

The Realities of Power

THE CHANGE that comes over politicians between the time just prior to their election to power and after is a remarkable one. Put it down to the realities of being in power and the Government if you like, but certainly it has nothing to do with honesty. The art is to say one thing and do another, while convincing the people that you are carrying out your verbal promises.

In the hustings the Tories, contrary to the name, gave the impression that they were the party of change. Probably with our dull consensus politics, it is inevitable that the opposition party should falsely acquire this image. However three weeks of power have substituted the image for reality, for whatever party forms the Government, they, by the reality of power, become the Tories. It is the Government who wish to conserve and the nature of their power, whether 'democratic' or 'despotic' determines the degree to which they are prepared to go in order to hang on to that power.

In this country we are saddled with 'democratic institutions', but the powers that are behind the

changing faces at Downing Street remain the same. While anarchists have always stressed this point, those who voted Tory learned this week that the promises given only a short time ago are now being delayed or hedged with conditions.

The Tories have said that they will reduce taxation and abolish Selective Employment Tax. These measures, we were told, would stimulate greater initiative in the individual. It would help investment and give people more freedom to use their money in the way they choose. The Tories also wanted to lift the monetary restraints imposed by the previous government and so

give impetus to a sluggish economy.

NO RELAXATION

Now that the new Chancellor, Mr. Macleod, has been briefed by the Treasury, the reality is that these promises cannot be implemented, at least not for the time being. It seems that despite that favourable balance of payments, and both the Tories and Labour agree here, we still cannot afford to relax. We are still having too much of a good time and the Tories are to re-examine Labour's spending projects. Economies and cut-backs in expenditure will have to be made if the 'difficulties' mentioned by the Prime

Minister are to be overcome.

How these economies will affect the people is not hard to imagine. Certainly they will not be made on defence, for the Tories envisage an expansion in the armed forces. They talk of a tough line on the nationalised industries, but this is hypocrisy. With the exception of steel, it was only the unprofitable industries which were taken over by the State and, by their ruthless management, are now beginning to climb out of the red.

The economies that will be implemented will, as in these State-controlled industries, be those which will affect the vast majority of the

country. The cut-backs in expenditure will not be made in the purchase of weapons of mass destruction for the forces, or equipment for the police, but in the social services that we now enjoy. Inroads on these were made by the Labour Government and the Tories will continue, not because they are the Conservatives, but simply because of the reality of power.

The economy dictates what the Government can or cannot do. The permanent officials in the Ministries in Whitehall give all the up-to-date information and formulate the policies to fit the economic situation of the time. It is true that each party may put a different emphasis on their policies, but the results are the same. They are the continuing exploitation of people's lives for the gain in power, privilege and profit.

P.T.

Hard Cases Make Bad Law

harassment has increased under the Conservatives; this, disregarding the fact that the Piccadilly commune clearance happened under Labour, drug laws were tightened up under Labour, and the cases against IT and Student Service were initiated by a Labour Government with a crusading Labour Home Secretary intent on 'Law and Order'.

The comforting myth that this would not have happened under Labour is inherent in attitudes about the Cambridge students' case when eight students were sentenced to six jail terms of nine to eighteen months and two Borstal sentences with the inclusion of double jeopardy of deportation for a Brazilian and a South African. It is true that

Judge Melford Stevenson is inherently vicious and wildly reckless in his sentencing and statements but this is, as it were, the weather. The climate of the law is always severe. Organized vengeance may seem worse under the Tories but the rigours of the law freeze the heart and numb the mind whether the voting lottery came up Labour or Tory. All sentences are life sentences.

Today in prisons up and down the country there are men and women doing time for social protest; they are no whit less political prisoners than their fellows in South Africa, Greece, Russia or Brazil. The law just happened to be different and the penalties greater but their offence was the same—defiance of the established institutions of property, international relations, morality and militarism. Some squatted; some were really dangerous—they defended themselves when attacked; some were romantic revolutionaries and paid for their dreams in 'porridge'; but all bear the witness and scars to the viciousness of law and order when roused in defence of property and the status quo. The idle myth of freedom of speech is shown up when the believer resorts to freedom of action.

Human memory is short but 'progressive' memories are shorter. When Labour was in power many such cases happened. In all the comment about Cambridge, there has escaped notice the equally vicious and in some respects more noteworthy case of the Brighton 'squat'. Readers of FREEDOM will, one hopes, need little reminding of the facts of that case, indeed of the whole era of squatting, which it typifies. It may be that as

there is a consensus of opinion betwixt Labour and Tory about squatting and there is none about Greece, this explains the press and 'progressive' neglect of Brighton.

