our lives in the community at large. These cuts do not just mean 2/6d. on prescriptions when we are ill, or another 1/- out of the wage packet. They also mean that the adventure playground, the swimming pool that the borough needed so badly, the bus shelter, or the road crossing at that dangerous corner, will not be provided. It is these things, that affect the old and the young alike, that should be fought for.

## NEEDS, NOT PROFIT

Cuts in welfare services can always be expected while the present economic system survives. The owners and controllers of industry, the bankers and the speculators, need people to work for them in order to make their profits, but people do not need them. The real wealth is created by the labour of men and women whose work can supply the needs of all, without profit.

As an Anarchist, I believe that people can co-operate to provide for the needs of everyone and, with present available resources, it is possible to achieve this, provided that there is a conscious desire in the minds and hearts of men.

There are signs that workers are fed up with the Labour Party and that the whole system of Parliament and the State is being increasingly questioned. People are looking for an alternative and as Anarchists we can put it before them.

P.T.

## Contact Column

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

**Jack Goundry**, of 80 Whitmere Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, wishes to contact readers of *Anarchy* and *FREEDOM* in Shropshire.

**Public Debate** on Anarchism. Kilburn AG versus SPGB Westminster. 'Royal Oak', York Street, W.1. February 7, 9 p.m. Stating the Anarchist case: Norman Miller.

**Free Bookshop**. If you want to help or have any advice telephone Driffield, PAD 2409 (after 6 p.m.).

**Cardiff**. Will any Cardiff anarchists contact Swansea anarchist group (address page 3). URGENT.

**T.N.T.** Manchester's first anarchist magazine out. Single copies 1s. post free; multiple copies 9d. each, plus postage from 9 Boland Street, Manchester, 14.

**Bristol** Anarchists please contact Susi Fisher and Adam Nicholson, 15 The Paragon, Clifton, Bristol 8.

**Badges**. 'I'm Backing Freedom', 'Freedom Needs a Home', 'Anarchy is on the Move'. 1/- each. Proceeds donated to P & M Fund by Harlow Anarchists.

**Canada**. Wanted now—tenants for part-furn. 4-bedroom farmhouse rent free for care of beefcattle. Details from D. Worthington, 2830 Salmo Court, Vancouver 8.

**Love and War Poems** by Kenneth Patchen. To be published this month. Advance orders to Dennis Gould, 56 Jackson Avenue, Mickleover, Derby. (2/6d. or 1 dollar).

**Freedom Weekly?** Eight pages every week? If all readers could get one extra subscription—it could be done. You may prefer to sell by the week. We can let you have copies on sale or return.

**Student Anarchism**. New fiery magazine starting beginning of this year. Enquiries from students, as well as articles, welcome. R. Bebb, 103a Camden Road, N.W.1.

**Flats and Houses Cleaned**. Simple redecoration and gardening jobs wanted. A. W. Uloth, 75 Templars Avenue, London, N.W.11.

**Pamphlets**. 'The Origins of the Spanish Revolutionary Movement' (M. Dasha)—2/6; 'Surrealism and Revolution' (anthol.)—2/6; 'Sixteen-Forty-nine, story of Diggers and Levellers'—5/-. Coptic Press, 7 Coptic Street, London, W.C.1.

**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 Brettia Carthey, 8 Vincent Square Mansions, Walcott Street, London, S.W.1. Use Registered Post. Money and letters fail to arrive.

**Ian Celnick** please get in touch with J.R. at Freedom Press.

**East Anglia**. If you're near Ipswich, call on us. We stock all Freedom Press publications, and have *FREEDOM* and *Anarchy* regularly. Orwell Books, 44 Upper Orwell Street, Ipswich, Suffolk.

**Van Wanted**. With or without driver to cover Aldermaston march—literature, speakers' stand, etc. Easter week-end April 11-15. Reply to LFA, Libra House.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

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

## AXEING THE SOCIAL SERVICES

The cuts at home are to give 'confidence' to the bankers and speculators who are not going to give the Labour Government loans just to spend on social services, while the defence cuts are obviously to sweeten the pill. The former hit the hardest those very people to whom the Labour Government had pledged to bring social justice, such as the lower paid, the needy and the underprivileged. When sick, there will be the added burden of prescription charges and another 10/- when visiting the dentist, making the treatment now £1 10s. in all. If this isn't bad enough, then there is also another 6d. per week deducted from the pay packets for the National Health and a further 6d. for the National Insurance Fund.

However, the meanest and most petty thing of all, I think, is the stopping of free milk in the secondary schools from September. Even those who are willing to pay for it will not be able to get it at the schools. This will mean a net reduction of £4.5 million in a year. Not a very big saving, but one that will do a lot of harm to children coming from poor families. For them, the free milk was some compensation for the lack of nutritious food at home and so what is saved on milk will be more than lost with increased costs on the Health Service.

Cuts by the Local Authorities will affect the housing programme of council dwellings. Here again the needy families, living in overcrowded rooms, paying high rents to private landlords, will suffer. While the low income families are most affected by these cuts in welfare and social services, other measures in the package deemed to strengthen the capitalist economy will, in fact, damage it. The cuts in the road building programme, the delay in raising the school leaving age, will only hinder it.

