

# Freedom

## Anarchist Weekly

60

OCTOBER 26 1968 Vol 29 No 33

### BRIEFING

The following is a necessarily brief, but we hope not superficial, outline of anarchist attitudes. There is no anarchist party line (there is no Anarchist Party, since this implies a political party striving for power) so it must be understood that many anarchists will not agree with everything below. It is no more than a rough guide to anarchism.

### CAPITALISM

This is the economic system everywhere in the world. In America, relatively 'pure' free-enterprise; in the Communist states, State-capitalism; in Britain a mixture of the two. It depends upon the exploitation of labour through the wages system, with the vast majority of people working for a minority who either own or control the means of life.

**Money** is the means by which goods and people are bought, sold and exchanged.

**Profit** is the motivation for all production, distribution, consumption. Anarchists maintain that the means of life should be freely available to all. Goods and services should be produced and operated for the benefit of all, not for the profit or power of the few. Technology should be harnessed to meet the needs of the world community, money should be abolished and instead of boss-control or state-control, production and distribution should be run under **Workers' Control**, with all concerned in these operations having equal say in decision- and policy-making, through workers' councils and industrial syndicates.

### THE STATE

Historically, the State has developed the defence mechanism of the ruling class. It is the concentration of the violent and coercive institutions in society—the Army, Navy, Air Force for external aggression and defence, the Police and Prison systems for internal security, the Civil Service for government and organised robbery of the people and the Law to give it all a veneer of constitutional respectability. Under the impact of 20th Century socialism, the State has become the ruling class, directly controlling more & more of our lives. Marxists say this power structure can be taken over and used to liberate society. Anarchists say this is nonsense. The State must be abolished, with mutual aid in the community replacing the Welfare State. We don't need anything in the place of the

Warfare State! Most of the causes of crime are economic and will be removed with capitalism. Crimes that are down to psychopathology will tend to disappear with the end of repressive morality.

**SEX, MARRIAGE & ALL THAT** Sexual repression is a very important aspect of government—a source of misery, anxiety, lack of confidence. The marriage system and the authoritarian family is a very important means of suppressing revolutionary energy & is bound up with private property. Anarchists have been in the forefront of the fight for birth-control and through that the greater freedom for women which is the only

libertarian aspect of 20th Century progress. The bond in human relationships should be love, not legal or religious vows. Children in a freely responsible family, based on love of life and not fear of it, are most likely to find emotional security, while the free society would provide economic security for young and old alike.

### EDUCATION

Education is a right, not a privilege. It is passing on the accumulated knowledge of society to the rising generation. Students are **not** a privileged class—it is those who do not go on to 'higher' education who are underprivileged. The young

should learn, not for the benefit of the State or the boss-class, but for their own benefit—and the more they realise their own fullest potential, the more will society benefit from what they have to give. Education should be freely available and freely accepted; not a putting-in of pre-digested attitudes, moralities and useful information for wage-slaves, technocrats or managers, but a 'bringing-out' of abilities and personalities. Students and pupils, like workers anywhere, should have a say in the running of their work-places.

### VIOLENCE & WAR

As far as anarchism is concerned, this is a red-herring. Violence has

# THE ANARCHIST REVOLUTION

**DURING 1968 THE BLACK FLAG OF ANARCHY HAS BEEN RAISED IN PARIS AND MEXICO CITY, IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AND BRUSSELS, IN LONDON AND IN ROME. FROM PEKING TO THE PENTAGON VIA THE VATICAN, THE SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL RULERS OF THE WORLD KNOW THAT THEY ARE FACED WITH A CRISIS OF AUTHORITY WHICH WILL NOT BE RESOLVED UNTIL MANKIND IS FREE FROM DECEIT AND COERCION—THE MEANS OF GOVERNMENT EVERYWHERE.**

**AT THE HEART OF THE WORLD-WIDE UNREST IS A DISGUST FOR AUTHORITY: THE PIOUS BIGOTRY OF THE POPE, THE CRUDE IMPERIALISM OF THE KREMLIN, THE WARMONGERING FROM WASHINGTON, THE SLY OPPORTUNISM OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT. UNDER EVERY POLITICAL SYSTEM YET DEvised, MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN ARE ENSLAVED, STARVED, BOMBED AND BURNT. THE CRUELTY OF GOVERNMENT HAS INDECENTLY EXPOSED ITSELF IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY AS NEVER BEFORE AND THE MYTH OF RADICAL CHANGE THROUGH POLITICAL MEANS HAS BEEN EXPLODED.**

