

THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

THE SINKING SHIP of Labour has deserted the rats. Mr. Crossman has returned to the *New Statesman*, presumably to rally the demoralized party from its columns. Mr. Mellish (the best and shortest-termed Minister of Housing we ever had) refuses to confirm or deny that he will re-enter the capitalist system. Fortunately, the retired Labour MPs' pension fund is in good shape

but it is unlikely that Mr. Robert Maxwell or Mr. Woodrow Wyatt will be signing on the dole. Post-mortems are the order of the day but some would say that the corpse has been smelling for some time.

One of the chief casualties of the election, apart from the Liberal Party, the Scottish and Welsh nationalists (who were all highly expendable) is the opinion poll

which is accused of luring Mr. Wilson into picking an early date for the election and also of lulling would-be Labour voters into complacency. The first assumption, that Mr. Wilson would have been better off 'going to the country' in October, is an unproved and unprovable assumption. Regardless of the fact that more people voted against the Conservatives than voted for them; the voting figures, taking a pollster's random sample of the first forty constituencies in *The Times'* results averages about 73%. This does not indicate much more than the usual signs of apathy.

It is not known—and when it comes to the important questions what do statisticians know?—how many of the 18-year-olds even registered to be given a vote. As to how many voted, this again is an unknown quantity. It could be that they have exercised the right of the young to express their discontent with the party in power by voting against them. A similar thing happened with the 'flapper' vote in the twenties—the Government who granted 'flappers' the vote was thrown out of office.

The contention of the Labour Party has usually been that abstentions are against them since they are the party of the working-class and they cannot get time off work, have no cars to go to the poll, have no one to look after the children when they go to vote, they are also subject to bullying and cajoling by

the Tories into not voting Labour. This is, of course, a completely fictitious idea of a working-class Labour Party. In the first place a working-class Tory is not unusual and an upper-class or capitalist Socialist is a not uncommon phenomena.

It would seem that the Labour Party is unable to believe that they have deteriorated so far from their early ideals that the cloth-capped Keir Hardie image no longer suits them although they fondly believe that it does. Given the gradual merging of the Tory and Labour standpoints, it is by no means a 'swing' to move over from one party to another. It is but one step and many voters took that step last Thursday.

The whole election campaign was, as most elections are, a calculated insult to the intelligence of the voters. It was made doubly insulting by the usage of high pressure salesmanship and modern public relations techniques (including a public opinion poll) to sell Harold Wilson. A similar campaign was put over to sell Ted Heath but it was claimed, by marketing experts, that his was a bad campaign and could not sell the product. Market research showed it statistically.

In 1948 a public opinion poll in the United States showed that Dewey was the favourite for presidency of the United States; opinion polls proved it to such a degree that one paper came out on the day

after the election with 'Dewey Wins' as a heading. Truman, for all the difference it made to history, was re-elected.

'There is some shit that a man cannot eat,' said e. e. cummings. We are asked to eat quite a lot of shit these days. Our lives are increasingly regimented, we are pressurized by advertisers through the newspapers and television to buy the product available in the supermarket in the size they think is best for them. We cannot refrain from buying the product because there is no alternative, we can have either Daz or Omo but we must have washing powder.

But there are occasional revolts. Man cannot put up with just any shit. The English always throw out their war-leaders (Lloyd George and Churchill), East Berlin and Hungary rose against the Soviets, Stalin rose against the Soviets, Stalin was overthrown. There comes a point when one cannot stand it any longer. One evades military service, one deserts, one tells lies to the authorities. Before last Thursday's farce, people quite simply told lies to the opinion polls and then went and voted against the Government. It was not a vote for the Conservatives.

The ballot is secret and in a world of increasing Big Brotherliness from bureaucrats, sociologists and public opinion pollsters, there are private places and the polling booth is one of them. But staying home is another!

JACK ROBINSON.

KEEP POLITICS OUT OF PILKINGTON'S

THE ENGLISH seem to have a thing about inquiries, as if they were some sort of cure-all for every awkward situation. In most cases, however, they end up telling us little we didn't know already.

The Pilkington Strike Inquiry has been consistent in this respect; uncovering no more than the average pressman did at the time of the strike, and making, for the most part, predictable recommendations.

The main causes of the strike were, in the view of the inquiry, the complicated wage structure, a lack of participation in works' negotiations by the men themselves, and the high-handed attitude of 'we know best' on the part of the union and the paternalistic Pilkington management.

The inquiry recognised the structural weakness in the Union of General & Municipal Workers, and called for greater democracy and regular branch meetings. The report also saw fit to urge the union to be more pressing in its demands on the management. Gerry Caughley, a leader of the unofficial strike, commented that he was glad to see the report recommended elections for representatives of the men on the shop floor. But he also said, 'The rank and file committee would like to see elections at all levels throughout the union to break up the union's family tree which has existed so long.'

Perhaps it would be wisest to view an inquiry of this type as a kind of con-trick; a device for getting the men back to work. Both the union and the firm are too thick-skinned to be embarrassed by any of the findings of a Court of Inquiry, and each usually has a knack of destroying the impact of any criticisms by rolling with the punch. Last week the union and Pilks claimed they were already carrying out the main proposals of the inquiry.

THE CAUSES OF CONFLICT

Indeed how could such a report, conducted as it was by outsiders, in the period of about a month flat, ever be anything more than a botched-up job? How could these people ever hope to do more than guess at the involved nature of the circumstances which made the Pilkington strike this spring and, perhaps more important, why now and not before?

Among the theories on this, we have had the blame being put on the 'national pay explosion', the importation of new workers from outside St. Helens into the Pilkington plants, the harsh conditions of glass work, and recent changes in the technical and productive processing of glass. In almost every case, when I've come across a complex system of piece work or bonuses as at Pilkingtons, there has been, as we suggested before, widespread fiddling. This may involve tampering with the machine (altering speeds, etc.), fiddling the figures on time sheets ('Billy's Weekly Liar'), or the deliberate destruction of good work in order to increase overall output. We needn't delve too deeply into this, as any worker who has been on a tight

piece work system will know, he must often fiddle to make a job pay.

Now if a worker can increase his income by any of these methods or overtime, or even if the opportunities for scrounging offsets the low pay, a worker will tend to take the less painful course of fiddling from his boss rather than fighting him. So what we do get is a constant rotting at the industrial roots, which may or may not come out into open conflict, after a long time-lag as at Pilkingtons.

ANTI-POLITICAL WORKERS

In our coverage of the Pilkington dispute we have tried to reveal the hidden factors and anarchic elements at work beneath any industrial situation. The political attitude of most workers is much more obvious; they have no time for politics and politicians.

This is not an act of wishful thinking on our part, but is backed up by recent research, and the declining turnout at every General Election since 1950.

That working men tend to resent political interference was shown when some Pilkington strikers shouted 'keep politics out', after one otherwise popular member of the St. Helens strike committee appeared to introduce a political note at one of the mass meetings.

Such is the strength of feeling against politics in England, one would have thought that any genuine militant with the workers' interests at heart, would have done everything possible to prevent any political stigma being stamped upon the Pilkington strikers. Alas, there are those who can't resist going in for crude party commercialism at the workers' expense.

In this respect the International Socialists in the North West, seem like silly salesmen trying to wring the last drop of party publicity out of every strike situation, no matter how much it may damage the interests of the strikers. These people seem unable to grasp or face up to the reality of the industrial situation and admit to themselves that in this country at least, workers detest everything to do with politics.

WHAT WILL THE UNION DO NOW?

In St. Helens, the National Union of General & Municipal Workers is in trouble, with a large part of its local membership still determined to set up a rival union in a town which, before the strike, was one of its biggest strongholds in the country. It could now stand to lose £25,000 a year in lost contributions.

Even a small-scale dictatorship like the General & Municipal Workers Union, can't ignore a loss of members and funds on these dimensions, and it will be interesting to see what steps the union takes to improve its image as a defender of the economic interests of its members.

If it is to stay in business the union will have to pull its socks up or else the members will vote with their feet. This was essentially the situation which faced the conservative trade union leader, J. L. Lewis, in the 1920's in the USA. He was

Continued on page 3

NOW THAT WE HAVE a True Blue Aristocrat and jolly fine English gentleman back in the Foreign Office, instead of that wet-leg Stewart, and now that we do in fact have a Government of Gentlemen who know how to keep their word which is of course their bond, we may all be quite sure that once again we shall be *Persona Grata* with all the Right People, and we shall be doing business with all the Right Governments, instead of only with some of them as under Mr. Wilson.