Last Thursday at Lewes Michael Mountford was jailed for eighteen months (plus a hitherto suspended sentence of twelve months), Anthony Ballerini was sent to Borstal, Paul Miles was jailed for eight months, Michael O'Neill was given a suspended sentence of six months and Michael Mitchell was jailed for fifteen months. Another was put on probation.

The judge orated on, as judges will, about 'callous and wicked' men who encouraged provocative action in the hope of starting civil strife and had sought sympathy and pity in the guise of helping the homeless. Their mood was a 'very ugly and dangerous one' and the

squat was 'a direct challenge to the civil authorities'. Mountford was described by the judge as 'the most culpable and most responsible for the people on the squat'. Furthermore he said that the premises had been 'deliberately selected with the view to being defended'.

The sentences were brought in under a fine piece of very necessary legislation brought in to protect the modern citizen coming home from a hard year at the Crusades to find that the local peasants had 'forcibly detained' his property. The judge, probably and properly feeling the inadequacy of this piece of mediaeval flummery, asked the jury to decide whether a 'Molotov cocktail' was an explosive substance within the meaning of the Explosive Substances Act. The jury apparently did so, so a new accretion of 'case law' has added its polyp to the reef

Continued on page 2

THE DOCK STRIKE

NOW THAT the Transport and General Workers Union has introduced democratic procedure whereby the wishes of the members can be expressed by their delegates, a 76 to 1 vote in favour of a national dock strike has resulted. It is important to remember that while hardly a week goes by without a dispute in a port, this is the first official national strike since 1926. This is, I think, indicative of the strength and solidarity which we have come to take for granted in portworkers.

By the standards of other workers, the docker is highly paid, but to reach this level, he has had to put up a struggle second to none. This is the stark reality for the working class. The employer does not hand over any part of the worker's surplus labour value unless he is forced to. It is also important to remember that in any high average wage figures, there are those who earn less than that figure.

In the present situation, the port employers have been stalling now for eighteen months and have refused to reply to a demand for an increase in the basic minimum wage from £11 1s. 8d. to £20 per week. The union has put this claim forward six times without reply and so it is hardly surprising that the delegates voted to strike. The employers only offer was to increase the minimum earnings guaranteed fall-back from £16 to £20 per week.

The claim, by any standard, is high, but it would give those at the bottom of the scale a more realistic take-home wage. It will also affect the bonus, overtime and holiday payment, all of which are calculated on the basic minimum and here the employer estimates a 50% increase on the wage bill.

THE DEVLIN PLAN

Although dockers earn high wages,

one-third of the labour force has disappeared from dockland, under Lord Devlin's modernisation plans, through natural wastage and early retirements. These men have gone quietly and the employers, under the Devlin plan, are soaking up the profits.

Under new local port productivity deals, dockers are being offered double shift workings, without piece-work, with weekly wages of £35 and over. As it is, the average wage in the industry is £35 and employers see the minimum basic increase as a method whereby dockers will push piece-work earnings up so high that they will reject the new productivity deals.

Even though it is a national strike, the effects of shortages in food, raw materials and essential equipment will not be serious for at least three weeks. Contingency plans by the Government, involving the use of troops, are, it seems to me, just tough propaganda from a new-broom Government wishing to keep its firm opposition image.

If it does come to the troops being brought in, then other workers should offer their solidarity and show the Tories what labour relations are really all about. If the Prime Minister does act out a tough image, then it should be met with a response that will shake not only the Government but also the State to its foundations. All power to the docker's elbow.

P.T.

Wednesday

The delegate conference rejected the terms of the port employers—the Strike is on.



Anarchism & Behaviourist Psychology

JIM HEWSON'S LETTER raises an issue that has been hanging around FREEDOM for some time and needs clarification. Is there any connection between anarchism and different orientations in psychology? Apparently some writers to the paper are very confused as to the meaning of behaviourism and look on it as a threatening bogey. Hewson declares: 'Behaviourism seeks to control and manipulate human beings (ostensibly in the interests of scientific objectivity). The sting, you see, is in the word ostensibly. Now my dentist seeks to control and manipulate human beings (me included) and as far as I am concerned I welcome such manipulations. But he does not do it 'in the interests of scientific objectivity' but in the interests of the dental health of human beings. Scientific objectivity is not some sort of god to be served; in my work I try to use it—it serves me.