## We Are All Criminals

AN INVESTIGATION recently made in Sweden shows that 40% of the students who are studying law are themselves guilty of thefts in shops. These people will soon sit in our civil courts—judging exactly the same sort of crimes! A large scale investigation in the USA showed that 99% committed a 'crime', and that 70% among the men and 35% among the women committed crimes which were actionable. This result was a shock to the authorities, and when they investigated the penalties for all crimes that a person commits during a life of normal length, they found that each American citizen should have to sit 5,000 years in prison and to pay one billion dollars in fine! If justice should be done...

This shows the stupidity of 'justice' in

this society. When nearly every citizen in a country commits 'crimes' and when nearly two-thirds of these commit crimes which are actionable, there must be something wrong somewhere. . . . And there cannot be something wrong with nearly every citizen in one country. It is the system, the kind of society, that we are forced to live in, that is wrong. The system in which the police, the courts, the lawyers, exist to fulfil one thing: the protection of the capitalist society in which man is robbed of his elementary rights. When will man get the right to take what he needs without being punished by the State? The 'justice' in Sweden acts so strangely that there is always about 5,000 persons that are being held prisoners. But, of these, only a little more than one hundred

# Freedom

## For Workers' Control

JANUARY 27 1968 Vol 29 No 3

## Roberts-Arundel—Lying Unlimited

FOR BAREFACED LIES the Stockport firm of Roberts-Arundel takes some beating. Today, one week after pretending to close, work here is still going on as usual. (Date for shut down January 12, 1968.)

Even on the first working day that followed the so-called closure, machines were running and though some lads had been sacked, we saw some new faces among those clocking in. At least 50 have been turning up for work this week and this with the 27 said to be outfitting, makes it about 80 scabs still employed. Let's hope the unions don't chicken out now! Any attempt to back out now, could only encourage any 'break in and burn it' ideas anybody might have. This could be what the firm wants, as they've just copped £1,000 for damages from the local council, etc.

Most of us reckon this company should be run out of the country, as would happen with any set of gangsters. Anyhow the pickets intend to stick it to the bitter end. Though, it's felt that the

firm's being let off lightly, and that in any other country, they'd have had more than broken windows to put up with.

As usual this has been an unfair, one-sided dispute, with a 'stop-at-nothing' management using every dirty trick it could to beat us. On our side we have, let's face it, soft, but honest unions who are no match for a firm like this. On the picket line we have good blokes and decent trade unionists. Not a roughneck among them and that's the trouble.

All we can do now is try to make sure the 'Blacking' of Arundels carries on, and don't give them a chance to say the strike is over as they have done before. Meanwhile anarchist elements in the area are saying the factory should be liberated and the UNIONS SHOULD HAVE THE GUTS TO TAKE IT OVER. But we have a responsibility too, and every anarchist and decent trade unionist should do all they can to stop this firm from doing the dirty on its workers.

NORTH WEST WORKERS.

## Shambles at Westminster

HE MARCHED THEM up to the top of the hill and he marched them down again—the Wilsonian policy for 1968. The only snag—some of the troops fell out half way up.

Abstentions against abstentions and just—abstentions, obviously this lot are not capable of running a 'booze-up in a brewery'. The biggest giggle of the lot is that every one is taking the stand on the highest of moral principles. If this were true, half of the Labour MPs would have left months ago, even if one takes the lowest of morality: 'party political morality'. Wilson and his cabinet henchmen have been leading the Labour Parliamentary Party by the nose for months and only an occasional cry of real pain has been heard.

The usual hot air spewing from the so-called 'left' of the Party, can be read in the left Labour journals, supported by a faint twinkle from the *Morning Star*. The parrot-like repetition of their policy is monotonous, to say the least. 'Support and strengthen the "left" for a real socialist policy'. The *Morning Star*, realising it has as much political support as our cat, is forced to support this politically dishonest policy. But as we all

know the CP would support the Virgin Mary if she could be manipulated.

There are two Labour MPs who do not profess to believe in socialism. One is Desmond Louis Donnelly, MP for Pembroke. Desmond is in favour of a broad-minded Christmas club or, as he chooses to describe the party of his dreams, a 'broad, classless, non-doctrinaire Radical Party'. If this is what you want Desmond, Jo Grimmond should welcome you with open arms, because surely this is the position claimed by the Liberal Party. You have resigned the Whip, it is only a few steps across the House. Perhaps the urge to remain an MP is too strong for such action.

The other Labour MP and stalwart supporter of the working class who does not reckon socialism and all that jazz is Reg Paget. His attack upon the Prime Minister can only be described as 'lovely'. If Paget is to be taken seriously then Wilson had better go into the hymn publishing business as alternative employment. I am sure Mary could fit him in somewhere.

In the last few weeks the parliamentary system has been exposed for all to see. What a bloody shambles. All three political parties claiming to know the answer. 'Things would be different if they had been "in office".'

How many times has one heard that pearl of wisdom. At least we as Anarchists do not claim to know all the answers. The shower at Westminster get paid for not knowing the answers and proving it by their actions.

The so-called party of the working people is praying for a miracle to happen, they applied and have been accepted into the first division but they have not the stars to keep them there. Let us be under no illusions—their job has been to prop up the present system, to coat it with sugar to make it palatable to the people. This has always been an impossible task, do not let the left-wing fakers tell us any different. The historic rôle of the Labour Party has been one of a safety valve through which militancy could be siphoned off. A term in office every few years kept the peasants quiet. But when the valve is no longer of any use. What happens then?

INGEMAR NILSSON.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.