Although the late Mr. Wilson was perfectly in order with the upper crust in his unwavering support of America in Vietnam and Cambodia; and although every right-thinking constitutionalist was right behind him in his policy of selling arms to the Federal Government of Nigeria (which unfortunately led to the death and starvation of thousands in Biafra—but that's life, old man) there was this one thing on which his doctrinaire socialism got the better of him: he wouldn't sell arms to the kith and kin in South Africa. The trouble with Wilson is that he was a slippery middle-class shyster instead of being a straightforward upper-class shyster.

Now that the party of the latter, under brilliant leadership, have swept the polls (and no one was more surprised than the brilliant leader himself since he happens to be a straightforward middle-class shyster) we can get back to the straightforward business of running this country in the interests of business without pretending otherwise. That was the other trouble with Wilson: he would pretend otherwise, about so many things.

GOOD FOR BUSINESS

When our business interests coincide with support for a good old nigger-bashing government that also doesn't pretend to be anything else, then this really is bang on and whizzo and we can get down to brass tacks and all do ourselves a bit of good, what?

Hence, without any mucking about or further ado, the New Government is right away going to implement one of its election promises: it is going to start selling arms again to South Africa,

TORY ARMS DEAL

In fact without waiting for the ink to be dry in the astonished headlines, Mr. Vorster has sent his own Foreign Minister, Dr. Hilgard Muller, to London, to start talking turkey with our new/old Foreign Minister, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, of beloved memory.

According to Monday's *Guardian*, even before the first Cabinet meeting had been held, it was expected that Sir Alec would 'move swiftly' in lifting the arms embargo, which has been in force since October, 1964. And one object in 'moving swiftly' is to get the business through as quickly as possible so as to be able to present the world with a *fait accompli*, without any public debate and in the hope of stifling public protest as much as possible. And it is the world that the Tories have to contend with in this issue, for Mr. Wilson was not initiating any principled move when he put the embargo on in 1964, he was simply implementing the resolution passed by the Security Council of the United Nations in 1963. This was initiated mainly by Canada and the United States.

Since 1964 world opinion has swung against South Africa much more strongly. The issues of world sport—tennis, athletics, cricket, rugby—have provided rallying points for anti-apartheid movements which have proved most effective in pin-pointing attention on the disgusting nature of the South African regime. So Vorster has been on the defensive and his recent tour of European governments—a surprisingly quiet tour, as it happened—was no doubt prompted by feelings of increasing isolation and uncertainty *vis-a-vis* the rest of the world.

Now he is going to be made a happy man. Jolly laughing Ted Heath, the Broadstairs bombshell, is going to raise his fingers to the rest of the world, not in defence of democracy, human rights, freedom, or any crap like that.

He will do that in defence of the price of Brasso.

TUPPENCE OFF

And don't think that's just a funny. Inflation in the supermarket will slow down when the gnomes of Zurich stop pissing about with the pound, and these gents will have much more 'confidence in the pound' if they see £225 millions coming into London from the sale of arms to South Africa—or anywhere else for that matter. Make no mistake about it; behind Ted Heath's sappy grin lies the grasping little mind of the supermarket manager. Deep down where it matters most he's a greedy little money-grubbing crawler whose concept of 'Honest Government' (and remember that one, everybody!) is on a par with Tuppence Off margarine. And if he can get Tuppence Off margarine by selling arms to racist South Africa, honest Ted will see it all as a demonstration of what a mavelous system capitalism is.

In his justification of the arms deal Heath is going to be helped by the build-up of the Russian 'presence' in the Indian Ocean. The increase of Russian naval activity, the growing Russian influence in Arab countries which opens the way down the East Coast of Africa

—these factors have started worrying the South African Government, which has drawn Britain's attention to the risk to sea routes to the Far East round the Cape (vital now Suez is out of our control) and underlines the arguments for the 'East of Suez' line. South Africa may yet be a bastion of democracy against communism, just like Hitler's Germany in the thirties!

And the Tories, like the Tories of the Thirties, will kiss the arse of any bastard if there's money in it.

JUSTIN.

More on Intelligence

Dear Comrades,

I should like to thank Marshall Colman and Geoff Charlton for their serious attention to my letter. I think however they are confusing behaviourism as a descriptive theory of human behaviour with the techniques of behaviour therapists. I have, of course, never advocated the application of such techniques or even defended them. But disapproval of the technical use made of a theory doesn't invalidate the theory itself. One doesn't say that the atomic theory of matter is wrong because atom bombs are vicious weapons. If indeed behaviourist techniques are of value to politicians in manipulating people, it seems to follow that behaviourism as a descriptive theory must have some validity, not the contrary.

Behaviourism is a study of individual human behaviour which accepts only what we can know with our senses and rejects concepts of hidden or mystical or occult processes which, by definition, cannot be proved. A behaviourist cannot hold a concept of intelligence as an innate characteristic without contradicting his own basic premiss. There is nothing in behaviourism that I know of to suggest that I should not value a man as an individual, or that I should regard him as a mere bundle of reflexes or anything else other than a man; certainly not that I should regard social control as an end in itself.

On the other hand all the *a priori* values that have been held through the ages haven't prevented man being oppressed, massacred and starved. Dictators from Alexander to Hitler and Stalin have made use of the theories of *a priori* philosophers like Plato, Nietzsche and Hegel, and the Americans who drop napalm in Vietnam employ chaplains to pray for their souls. Nor have I seen the abolition of government advocated by any of the neo-Freudian writers mentioned. On the contrary, Marcuse and Fromm specifically advocate forms of government.

If behaviourism is a dirty word I am prepared to drop it, but I am concerned about the way in which Freudian psychology has so permeated our culture that it has become a new mythology inhibiting action, rather in the way that religion did in the past. A new opium of the people? To counter this I should like to introduce a new concept which I shall christen ANARCHADE. Perhaps the Editors of FREEDOM will give me space sometime to explain this concept.

Wells, Somerset GEOFFREY BARFOOT.

DIVIDED ULSTER, Liam de Paor, Penguin Special, 1970, 5/-.

SINS OF OUR FATHERS, Owen Dudley Edwards, Gill & Macmillan, 1970, 42/-.

BOTH THESE BOOKS are excellent in their different ways for the reader wishing to find out the background to the Ulster 'crisis'. The Penguin Special is more for the readers outside Ulster who want to inform themselves of the background to the situation. Edwards' book is more for the cognoscenti if not the 'in'-crowd, for it has the flavour of a rich and secret Irish joke.

De Paor has laid out in comparatively simple terms the roots of the problem and alongside that the present cultural division between the two sections of the community. The history of the recent conflict however is probably better covered by *The Times* or *Guardian* or any 'quality' paper, and is presented in simplistic terms which add to the confusion rather than otherwise. In justice to him, he makes very clear, as does Edwards, the conditions and religious influences in the Republic which are so distasteful to the average 'Prods' in the North.

ii

Dear Friends,

The letter from Marshall Colman (16.5.70) must be replied to, although I have to admit to having missed the original article.

If Freudians are so unconcerned with intelligence why is it that the techniques based on Freudian theory are often quoted as being only suitable for the more verbally articulate and more intelligent (whatever that means) members of society.

As for behaviourism being an ally of authoritarianism, yes it can be so but so can any other theory of the development of individuals. It is the Freudian-type psychodynamic theories which has allowed society to condemn people as being sick, immature, etc., when they deviate from the expectations and norms of the society. The Freudian theorist believes that the experiences of early years dominate, with possibly some change at adolescence. Further, the Freudian claims that once formed by these early experiences, personality can be little changed by later experience. (Perhaps we ought to grab them from the cradle if we are to change society.) The behaviourist claims all experience to be important, they would not deny that it is more difficult to change already entrenched patterns but it is by no means impossible.

Of course the behaviourist theory could lead to gross manipulation but so could any theory base. What behaviourism has done is to bring to the forefront the amount of indoctrination and lack of real freedom that is present throughout this and every society. To those of the left this is obvious but

ON ULSTER

It is, indeed, a thumbnail sketch and useful as such.