As I am a behaviourist psychologist I meet many others. Some are anarchists, many are vaguely radical and some are downright authoritarian and reactionary. But one meets the same spectrum of attitude among civil engineers, psychoanalysts, schoolteachers and bus conductors. Some people would say, therefore, that there is really no point in pursuing the discussion—it is not relevant to anarchism. Here I disagree; orientation in science is relevant to what anarchism is all about, and it is well worth while pursuing the matter further.

The relevance of orientation in philosophy and science to socio-political thinking has long been recognized. Today, when science is largely swamped by technology, this may be lost sight of. In Kropotkin's *Modern Science and Anarchism* he writes:

'What place, then, does Anarchism occupy in the great intellectual movement of the nineteenth century? . . . Anarchism is a conception of the universe based on the mechanical interpretation of phenomena, which comprises the whole of nature, including the life of human societies and their economic, political and moral problems. Its method is that of the natural sciences, and every conclusion it comes to must be verified by this method if it pretends to be scientific.'

Bakunin, from whom apparently Kropotkin had no direct influence, took the same line. In that collection of his writings which is sometimes published

under the title of *God and the State* he attacks what he calls the idealist trend in nineteenth century thought because it trammels the human mind with metaphysical chains. He argues that the methods of natural science applied to human affairs are essentially liberating.

THE STUDY OF BEHAVIOUR

Behaviourist psychology did not begin out of the blue with Watson in 1913. There had been plenty of forerunners in the nineteenth century and earlier. Some of what Watson claimed we know now to be basically untrue. There is now a great wealth of evidence indicating the extent to which behaviour is determined by genetic and instinctual factors which are not completely modifiable by experience, as Watson believed. But Watson was a useful figure in making psychologists face up to just what sort of science they were developing.

Today most people calling themselves psychologists (and recognized as such by their professional organization) would agree that what psychology is about is the study of behaviour.

Can psychology be used for anti-social ends? Yes of course it can—and is. Given a proper understanding of the mechanisms of human behaviour, people can be efficiently brain-washed. But this is not really an argument against psychology. All science gives power. The same sorts of science can be used to raise food production or to lay countries waste; knowledge of human physiology can be used to cure disease or poison people with nerve gases. Anarchism is not anti-knowledge, but opposed to the abuse of that knowledge by power groups.

HANGOVER FROM RELIGION

Now the ordinary layman feels that he can understand what science is about in matters of physics and chemistry, but he is rather uneasy about scientific psychology. This fear is a hangover from religion. He fears that the brutal behaviourist will disregard his tender psyche, do horrible things to his shy unconscious and somehow undermine his human dignity. Many would rather trust the blandishments of such ambiguous characters as the existential psychoanalysts who practise all the worse faults of psychiatry under the guise of 'anti-psychiatry'. They, like a very similar mob, the Scientologists, make a bid for influence by wrapping

up everything they claim in such vague and woolly jargon, and appeal to every high-sounding principle and libertarian exhortation, that their meaning is suitably obscure. They are the modern equivalent of the idealist philosophers against whom Bakunin railed. They are the purveyors of hocus pocus who are stepping into the places left by the priests of the dying Christian religion.

As a scientist I have a natural antipathy to hocus pocus whether it is purveyed by Alistair Crowley, Ronnie Laing or Ronnie Hubbard. Also, in my stiff-necked and prejudiced way, I have a contempt for those who become dupes because they are too feeble to question the authority of anyone who sets up to be a Master. My heart warms to old Kropotkin who wrote more than half a century ago:—

'When metaphysicians wish to persuade a naturalist that the intellectual and emotional life of man is unrolled "according to the inherent laws of the Spirit", the naturalist shrugs his shoulders and continues his patient study of the phenomena of life, of intelligence, and of emotions and passions, in order to prove that they may all be reduced to physical and chemical phenomena. He endeavours to discover their natural laws.'

Jim Hewson is probably wondering now who this writer Kropotkin is, and how on earth any anarchist publishing house came to publish such stuff! I would say that this that I have quoted is in the true tradition of the French Encyclopaedists, Godwin, Darwin, Bain, Herbert Spencer, Reclus, Thomas Huxley, Bertrand Russell and all those who have

fought against the domination of the Church and the obscurantism of the establishment. They have helped to develop a tradition of hard-headed empiricism which is one of the central themes in anarchism. William James characterized the anarchists as 'tough-minded lovers of facts in all their crude variety'. I should be sorry to see growing up within the anarchist movement today a sect of befuddled mystics characterized by their ignorance of anarchism and by their devotion to whatever phoney gurus are the pop thing of the moment.