Edwards, however, is attempting to fill in the sketch. His detail is marred not so much by partisanship as a mendacious esotericism so common to the left academic. He displays his learning like a stagestruck ballerina disguising a slip as a part of the routine. Despite its 'in' style it conveys a considerable amount of detail.

One particularly good section is on the Roman Church's acceptance of the ghetto as a means of a preserved and contained influence. The ghetto served the priest and kept out 'unholy' influences. Socially and ethically, they and the Protestant establishment had much in common. The result is driven home in the excellent chapter 'The Breaking of the Irish Working Class' (the pun is laboured and explained with footnotes). The ghetto was established with the aid of the Church and ex-

ploited by Joe Devlin and the AOH. The result was Tammany Hall versus the Orange Order. Everything was carved up and agreed.

Sadly his chapter on 'The Thing That Was to Come' (no footnotes but what a bleedin' pun) is nowhere on the same level. It is facile and fails totally to understand the breakdown of the traditional Orange Order. His emphasis on Pope John the ? or who doesn't help either. Northern Ireland got the brunt end of the hard stick of modernisation and the internationalisation of capital. Nowhere is this implied. The radicalism of the predominantly Protestant 'Queens' is glibly passed off in student debating terms.

It went a good deal deeper than that. This is Edwards' weak point. Although he suggests that there were foreign parallels drawn on—he disparages this too—he tries to confine everything to a 'Gaelic' framework. John McGaffin

for those traditionally supporting the system, for example teachers and social workers, it has meant a realisation of their controlling role, leading, one hopes, to a growth of political awareness and a move towards attacking the system rather than moulding people to fit it.

Yours,

Leicester.

S. BENNETT.

iii

Comrades,

R.B. thinks that anarchism can only be understood by the intelligent, and one seems to gather the implication that he holds the converse, that all intelligent people understand anarchism. If this is so one cannot compliment him on his intelligence and can only recommend a short study of Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid* as a beginning to real understanding.

To hold that all the world, bar one man, has the right to say to that man, 'you are insufficiently intelligent to be permitted to mate with another and breed children', is to hold a governmentalist attitude and therefore to negate anarchism.

Kropotkin showed, in his reply to the Huxley-Spencerian interpretations of Darwin, that it is palpably false to believe that survival of the fittest works within species to the good of that species. Man survived as a species because he was able to co-operate and practice mutual aid in the early period of his evolution; and the evidence is that man will cease to survive because he now competes.

To make sanctions against a person who, by some perfectly superficial yardstick, is inferior and prevent that person living his life as a real human, is to negate everything for which anarchists

stand and to advocate a meritocracy on Platonic grounds.

Fraternally,

LAURENS OTTER.

iv

To the Editors,

Whilst agreeing with the sentiments expressed in M. Colman's letter last week ('The Myth of Intelligence'), I feel it should be emphasised that the neo-Freudian theorists he mentions (Reich, Fromm, Norman Brown, Laing, etc.) were, or are, very much rebels within their own camp and that Freudian-type psychoanalysis as a purchasable commodity or service is potentially just as much a technique for the manipulation of people as behaviourism.

Certainly it is a more 'humanistic' method that the aversion therapy or deconditioning techniques of the behaviourists but arguably identical in goals, i.e. the personality manipulation is in the direction of social conformity and 'democratic' good citizenship.

The goals of the therapy and even the delineation of the clients' illness will reflect the social values and personal ethics of the therapists—which are no more likely to be radical than the social values and ethics of most doctors, lecturers, solicitors or other well-off middle-class professionals.

Finally, it is rather overstating the case to say Freudians are quite unconcerned with intelligence. I believe it is the general view amongst analysts that a client with a limited capacity to verbalise his inner anxieties and conflicts is a non-starter for analytic treatment. The implication is that the development of this verbal facility relates to intelligence and, of course, social

is influenced by Wilde, Joe Quigley by Larkin, Michael Farrell by Connolly. No outside Foreign Influences you note. This from a man who pleads that the Cormeron wanted 'brainwashed' revolutionaries and spends much time pointing out the absurdities of that position. Even when he has to admit Peter Cosgrove's interest in Mao, he has to say adapted to an Irish context—as though any sane revolutionary doesn't seek to interpret theory in the present!

There is also a long piece of rubbish on Trevor-Roper's shitty article in *Realities*. God help us, nearly six pages!!

Still it's worth reading with a pinch of salt. Too expensive.

Both have no bibliography or index. In the case of Edwards this is a bad omission considering the way the material is laid out.

And both, of course, to prove God knows what, end with a quote from Connolly. You poor bastard, you're an industry for socialist purity.

Buy or order and read. And thank your lucky stars you don't live there. Apartheid on our doorstep. Both bring this through as clear as the starry plough.

JOHN DIGGERA.

class (ref. Professor Bernstein).

The relationship between social class and the type of treatment offered to prospective clients of the mental health services (drugs, ECT, psychotherapy, etc.) is another subject altogether—but it is important to recognise that ostensibly medical treatment—even 'benign' psychotherapy—is not a politically neutral act. (See T. J. Scheff's book *On Being Mentally Ill*, and the articles of T. S. Szasz, e.g. 'Psychiatry, Ethics and the Criminal Law', *Columbia Law Review* 1958, No. 183.)

Fraternally,

London, N.W.7

PETER FORD.



PRESS FUND

June 16 to 22 inc.

Edgware: M.K. 10/-; Dunstable: J.D. 19/1; Hove: H.C. 6/9; Bishopsthorpe: W.C. £2/0/6; Chesham: E.C.S. 4/-; Birmingham: R.L.F. 5/7; Lowestoft: G. & A.C. 5/-; N.Z.: G.A.E. £2/0/6; Oxford: Anon 6/-; Todmorden: G.B. £1/19/5; Kirup: C.K. £1/17/2; Blackpool: J.D. 2/4; Merstham: L.D. 3/6; Stapleford: A.G. £2; Blackburn: J.A.G. £1/0/4.

Total: £14 0 0

B/L: £60 6 6

£74 6 6



All correspondence to
Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road,
Rotton Park, Birmingham 16

ANARCHIST FEDERATION of BRITAIN

LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS. All correspondence to LFA, c/o Freedom Press, BLACK KNIGHT GROUP, 5 Nelson Road, N.8. Meeting Wednesdays.
LAVERHAM HILL. Contact C. Broad, 116 Tyneham Road, S.W.11 (228 4086).
FORTBELLO ROAD ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Andrew Dewar, 16 Kilburn House, Malvern Place, N.W.6. Meetings 8 p.m. every Tuesday.
BEXLEY ANARCHIST MOVEMENT. Steve Leman, 28 New Road, Abbey Wood, S.E.2. Tel: ET 35377. Meetings every Friday, 8 p.m., Lord Bexley, Bexleyheath Broadway.
S.W. LONDON ANARCHISTS. Meeting alternate Wednesdays. Correspondence c/o Freedom Press.
NOTTING HILL. Sebastian Scragg, 10 Bassett Road, W.10.
NEWHAM. Pat Keen, 26 Farringford Road, E.15.
LIBERTARIAN TEACHERS ASSOCIATION. Peter Ford, 36 Devonshire Road, Mill Hill, N.W.7.

EAST LONDON UNDERGROUND
Secretary: Anthony Matthews, 35 Mayfield Road, London, E.11.
REGULAR WEEKLY MEETINGS
Mondays, 7.30 p.m., at Flat 10, Chessington Lodge, Regents Park Road, N.3.
Wednesdays, 8 p.m., at Freedom Hall, 84B Whitechapel High Street, E.1 (Aldgate East Station).

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS
BIRMINGHAM ANARCHIST GROUP. Secretary, Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road, Rotton Park, Birmingham, 16. Meetings every Sunday, 8 p.m., in the smoke room of St. Martin pub, corner of St. Martin's Lane and Jamaica Row.
BOURNEMOUTH AREA. Bob Fry, 30 Douglas Close, Upton, Poole, Dorset.

CORNWALL ANARCHISTS. Contact Arthur Jacobs, 13 Ledrah Road, St Austell, Cornwall. Meetings on the second Friday of each month at 42 Pendarves Street, Beacon, Camborne, 7.30 p.m. Visiting comrades very welcome.
PEACE ACTION. Rory Weightman, P.C.T. Peace Action Group, St. Pauls Road, Portsmouth, Hants.
CROYDON LIBERTARIANS. Laurens and Celia Otter, 35 Natal Road, Thornton Heath, CR4 8QH (653 7546) or contact Keith McCain, 1 Langmead Street, West Norwood, S.E.27. Phone 670 7297.
EDGWARE PEACE ACTION GROUP. Contact Mervyn Estrin, 84 Edgwarebury Lane, Edgware, Middx.
FARNBOROUGH. 81 Mytchett Road, Mytchett, Camberley, Surrey. Tel: Farnborough 43811.
HERTS. Contact Val and John Funnell, 10 Fry Road, Chells, Stevenage.
LEICESTER. Contact Di and A. Humphrey, 74 High Street, Leicester (Leicester 22046).
LOUGHBOROUGH. Peter Davies, 67 Friffin Close, Shepshed, Leics.

MUTUAL AID GROUP. c/o Borrowdale, Carriage Drive, Frodsham, Cheshire.
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE. Terry Phillips, 70 Blenheim Walk, Corby, Northants.
NORTH EAST ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact M. Renick, 122 Mowbray Street, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne 6.
NORTH SOMERSET ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Roy Emery, 3 Abbey Street, Bath, or Geoffrey Barfoot, 71 St. Thomas Street, Wells.
ORPINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Knockholt, Nr. Sevenoaks, Kent. Every six weeks at Greenways, Knockholt. Phone: Knockholt 2916. Brian and Maureen Richardson.
PORTSMOUTH. Ken Bowbrick, 26 Highbledon House, Landport, Portsmouth, Hants.
READING. 26 Bulmershe Road. Tel: Reading 65445. Meetings every Thursday.
SOUTHALL. Dave Smith, 102 Abbots Road, Southall.
TAUNTON. c/o Dave Poulson, 473 Bramley Road, Taunton, Somerset.
WEST HAM ANARCHISTS. Regular meetings and activities contact Mr. T. Plant, 10 Thackeray Road, East Ham, E.6. Tel: 552 4162.

ESSEX & EAST HERTS FEDERATION

NORTH ESSEX. Write: Peter Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester.
BASILDON & WICKFORD. Mick Powell, 24 Cameron Close, Brentwood, Essex.
BISHOPS STORTFORD. Vic Mount, 'Eastview', Castle Street, Bishops Stortford, Herts.
CHELMSFORD. (Mrs.) Eva Archer, Mill House, Purleigh, Chelmsford, Essex.
EFFING. John Barrick, 14 Centre Avenue, Epping, Essex.
HARLOW. Stephen Murrell, 34 Sharpcroft, Essex.
LOUGHTON. Group c/o Students' Union, Loughton College of Further Education, Borders Lane, Loughton, Essex.

NORTH-WEST FEDERATION

N.W. Fed. Sec.: Tom Howard, 163 Ryelands Road, Lancaster.
Secretary: Phil, 7 Trinity Square, Preston.
BLACKPOOL. Contact Christine and Graham, 2 Fenner Avenue, Southshore, Blackpool.
BOLTON. Contact John Hayes, 51 Rydal Road, Bolton.
CHORLEY. Contact Kevin Lynch, 6 Garfield Terrace, Chorley.
LANCASTER & MORECAMBE. Tom Howard, 163 Ryelands Road, Lancaster. Meetings Monday at 8 p.m., Phil Woodhead's, 30 Dunkeld Street, Lancaster. Regular literature sales.
MANCHESTER ANARCHISTS AND SYNDICALISTS. Contact Rachel Golditch, 34 Wyndpark Road, Salford, Lancs. (740 2516).
PRESTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Rob Wilkinson, 73 Trafford Street, Preston. Meetings: 'The Wellington Hotel', Glovers Court, Preston. Wednesdays, 8 p.m.

SURREY FEDERATION

MERSEYSIDE. c/o John Cowan, 172a Lodge Lane, Liverpool 8.
DORKING. Mungo Park, 16 Overdale Road, Dorking, Surrey.
EPSOM. G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom. Tel. Epsom 23866.
KINGSTON. Michael Squirrel, 4 Woodgate Ave., Hook, Chesham, Bucks.
GUILDFORD. Contact Epsom Group.
MERTON. Elliot Burns, 13 Amity Grove, London, S.W.19. Tel. 01-946 1444.

SUSSEX FEDERATION

Groups and individuals invited to associate: c/o Eddie Poole, 5 Tilsbury, Flindon Road, Whitehawk, Brighton.
BRIGHTON & HOVE ANARCHIST GROUP TOWN & UNIVERSITY. Contact Nick Heath, Flat 3, 26 Clifton Road, Brighton.
CRAWLEY ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Richard Ashwell, 87 Backwood Drive, Gossops Green, Crawley, Sussex.
SUSSEX UNIVERSITY ANARCHIST GROUP

(see details under Student Groups).

YORKSHIRE FEDERATION

Secretary: Contact Leeds Group.
HARROGATE. Contact Roger Willis, 22 Princess Avenue, Knaresborough, Yorks.
HULL: Jim Young, 3 Fredericks Crescent, Hawthorn Avenue, Hull.
KEIGHLEY: Steve Wood, 26B Cavendish Street, Keighley.
LEEDS GROUP. Contact Martin Watkins, 3 Marlborough Grove, Leeds 2.
SHEFFIELD: Dave Jeffries, c/o Students Union, Western Bank, Sheffield, 10. I. C. Wood, 65 Glencoe Road, Sheffield.
YORK. Keith Nathan, Vanbrugh College, Heston, York.

WELSH FEDERATION

ABERYSTWYTH ANARCHISTS. J. Smith, Nanteos Mans, Aberystwyth, Cards. Bobus Marsland, c/o Students' Union, Laure Place, Aberystwyth, Cards.
CARDIFF ANARCHIST GROUP. All correspondence to—Pete Raymond, 18 Marion Street, Splott, Cardiff.
SWANSEA ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Ian Bone, 18 Windsor Street, Uplands, Swansea. Meetings at the above address every Sunday at 7 p.m.
LLANELLI: Contact Dai Walker, 6 Llwyrynydd Road, Llanelli, Carm. Tel: Llanelli 2548.

SCOTTISH FEDERATION

All correspondence to Tony Hughes, Top Flat, 40 Angle Park Terrace, Edinburgh, 11.
ABERDEEN ANARCHISTS & SYNDICALISTS. Contact Ian & Peggy Sutherland, 8 Esmolton Avenue, Aberdeen. Regular 'Freedom' Sale, leafletting, etc. Visiting comrades welcome.
GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP. Robert Lynn, 12 Ross Street, S.E.
EDINBURGH. Tony Hughes, Top Flat, 40 Angle Park Terrace, Edinburgh 11.
FIFE. Bob and Una Turnbull, 39 Stratheden Park, Stratheden Hospital, By Cupar.
MONTROSE. Dave Goull, 3 Eskview Terrace, Ferryden, Montrose, Angus.
ROSS-SHIRE. Contact David Rodgers, Broomfield, Evanton, Ross-shire, Scotland.

NORTHERN IRELAND

BELFAST ANARCHIST GROUP. No address available. Letters c/o Freedom Press.

SOUTHERN IRELAND

IRISH ANARCHIST FEDERATION. Permanent centre. Meetings every Sunday 3.30 p.m., Island, Corner Merrion Road and Nutley Lane, Dublin, 4. Visitors accommodated.

STUDENT GROUPS

LOUGHTON. c/o Students Union, Loughton College of Further Education, Borders Lane, Loughton, Essex.

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX. Contact Andrew Chalk, William Morris Tower, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex.
KEELE UNIVERSITY ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Pete Hannah, c/o Students Union, University of Keele, Staffs.
OXFORD ANARCHISTS. Contact John Nygate, New College, Oxford; Steve Watts, Trinity College, Oxford.
SWANSEA. Contact Ian Bone, 18 Windsor Street, Uplands, Swansea.
TAUNTON. Contact Dave Poulson, 47b Bramley Road, Taunton, Somerset.
YORK. Contact R. Atkins, Vanbrugh College, Heston, York.
LSE. St. Clements Buildings, Houghton Street, W.C.2.
LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY GROUP. At the Anarchist Bookstall, Union Foyer, every Friday lunch time or write Anarchist Group, Student Union, Liverpool University.
SCHOOLS ANARCHIST GROUP. Kate & Joe, 3 Withy Lea, Leonard Stanley, nr. Stonehouse, GL10 3NS, Gloucestershire.
SCHOOLS ANARCHIST GROUP — BELFAST AREA. Michael Scott, Longshot, Ballyvaughin, Lisburn.