I am well aware that some brash behaviourist psychologists like B. F. Skinner (his initials may be significant) are only too eager for his techniques to be used by the US navy. This is on a par with Leonardo da Vinci prostituting his great findings in the services of the wars of the Italian princes. But long after Skinner's daft ideas about trained pigeons directing naval torpedoes are forgotten, his sound work on the mechanisms of learning will have their place in science.

A LASTING RECOGNITION

Let me make it quite clear that I do not repudiate the essential value of the work of Sigmund Freud to modern psychology. His great insights into the nature of man deserve a lasting recognition. But Freud was no scientist, and many of the latter-day Freudians and pseudo-Freudians are not fit to lick his boots intellectually. I have defended the work of Freud against silly attack in the columns of FREEDOM in the past. As well as being no scientist, Freud was essentially an authoritarian in outlook, and

this authoritarianism is part of the Freudian tradition. It is not authoritarianism of the jack-boot variety, but authoritarianism of a spiritual variety such as forms the core of orthodox Judaic philosophy. They hold that only the initiated are in possession of the truth, the man-in-the-street just has to believe and follow. In contrast, behaviourist psychology is essentially radical and egalitarian. Popularizers like Eysenck have shown that everyone can come to grips with the problems of psychology. We think with our heads, not with our blood as the late Adolph Hitler enjoined us to do.

What we are up against is ignorance and fear. As I stated earlier, I trust and value the manipulations in which my dentist is skilled. Likewise I value the manipulations of other specialists—even those who have 'manipulated' my mind by teaching me things I wanted to learn. But I am my own owner, in Stiner's sense, and it is up to every man to own himself. If we own ourselves we will not be frightened of the bogey of the behaviourist psychologist. Rather we should be chary of the claims of the guru who promises some sort of spiritual salvation if we will only trust to his analysing us or processing us, and lead us to a Higher Reality.

TONY GIBSON.



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

Paisley in Leicester

IAN PAISLEY VISITED Leicester on Thursday, June 25, to 'Preach the Word of God' (the Word according to Paisley, that is) at the Evangelical Free Church, Melbourne Hall. That 'Word' is, of course, a word of hatred and intimidation and is designed to widen the split between the people of Northern Ireland.

A strong contingent of protesters accepted the invitation to 'come yourself—bring your friends' and succeeded in giving this 'Man of God' one of his warmest receptions. According to a policeman afterwards Paisley had 'never been so frightened' by an audience. The 'sermon' was in fact a political tirade in support of separatist Protestantism and against Roman Catholics and was punctuated by hecklers who were immediately and violently ejected by stewards, many wearing National Front badges.

In an overflow meeting in another part of the building we called down the wrath of the uptight respectable audience by ripping out the loudspeaker wiring when Paisley was in full flight. We were lucky to be 'rescued' by the police!

After the meeting the streets around the hall were crowded with people and the angry crowd, waiting to give Paisley the send-off he deserved, was provoked into sporadic fights and scuffles as anxious police tried to 'move people on' and arrest them for 'obstruction'. Following a particularly vicious attack on a West Indian 'obstructor' comrades (including Alan Ross) attempted to prevent the police van from moving. Soon after

it did get away Paisley managed to scuttle out of an unattended exit and escape, nearly two hours after the end of the meeting! As the police van returned from the station Alan shouted, 'Were you in the Gestapo, then,' at the driver who immediately stopped and arrested him. Unfortunately Alan still had in his pocket a bag of flour which had been thrust at him by a demonstrator but which he had not wanted to use. When this bag was discovered a policeman accused Alan of having thrown a flour-bomb at him (he had not thrown any). When Alan denied this the policeman replied, 'Well, somebody did!', and charged Alan with assault and using threatening behaviour. Seeing no way of establishing his innocence and being anxious to avoid an adjournment Alan pleaded 'guilty' to both offences. As a result he was fined the incredible sum of £75 (his grant amounts to £90 per term) which he is to be allowed to pay off at a rate of £5 per month. Other cases, including other assault cases, have been adjourned but we now have some idea of the vindictive penalties to be expected. If you can contribute towards a fund to help meet these fines please send whatever you can to:

Black Flag Bookshop,
1 Wilne Street,
Leicester.

We will acknowledge all money received and keep you informed of the outcome of the adjourned cases.

LEICESTER ANARCHISTS.