ABROAD

AUSTRALIA. Federation of Australian Anarchists, P.O. Box 4 389, Sydney South, NSW 2000.
BELGIUM. Groupe du journal *Le Libertaire*, 220 rue Vivignis, Liège.
RADICAL LIBERTARIAN ALLIANCE. Box 2104, Grand Central Station, New York, N.Y. 10017.

PROPOSED GROUPS

BERMONDSEY. Roy Heath, 58 Thurburn Square, S.E.1.
BRISTOL GROUP. Alex Bird, 59 Belvoir Road, St. Andrews, Bristol.
MONTREAL, QUEBEC. Anyone interested in forming a Montreal area Anarchist group please contact Ron Siger. Tel. 489-6432.
NORWICH. c/o John Sullivan, 32 Jerningham Road, New Costessey.
NOTTINGHAM and area. Contact Jim Hewson, 43 Henry Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham.
NOVA SCOTIA. P. Ridley, c/o Newport Post Office, Newport, Nova Scotia, Canada.
OXFORD ANARCHISTS. Dave Archard, Corpus Christi College, or John Humphries, Balliol.
VANCOUVER I.W.W. and Libertarian group. Box 512, Postal St. 'A', Vancouver 1, B.C., Canada. Read 'The Rebel'—please send donation for postage.

Please notify us if entries in these columns need amending.

All Powell to the People

NOW THAT THE Conservative Party has been elected, we have to take at least part of the responsibility for those results. The voter turnout in this election was 70% of the electorate. Part of the missing 30% must be accredited to our 'Don't Vote' campaigns as well as general disillusionment with both parties. Anyone who was part of this campaign knew before he made the decision to participate, that a low voter turnout could possibly mean a Conservative victory. Now that they have won, we must analyze our actions. (Last week's FREEDOM, by the way, was shown on the David Frost show, as 'the only paper in Britain that correctly predicted the election results'. If Mr. Frost would have read the article, however, he would have seen that the title referred to either party.)

The Conservative victory means in concrete terms, a tightening of the economic belt, more blatant repression of students and other young people, more stringent rules for unions and factory workers, and a whole array of other unpleasant policies. This might at first look as if we've made a mistake. Some of our comrades might have even felt a tinge of regret or even guilt at the Labour defeat.

The situation in England at the present time is in many ways similar to the situation in the United States after Nixon's election. The Yuppies and others

had gone to Chicago to 'Dump the Hump' and they were successful. There is little doubt that the fighting on the streets during the Convention, helped the Republicans win the White House in November.

Edward Heath is Britain's Richard Nixon, and Enoch Powell his Spiro Agnew. Since the last American election, the United States has moved from a state of general disruption, to a climate of insurrection. Nixon and Agnew stripped away the Kennedy facade which was already under heavy strain after Lyndon Johnson. It is highly likely that Heath's ineptitude and Powell's blatant racism will do the same here.

There is of course, a great risk. During the 1930's, the German Communists supported the Nazis with the hope that they would create a revolutionary situation. They were wrong, and the world suffered the consequences. In America, it seems, the Left has made the same choice, and the results are inconclusive. Now we, every one of us who urged people not to vote, or in some other way helped to prevent a Labour victory, is faced with the same choice. Our decision is not as yet of the same magnitude as that of the German Communists. Edward Heath is certainly not an Adolf Hitler, but with the Atom Bomb and the whole of modern technology, the final results could be worse. These are all

factors which we must (should have) considered before we aid, in any way, the more blatantly reactionary government.

Realizing the consequences of our action, we still maintain our anarchist position. If we truly believe that all governments are the same (Labour may shoot us with 'Sugar-coated Bullets', but they are bullets just the same) then our major goal is to bring them all to an end. During the Chicago riots, Humphrey showed the true nature of American Government by refusing to condemn the police actions. Similarly Wilson, during his term in office, refused to condemn the racism of South Africa or the US

The American Republicans and the British Conservatives will end any illusion of a government, by, for, and of, the people. As big business benefits, the poor man on the street who voted Conservative because 'the Labour Party didn't do anything for us', will have no alternative but to take power into his own hands. The next election will have more people in the streets and fewer at the polls than did this one. Powellism, along with economic and political chaos will alienate enough people to begin a movement beyond politics.

There is a risk, a grave risk. Six students were already killed on American campuses. The Republicans brought to young whites, first-hand experience of what the blacks have been suffering during the past 200 years. Is it worth it? If liberty is the goal, we must take the chance.

MIKE BOARD.



Any book not in stock, but in print can be promptly supplied. Book Tokens accepted. Please add postage & cash with order helps.

New Books on Anarchism and kindred subjects

(Paperbacks)

- Surrealism and Revolution: an Anthology 7/6
- Communitas Paul & Percival Goodman 14/-
- Character Analysis Wilhelm Reich 30/-
- Reich Speaks of Freud 20/-
- Commonwealth of Massachusetts versus Sacco and Vanzetti 20/-
- Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood 18/6
- Rebel Voices: an IWW Anthology 45/-
- The Spanish Labyrinth Gerard Brenan 22/-
- Anarchism George Woodcock 8/-
- Patterns of Anarchy Krimmerman & Perry 20/-
- Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School Leila Berg 6/-
- How Children Learn John Holt 5/-
- How Children Fail John Holt 5/-
- The Anxiety Makers Alex Comfort 8/6
- Nature and Human Nature Alex Comfort 6/-
- Divided Ulster Liam de Paor 5/-
- French Revolution 1968 Seale & McConville 6/-
- In the Fist of the Revolution: Life in Castro's Cuba J. Yglesias 8/-
- Killing no Murder Edward Hyams 8/-
- No Treason Lysander Spooner 12/-

Younger than Yesterday

YOU ARE PROBABLY one of those who didn't vote last Thursday. Maybe you even decided to join the 'Festival of the Oppressed' in Itchy Park. If you did, you saw more than 300 happy people. You saw some dancing to the beat of a Jamaican band, while others were chanting the Hare Krishna. Perhaps you enjoyed a masterful rendition of the Internationale played on a plastic kazoo. You were relieved to see the ideals which died at the Roundhouse (see last week's FREEDOM), reborn in the park that morning. Gone were the authoritarian speech-makers. Gone were the 'Don't hassel me man, let me do my own thing' hippies. And gone was the commercialism of those who would try to profit from a developing life-style. You began to understand the words of Jerry Rubin: 'Hip capitalism is pig capitalism.'

You were probably among the people who danced out of the park at 2 p.m. into the neighbouring factory district in the East End. You saw the people inside open their windows and peer out. At first they were curious, then joyful. Some flashed the V-peace sign and others gave the clenched fist. You returned their salute and shouted to them. You told them not to vote, but rather to come and join the march. As the parade moved toward the city, you noticed that the enthusiasm of the spectators diminished. That didn't really bother you though, as you looked at their tight collars and hot jackets. Near the Stock Exchange the police tightened their ranks. The bankers and brokers standing in the streets were actively hostile. A copper smiled and pointed to you. 'He's mine', you heard him say. Another officer took the poster you were carrying. Maybe you wondered if he would paste it on some deserted wall in the middle of the night.

Suddenly there was shouting from the front of the procession. You turned to see a young man being dragged by the neck into the applauding crowd of spectators. A little frightened, you were glad

to see the parade move back to the East End.

Back in the factory district, your cries of 'Don't vote' were again met with shouts of agreement. While few people left their factories to join you in the street, you could see from their faces that they were with you in spirit. Some day, you knew, they would be with you in body. Maybe you closed your eyes to see visions of garment workers, tired of pushing their needles into cloth, using them as weapons against their bosses. You saw the tyre tracks left by the auto workers on the bodies of the politicians. The flower children grew thorns, and began to prick away at their teachers, the police and the last remnants of all authority.