Reich Revisited

Continued from page 2

The second part of this pamphlet deals with Lenin, and the Russian Revolution. The Bolsheviks, in their attitudes to sex, and indeed to life in general, often differed not at all from the Boy Scouts. (Medical books are published in Russia today warning against the 'evils' of masturbation.) Lenin's famous remark that while sex may be no more than a glass of water no sane man will drink from a dirty glass shows that he saw sexual freedom in terms of prostitution, or half did so, for he then went on to qualify his statement by saying that in the case of sex, unlike drinking, two lives are involved. Unfortunately the second half of his statement tends to get forgotten. The first half was seized upon by all the petty bureaucrats and anxiety makers in the Soviet Union, in order to justify a policy of repression. The Russian Revolution, begun so hopefully, founded in patriotism and mysticism. Stalin was the last of the Byzantine emperors. Poems, quoted in Ethel Mannin's *Christianity or Chaos*, suggest that to some Russians he was a Sun God. 'Hail to thee, great Stalin, who makes

the sun to shine, and the crops to grow.' An ancient Egyptian would find this sentiment perfectly comprehensible. Lenin would have been bewildered, but he had some hand in it.

The present spectacle of the British nation, enthusiastically harriving a defenceless, but unfortunately easily identifiable minority, should be a warning to us. It can happen here. The youth seem freer than they have ever been before, but are they, are we, free enough from our repressions, and are we sufficiently numerous, to resist the present wave of the 'irrational', survive it and even check it?
A.W.U.

'There are only two kinds of government; the good and the bad. The good has never yet existed. The bad operates on the principle of transferring the property of its opponents into the pockets of its supporters.'—Dean Inge.

Squatting Story of Dublin

WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, was Black Wednesday in Dublin. At dawn somewhere about 150 gardai attacked 148 Pembroke Road, and effected the arrest of Mr. James McMahon, against whom there was an order of attachment, and the other people who were in the house with him to try to protect this family. The occupants resisted with coloured water, paste, etc., but the gardai outnumbered them hopelessly and were wearing riot gear and carrying chain saws and steel shields which they held over their heads. After a time those inside flew a white flag and perforce surrendered.

Meanwhile the house next door belonging to a jeweller, Paul Stritch by name, was entered by police with a search warrant, on the excuse of searching for arms. They had already done this before and found NOTHING. This time they found five rounds of .45 in a lavatory, but no gun. Some people think these cartridges were planted by Branch men. Certainly the man arrested for having them is as innocent as a babe unborn. The women and children in the house were made to get dressed and taken to the police station where they were searched. They were then driven back to the house which was now in possession of Mr. Paul Stritch, some of the Gallagher group who own 148 and a collection of God knows who. The men were retained in custody. The Stritch-Gallagher men intimidated the women so much that they were bundled out to sit on the steps in the cold dawn while the gardai did nothing to protect them or help them in any way. There they sat on the steps sans most of their possessions, terrified and dazed until the writer, having heard what had happened on the news, dashed down and took them to her tiny room. There they remained all day while she was at the court and generally running around, though she rang them up from time to time.

In the evening a very good and kind doctor took them to her house where a room—I think her own children's new bedroom—had been arranged as a temporary dormitory and home for them,

the husbands dosing down where they might. There were two dogs in the house. One, an adult, came out with its owner and for the moment is a boarder at the Cat and Dog Home, but the writer cannot pay for more than a week for its board. The puppy is still in the garden. The Cat and Dog Home man went down and received a very hostile greeting from the millionaire now occupiers and those men so blind to the rights of their own that for money they are acting against other working class people. Up to time of writing the poor pup is still there.

On the same morning, 'The Island', home of a working commune in Ballsbridge, had been invaded while some members were having breakfast and others were still asleep and the lodge where they lived was literally pulled down over their heads, their possessions being destroyed and three little kittens killed by falling bricks. No one knows to whom this derelict house with its enormous garden (before the commune took over a wilderness, but owing to their hard work rapidly turning into a useful plot, potatoes, cabbages and lettuce, and an adventure playground for children) belongs. The writer has a damn good idea but cannot prove it!

Meanwhile the Dail is rushing a bill through to make squatting a crime and also trying to get the notorious Criminal 'Justice' Bill made law. Decent poor people in Ireland have Hell ahead of them with so much utter corruption and money grubbing and God help the 10,000 homeless families. Yet smug fools write to the papers and say we are a wonderful country and never had it so good and why don't everybody (except of course themselves) stay single and work! This sort of writer has obviously never had soiled hands in his life but wants to keep his privileges for himself like all Fianna Fail Government members.

If I was not old and a woman I'd use LANGUAGE MOST FOUL. I assure you it is an unforgivable crime to be poor in Ireland and if you are old too you have had it, chum. The dark night of despair lies ahead.

H.