Later that night, if you weren't too tired, you joined your sisters and brothers at the Arbour Square squat. There were supposed to be Rock Groups performing there, but none of them showed up. You didn't care. Over in the corner of the vacant lot, someone began to burn the trash which obviously had lain there for ages. The fire brigade came to douse the bonfire. While they were manning the hoses, you smile as you saw some seven- and eight-year-old children begin to build another, behind the backs of the firemen. When the first fire was extinguished, the second was already blazing. When they turned to put this one out, the children began booing. After the truck left, you were amazed to see another crowd of children begin to build a third fire. As you walked away from the square, you turned to see the fire blazing as the boys and girls were still piling it high with rubbish.

Next time someone tells you that we can't win, that 'we really don't realize how few we are', or 'the people will never understand the need to control their own lives', you will point to the children and smile, knowing that with them on our side, we can't lose.

RASPUTIN.

Nothing has really Changed

THE UNEXPECTED VICTORY for the Tories on June 18 means that we have a change in the political power of the country. But Friday morning was like any other morning in that the working people still had to go to work to earn the wherewithal to live.

That is the reality of the situation, for although there has been a change at Westminster, nothing has changed for the vast majority of the population. Whichever party forms the government, people will still have very little control over the decisions that will affect their lives. People will still have to face the same frustrations, chase rising prices and rents, be made redundant and even evicted. However it is little consolation to say that we have not taken part in this great con of voting every five years or so, for whether we like it or not, we are affected.

During this election there has been considerable amount of attention focussed on the act of voting. According to a variance of opinion, the crime was not so much which party you voted for, but whether you voted. Both the Guardian and the Daily Mirror emphasised the importance of voting and a priest in Kensington even said it was anti-Christian not to.

Clemenceau once let the cat out of the bag when he wrote: 'The popular vote is a toy of which one soon tires, but one must not say this aloud for the people must have a religion. Sad it is. . . . Sad, but true.' It is certainly true that the

nation States, with their 'democracy', have replaced the once powerful churches. People have looked to the State to provide, and 'democracy' gives the impression that people are participating and governing themselves.

Both Labour and the Conservatives, in their election campaigns, laid great emphasis on the economy. They linked it with the strength of the nation. Both tried to outdo each other at being patriots. But people's interests are not tied to those who are concerned with a strong economy. It is true that this can bring higher wages, etc., but it also means a more powerful ruling class. Whoever lives at No. 10 Downing Street, it is important to remember that big business, the permanent civil servants and the military do not change, neither do they come up for election.

People are becoming more and more frustrated by the normal political processes. The 'democratic' channels have long since been clogged up and blocked, that is if they were ever open! Sensing and knowing this, frustrated people are taking extra-parliamentary action for themselves, by a number of means. Certainly there is nothing new in this, but what is different and important, from an anarchist view, is the extent to which that direct action is being used. People are beginning to act for themselves, whether it is for a pedestrian crossing or a wage increase. And what is more, such action is getting results.

P.T.

Hostage Raids

Dear Comrades,

The article in FREEDOM (20.6.70), 'Hostage Raids in London', omits the most important fact, which is that when Miguel Garcia Garcia's room was searched, the police took away documents for which they gave him no receipt. (Comrade Garcia told me this.) Has Anarchist Black Cross taken any steps to inquire into this?

This letter refers to only one point made in the article, because most of it is too inexplicit to evaluate and some seems pure Walter Mitty—the reference to the farcical shadowing of Stuart Christie, following directions from the Home Secretary, 'to keep the anarchists quiet' over the election period—which date ABC seems not to have noticed coincided with the visit of Juan Carlos.

The point which should be taken seriously is the extension of police visitations to relatives and friends of people the police are interested in. This should be combated vigorously and persistently. It is indeed disgraceful when unknowing and unsuspecting people, including old ladies, are subjected to the very disagreeable experience of having several hefty policemen clumping through their privacy. It seems to me that some of the disgrace descends on those who, knowing the habits of police everywhere and their leaning towards 'guilt by association', choose to keep people with whom their lives are closely involved

ignorant that such a disagreeable experience could possibly come to them. If you have been publicly, but apparently not privately, proclaiming your support for terrorism as the right action in a particular cause, who do you expect the police to visit when somebody performs a terrorist act in the cause which is your own?

Fraternally,
MARY CANIPA.

Letters

The Arts and the Working Class

Dear Comrades,

Pete Neville's letter (FREEDOM, 23.5.70) completely misunderstood my previous letter to FREEDOM (9.5.70). First of all I did not attack Art or Poetry as such. I attacked what seemed to me to be an over-generous amount of space devoted to Art Criticism, and the individual philosophising of an élite. I am all in favour of genuine first-hand poetry or art included in FREEDOM, and just as I

compare first-hand art with vicarious art, so too do I compare Political Philosophy and Individual Philosophy. Let us have Political Philosophy and genuine art and poetry included in FREEDOM, but let's leave the individualistic philosophising for the private gatherings.

Our aim, comrades, is surely to sell FREEDOM to a mass audience—at least a politically-minded audience. (It's the only world-wide paper in English we've got.)

My aim in writing my previous letter was to suggest means of selling more FREEDOMS, and not to denigrate the poets, artists, etc., amongst us.

Yours fraternally,
PETE RIDLEY.

The Crazies is Everywhere!

This reply to the letter from John Roe, criticizing the article 'Crazies is Coming' was accidentally omitted in the last issue.

IT IS UNFORTUNATE that John Roe has misinterpreted my article. I was opposed to the indiscriminate hitting of demonstrators by their comrades. If Mr. Roe would re-read by article he would find that I wrote: 'Wrecking is an act of beauty, but it must be selective'. I even went further, stating that if the crowbar throwers (as they themselves stated) wanted to see 'as much of a bloody mess' as they could, then they should 'impale themselves on the iron fence surrounding the building' rather than throw things at people who were already on their side.

As for the question of violence, we

must distinguish between repressive violence and liberating violence. Rent, police clubs, rats, etc., are all forms of repressive violence. If we are chained, and we break those chains, that too is violence, but it is liberating violence. Black people, Pakistanis, Poles, and Jews are not tools of repressive violence. Bankers and police are. My 'orgasm' come not from 'blood and terror' but from freedom.

RASPUTIN.

Every Wedge . .

GLASGOW POLICE are soon to be issued with a riot shotgun which is made in America. It is of the type used by American police forces and made its debut in Chicago last year with Mayor Daly's riot squads.

It has a very wide spread of shot and can pepper a room by being fired through a letterbox. At close range it will blow a hole clean through a man's body.

Glasgow police were worried by the gunman that recently went wild in that city and they see it as a means of taming dangerous, armed criminals without exposing police personnel to injury. A police spokesman hastened to add that it would not be used in the preserving of public order or against demonstrators as in Chicago.

It is worth remembering that when CS gas grenades were issued to the British police two years ago the Home Secretary said (July 4, 1968), 'It is misleading to suggest that CS gas might be used for maintaining public order.'

LARRY LAW.

FREEDOM PRESS & BOOKSHOP

Revised opening times:

- Monday Closed all day
- Tuesday open 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.
- Wednesday open 2 p.m. to 5 p.m.
- Thursday open 2 p.m. to 8 p.m.
- Friday open 2 p.m. to 8 p.m.
- Saturday open Noon to 4 p.m.
- Sunday Closed all day

CLOSED AT ALL OTHER TIMES EXCEPT

Wednesday night meetings in hall on ground floor 8 p.m. to 10.30 p.m.
Thursday—except the first in each month—FREEDOM folding until 9.00 p.m.

Continued from page 1

PILKINGTON'S

forced to adopt militant tactics in order to save the union from a serious decline in members and even went on to hire socialists and communists as CIO organisers in the late 1930's.

It remains to be seen whether Lord Cooper will do a John L. Lewis in the Municipal Workers' Union, but if the union doesn't make some militant gestures soon, it could be that the union will be a dead duck.

NORTH WEST WORKERS.

World Government or No Government

AN OPEN LETTER to George Lakey and all believers in non-violent revolution, written after I had attended a day-school with G.L. as the main speaker, on 'Strategies for Non-violent Revolution', at the Friends Meeting House in Manchester, on May 23.

In his opening speech George Lakey spoke a lot about an envisaged 'world community' and ended by proclaiming his assumption that the ideal we all had in mind was World Government. When I asked him to explain the connection between 'world community' and World Government, two totally opposed concepts to me, G.L. replied that they were the same thing. I gathered that George developed the ideal of World Government due to his belief that we could not get around the problem of 'the Law thing'.

If you propose that, since history has shown that Man cannot do without Government, the end for which we strive is a World Government, achieved by the means of non-violent revolution, you must also see that throughout recorded history every Government has had the power, the agencies, and has not hesitated to use, small or large-scale violence to preserve the *status quo*. More precisely, it seems that if you propose: it is evident from history and/or is evident now that Man has always needed Government (to preserve Law and Order), you must accept: it is evident from history—and to me now—that every Government has needed to use violence (to preserve Law and Order), from which I infer that you are saying: it is evident from history and/or now that Man has always needed violence (to preserve Law and Order).

I assume that G.L.'s claim after offering the first proposition (have you read *The Poverty of Historicism* by Karl Popper?) and accepting the second, is that my inference can be avoided by saying that a World Government and the Law and Order it would be preserving would differ considerably and fundamentally from any Government hitherto governing. I would ask G.L. how. I would ask him how he sees such a heterogeneous species—in individual differences and in group norms—as 'Mankind' bound to a (I suppose, assembly of representative-type) World Government and the 'Law and Order' it purports to be preserving (but which it would undoubtedly manufacture so that it has something to, can be seen to have something to, and justifies its existence in, preserving) without the use by the World Government of violence. To me, 'to preserve Law and Order' is a blanket phrase used by some Governments, and a concept implicit in all Governments, whether they call it 'Law and Order', 'National Interests' or in G.L.'s case 'World Interests' so that they can reduce, classify, illegitimise and thus contain the whole range of behaviour they suspect or know to be against them, or at all likely to bring them down—from the 'mentally sick' to the 'thief', from the vandal to the conscientious objector; the first three categories of which Governments and their agencies say they are interested in reducing, i.e., a large justification for their existence since those categories threaten the stability of the *status quo*—but whose classificatory scales and incidence rates they are forever increasing. We are still slaves, but most of us do not see that we are slaves (in the so-called 'democracies' of the West, at any rate)—which is all to the good for Governments and their associates, Big Business Inc.—for slaves who do not feel or see their shackles, do not demand their release, are unlikely to rebel.

To get back to my main point. That if you adopt the strategy of non-violent revolution because this is the nature of your own conscientious position and is the fundamental nature of the desired 'world community' (the end therefore intimately linked with the means of achieving it), it is paradoxical, even I would say an untenable position, that you find the real fact of any Government today at all viable in the light of your own non-violent conscience, and the idea of a World Government (which, if you do accept the above propositions about Governments—their necessity and their necessary violence—to be true, you must postulate as having 'law-enforcement agencies') to be the ideal end for non-violent revolution. (This argument has been stated much more succinctly by, for instance, *Herbert Read*—see *Resurgence*, Vol. 2, No. 2—and before him *Gandhi*, *Tolstoy* and probably many others.)

The processes of forced 'union', concentration and centralisation of power by Governments and other hierarchical power structures (i.e., really a con-

cretization, isolation and insulation) undoubtedly has deleterious effects on the persons thus forcefully 'unified' (immediately—e.g., for those dispossessed by the Enclosures, and in the long term—e.g., again the dispossessed, and the effects of 'unity' under one Government on any region more than a certain distance from the Government ruling it) and with obviously advantageous effects for the 'Unifiers'—Governments and the dominant ruling class they exist to, and notably, protect. Yet more centralisation and concentration of power, which is implied in the concept of 'World Government', would indubitably increase alienation; this would undoubtedly lead to an increase in 'anti-social' and 'asocial' behaviour; the World Government would organise more coercive agencies to deal with it (i.e., to preserve 'Law and Order' or 'World Interests') which would further antagonise persons and groups of persecuted persons, and result in widespread violence. I suggest that World Government is no solution to Governments in conflict now.

Governments and authoritarian organisations illegitimise all violence except their own and that which is advantageous to them. Something like the attitude most persons might now have perhaps—but the effect differs considerably in magnitude. I have not and do not intend to, use violence to compel people to accept my ideas or do what I say—though I realise that in paying taxes to the State I am indirectly involved in violence. However, I accept though find it abhorrent, that some people welcome and are content to use violence. I do not hope to change this situation, because I do not fully understand it (except to say that compulsion and coercion of people by Governments has a brutalising effect, and forces people to be violent). Governments talk about 'putting down' violence and disorder (by their own violence, of course). Surely the violent individual is least socially harmful the more his capacity for (especially large-scale) violence is minimised, i.e., hierarchical power structures which allow persons to gain positions whereby they are enabled to use violence on a large-scale, must be dissolved. To illustrate this—a man with an impulsive, violent temperament in possession of a wooden pistol in the middle of the Sahara Desert is obviously socially harmless; in a village with a rifle he is dangerous; more so with a tank in a city, and yet more dangerous sat by the controls of a rocket-range (back in the desert?).

What I do see is that institutionalised violence has been and is the biggest single preventative of peace and harmony on earth. There is a lot of evidence for believing that politicians and policemen and the like tend to have (obviously) authoritarian, aggressive and violent, even delinquent, personalities. (See *Alex Comfort's Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State*.) I see nothing revolutionary in proposing a union of present Governments, in terms of creating a non-violent world; nor in the idea of a new institution—a World Government—because I believe that it would not fail to use violence, and on a large scale. I propose that the only revolutionary idea, in terms of creating a non-violent world, is the doing away with violent, hierarchical institutions, not least—Governments.

I believe in 'self-government'—the only 'government' I will have—my own conscience. I am represented by, and represent, no one but myself. I believe that the only way that Mankind can live so that each person can develop his best capabilities is by a way of voluntary co-operation—by mutual aid. I ask George to think again about the idea of World Government. 'World community?'—well, I visualise rather a 'World of communities' of free persons in free co-operation, living together by free exchange. As you have gathered, I am an Anarchist. We do not need, and never have needed (although there have always been), Governments, masters, 'bosses' and formal authority of any kind. (See the current *Anarchy*, No. 111, for a good exposition of Anarchism as being the only essentially non-violent and revolutionary philosophy.)

About 'the Law thing'—you must be aware that there is no required, or evident, connection between legality and morality; yet, unless you believe in the necessity of legal systems 'for their own sake', you seem to believe that without the legal system there would be no morality. To me, they seem for the greater part, opposed. The State holds you responsible for any 'crime' you may commit, including 'crimes' against itself like refusing to fight in its wars, but reduces any constructive and purposeful personal res-

ponsibility you have in deciding what you want to do with your life to little or nothing. Witness the tragic absurdity of the American and British Governments in, on the one hand, making 'pot-smoking illegal when it has been found to be highly unlikely to have physically or socially harmful effects, and on the other hand, to refuse to make illegal or stop using 'CS' gas when it has been found to be certainly physically harmful (and to me socially harmful as are all such typical manifestations of Governments). The *bellum omnium contra omnes* that I think G.L. fears, is already evident to me, and it is not the 'war of all against all' that Hobbes took the State to be stopping and preventing, but a war of all against all that the State is happily perpetuating.

I suspect that George formed the ideal of a World Government from a belief that Man needs Governments and will always need Governments, and because of all the Governments now preparing for or actually waging war against each other, one Government—a World Government—would be best. If you do not believe in the absolute and eternal necessity of Governments though, would you then postulate the 'World Government as ultimately 'withering away'? I suspect that this is a highly improbable prophecy/promise. Even if it purported to be a non-warring Government of the World (but nevertheless with its 'law-enforcement agencies' to control 'civilly-disobedient' Earthlings), it would seem likely that a similar excuse to the Soviet State's would be found; instead of the possibilities of 'counter-revolution' and invasion by other nations, the World Government would hang on to power and all its trappings—nuclear weapons, a soaring space-weapons budget, etc., the lot!, on the grounds of a 'World Defence System' in case of invasion from outer space.

Even if George Lakey had stated a case for World Government as the ideal end for non-violent revolution, on the sole basis of a rational world-economy and equal distribution of wealth, I would dispute this again on the grounds that coercion of regions would be likely to accrue from any conflicts irresolvable on the basis of prolonged rational discussion, between it and any region, and would lead the World Government to form and use violent 'law-enforcement agencies'. If you reject this suspicion, I would suggest that a world united by a system of free exchange of commodities, surplus food, etc. (and this I presume is what G.L. wants—or at least the disappearance of free-enterprise and State-capitalism), and with the recognition of the freedom of each commodity-producing group or unit by each other, would not need a World Government, but would function well with a system of unit-co-ordinating information (NOT decision-making) centres.

The violent power-seekers and delinquents, and that is not to say that politicians or aspiring politicians are not sincere men(!), must be deprived of

their expensive and so-effectively destructive toys—the machines and the machine of power. One might say that there is a sort of 'World Government' already—or at least a world conspiracy of Governments. They are all agreed on the rules of the game they play with the lives of those they govern (thus there has never been a war with total annihilation of one Government and its 'side' by another). They all ultimately agree, but need to make it look as if they don't, so that the governed will keep providing expensive, destructive toys, and remain happy to be, or at least not unhappy to be, governed. As the American anarchist, *Randolph Bourne* said: 'War is the health of the State'—'health' primarily in psycho-social terms—i.e., Governments certainty of their ability (and staging of 'shows' like wars, etc.) to hold the governed, and keep them convinced (conned) of the necessity for Government. There is a better chance of the appearance of a non-violent humanity (and the disappearance of violent humanity) when the institutions which encourage, enforce and perpetuate violence, are gone.

I would suggest that the 'illusion of being together' and the miserable endurance, which is all we seem to have in common at present, would be strengthened by the existence of a World Government; that the mature recognition and acceptance of the differences and the uniqueness of individual human beings, would be hindered or made impossible. Unless you want even less freedom than most of humanity have now, unless you are prepared to justify violence as a necessary measure in certain instances (then specify), if you remain basically a believer in non-violence, such an ideal as World Government is inappropriate, even foolish.

Unless you can provide totally convincing reasons and evidence for upholding your present views on non-violence/to World Government, and I am fairly convinced that you cannot (please do not think me smug—I am just very concerned that you do reconsider your ideals), I cannot help but see you at present as a 'wolf in sheep's clothing', and a potential willing member of some Government, at some time, somewhere.

This does not minimise my admiration for people in the Quaker Action Movement like the crew of the *Phoenix* who, despite its declared illegality by the US Government, shipped medical supplies to N. Vietnam, and for draft-resisters and all insurrectionaries and rebels everywhere acting for and taking their freedom. However, I ask you, George, to see that the only consistent outlook that you can have on the basis of non-violence, is a libertarian one. Until all non-violent revolutionaries see this, the movement will remain radically split; and I for one will not join with George Lakey in any action, nor support any action of his, if his action is intended to further the creation of a World Government.

PETER BAKER.

LETTER

TRAVEL SYNDICALIST!

Dear Comrades,

The recent invitation in the Contact Column issued by the Syndicalist Workers' Federation to 'travel syndicalist this year' amused me. Twenty-five years ago, when I was a lad of fifteen in Denmark, I struck up a friendship with an old anarcho-syndicalist. He was eloquent as well as erudite and he told all and sundry (provided they would listen) that 'travel syndicalist' along the stony path of life was about the most rational thing a human being could do. He was, perhaps, an anarcho-syndicalist of the old school—his love for humanity was equalled only by his hatred for the bosses—but he was more than anyone else responsible for the reason that I came to regard anarcho-syndicalism as a solution to many of the problems which face people in a highly developed society.

Although the ideas of syndicalism have not received the mass support they deserve, there are signs that issues such as workers' control, power at the point of production, etc., are being considered

'Who will govern the governors?'—Juvenal.

as practical and desirable by an increasing number of people.

Thousands of workers are truly fed up with the prospect of having to fight a powerful, comfortably entrenched trade union bureaucracy as well as the bosses—and fed up with a status which amounts to little more than industrial serfdom. Frustration is, alas, one thing—and a capacity to see a way out of the situation quite another.

Will extensive syndicalist and anarchist propaganda in our factories, farms and centres of distribution convince the workers that here is a solution—or have the minds of the frustrated been conditioned to look for solace rather than solutions?

Most of us inherit at birth quite a number of emotional and intellectual crutches. Anarchists are perhaps more successful than others in discarding them, but we should not overlook that a great number of people grow to love their crutches to such an extent that they are perfectly convinced they cannot walk without them—and that it would be folly even to try.

Attitudes such as this, I think, prompted my old friend to say: 'If it is true that the working class has a messianic role, then, by Christ, there are an awful lot of latter-day Messiahs who

Contact

Contact Column is for making contact! Use is free, but donations towards typesetting costs are welcome

Libertarian Teachers Association. Day Conference, Sunday, July 5, 11 a.m., Freedom Hall.

Agitprop Information will continue during the summer months. In addition we will be maintaining a left bookshop from 2 to 8 p.m. at 160 North Gower Street, London, N.W.1 (01-387 5406). A sample copy of *Red Notes*, our monthly information newsletter, and the literature list, especially useful for community organizers, are available, s.a.e.

Lowestoft Libertarians contact Ann & Gordon Collins, 9 Ontario Road, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Tuesday evenings. Comrades welcome for short stay by the sea.

Drug Dependents' Care Group needs accommodation. Flats or Houses with understanding landlords. Offers or help to Liz Johnson, 2 Bullfinch Close, Riverhead, Sevenoaks, Kent. Also meetings alternate Thursdays, July 2, 16, etc., 7.30 p.m., 6 Endsleigh Street, W.C.1. Jumble is needed to raise funds, and any offers to visit drug offenders in Prison and Remand Homes. Contact Liz Johnson 0732 51061.

Orpington Group — Meeting Saturday, June 27 at 3 o'clock.

Any Comrade wanting a Continental holiday with beautiful scenery available, a fine library of Anarchist books in many languages—about 150 books and pamphlets in English—and very friendly comrades, should visit CIRA (International Centre for Research on Anarchism), Beaumont 24, 1012 Lausanne, Switzerland. Sleeping bag accommodation could even be arranged if good notice is given of intended visit.

Bristol Group. Anyone interested in getting a group together contact: Alex Bird, 59 Belvoir Road, St. Andrews, Bristol. Also could 'Roderick' contact me as soon as possible.

'Anarchy' numbers 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 26, 30, 96, 98 wanted to complete collection. Can offer numbers 39 and 48. Contact Andrew Nicolson, 12a The Pryors, East Heath Road, London, N.W.3 (01-435 1389).

Going to Canada to Avoid the Draft? You need the new March, 1970 edition of 'Immigration to Canada and its Relation to the Draft and the Military'. Single copies free from the Montreal Council to Aid War Resisters, Case Postale 5, Succursale Westmount, Montreal 215, Quebec, Canada.

Notting Hill Libertarian Society. Meetings every Monday at 7.30 p.m., upstairs room of 'The Ladbroke', Ladbroke Crescent, Ladbroke Grove, W.11. Nearest tube station Ladbroke Grove. Correspondence to Sebastian Scragg, 10 Basset Road, W.10.

Comrades in Southern England needed to picket/leaflet Cornwall holiday routes (A.30 and A.38), main line stations, etc. First co-ordinated weekend, Saturday, July 4. More details from *Cloze Nancekuke Now*, 42 Pendarves Street, Beacon, Cambridge, Cornwall.

Oxford Anarchists. New group being formed, contact Dave Archard, Corpus Christi College, or John Humphries, Balliol.

'The Alternative Election' — Anarcho-Syndicalism; illustrated poster available, 4/- post free or 7 copies for a guinea. From Syndicalist Workers Federation, c/o 18 Scoresdale, 13 Beulah Hill, London, S.E.19.

Merseyside Anarchists: Meetings 8 p.m. on first Sunday of each month at 172A Lodge Lane, Liverpool 8. Contact J. B. Cowen at above address.

Wednesday discussion meetings at Freedom Meeting Hall from 8 p.m.

Urgent. Help fold and dispatch FREEDOM every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.

haven't heard about it yet.' Most of the time, however, he was tremendously optimistic—as I am and most of us are—but I know that the question which occasionally concerned him was: How long will it take to tell them all and, having told them, how many are willing to think about it?

Fraternally,
HANS CHRISTIAN JENSEN.

Chippenham; Wilts. (The above article is a copy of an article published in *Freedom Press*, London, N.1. Printed by Express Printing, London, E.1.)