**TODAY IT IS ONLY ANARCHISM THAT MEETS THE SITUATION. A REVOLUTIONARY PHILOSOPHY WHICH DOES NOT DEMAND THE SUBJECTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL; WHICH WILL NOT ALLOW THE EMERGENCE OF A NEW TYRANNY ON THE ASHES OF THE OLD; WHICH DEMANDS A REVOLUTION IN DEPTH BUILT UPON RESPONSIBILITY AND FREEDOM FOR THE INDIVIDUAL IN CO-OPERATION WITH HIS FELLOWS. AN ANARCHIST REVOLUTION IS NOT GOING TO BE MADE ONE SUNDAY AFTERNOON IN THE WEST END OF LONDON—BUT IT IS SUPREMELY RELEVANT TO THE SITUATION IN EVERY COUNTRY PRECISELY BECAUSE IT IS AGAINST AUTHORITY EVERYWHERE.**

nothing to do with anarchism (a condition of anarchy is the only possible pacific society), although some anarchists do get violent sometimes in order to destroy the violent institutions of the State, which force violence upon society. The bourgeoisie never balk at using violence for their own ends, but hypocritically profess horror when it is used against them. The prime purpose of the State is to wage war. Anarchists oppose wars as the expression of the State's interests against the interests of the people, who do the fighting and dying in defence of systems which enslave them. If violence is used in a revolutionary situation, it must be short, sharp and decisive. Once it settles down into a civil war (cf. Spain, Vietnam) it becomes a power struggle, & violence becomes institutionalised once more. Ideally, revolution could be achieved non-violently, through disaffection of the State's forces, and it is the degree of disaffection which determines the possibility of success.

**DEMONSTRATIONS** As a footnote to the above, it may be said that violence on demonstrations achieves publicity, which is the main object of the exercise, but little else. It has little point until such time as the opposition can be overwhelmed, in other words when the situation is actually revolutionary. But demonstrations do rally support for your cause from those agreeing with you. ('Stand up and be counted').

**PROPAGANDA & EDUCATION FOR REVOLUTION** But the real work of revolution is done over the years in factories, in schools and universities, on street corners, in the home. The social revolution can only be the culmination of all this—the final expression of people throwing off authority which they no longer need. The revolutions of the past all failed because the people have not reached this stage. It is the anarchists' self-appointed task to propagate the idea that **YOU DO NOT NEED AUTHORITY** and when enough people have enough self-confidence to live without leaders, bosses, policemen or priests, then this whole phony apparatus of power and corruption, coercion and conformism, racialism and religion, fear and cruelty, will be swept away. The people will make the anarchist revolution.

**DO NOT NEED AUTHORITY**

and when enough people have enough self-confidence to live without leaders, bosses, policemen or priests, then this whole phony apparatus of power and corruption, coercion and conformism, racialism and religion, fear and cruelty, will be swept away. The people will make the anarchist revolution.

them all that much however. Many of the soldiers are negroes or poor whites, whose loyalty is by no means certain. The end of the war in Vietnam may be the beginning of the Second American Civil War. As for the two Vietnams, the situation will probably remain the same. History repeats itself. Korea remained divided. All the bloodshed led to the re-establishment of the *status quo*. No doubt the NLF will continue the struggle, but much less helped by the North than formerly. In fact both the NLF and the Southern Government are likely to feel betrayed. Not that that will worry Washington or Hanoi at all. As far as the ordinary people are concerned, a reduction of the fighting and destroying is likely to be welcome, whatever the causes. Thanks be for small mercies! Even if the ending of war in one place does not mean the ending of war elsewhere, at least it is something.



## VIETNAM - The End in Sight?

**T**HE NORTH VIETNAMESE and the United States Governments have agreed to a 36-hour cease-fire in a 288-square-mile area along the coast of North Vietnam, for the purpose of releasing the 14 North Vietnamese seamen captured more than two years ago. It is also rumoured that North Vietnam has accepted terms for a bombing halt. The concessions they have made, or are supposed to have made, do not include a promise to withdraw their forces from the demilitarised zone.

There are also rumours of projected withdrawals of American troops, amounting to as many as 100,000 by the New Year. It is suggested that Hanoi is eager to come to an agreement with the present US administration, rather than face a future even more bloody-minded one, which would be prepared to 'bomb them back into the

'Stone Age', instead of merely the Early Iron Age as at present.

This may be the case, but why should the American Government accept the concessions which Hanoi offers, which do not seem to go very far? Perhaps the American rulers are becoming nervous about the situation prevailing in their own country.

A country so powerful, with such enormous resources as the United States, is difficult to imagine being seriously threatened by a war in a small country such as South Vietnam. Yet the losses of men and material have been very great, and the bringing into action of antiquated devices such as a battleship suggests a certain feeling of desperation.

Possibly the ruling groups in America are afraid of being landed with a wasting war in South-East Asia, and a civil war at home. The bringing home of large numbers of troops may not help

# BOOKS ON ANARCHISM

## and kindred subjects

We can get books to order (school and technical books included). Please supply name of publishers.

- The Sexual Revolution**  
Wilhelm Reich 25/-
- The Shop Stewards' Movement and Workers' Control 1910-22**  
Branko Pribicevic 25/-
- Report from Iron Mountain**  
(Penguin) 4/-
- Communitas**  
Paul and Percival Goodman 14/-
- Fear of Freedom**  
Erich Fromm (paperback) 10/-
- The Art of Loving**  
Erich Fromm (paperback) 5/-
- Authority and Delinquency in the Modern State**  
Alex Comfort 10/6
- Rebel in Paradise**  
Richard Drinnon 48/-
- Education through Art**  
Herbert Read (paperback) 16/-
- Last Exit to Brooklyn**  
Hubert Selby Jr. 42/-
- The Sins of the Children**  
R. F. Mackenzie 25/-
- Escape from the Classroom**  
R. F. Mackenzie 18/-
- French Revolution 1968**  
Patrick Seale and Maureen McConville 6/-
- The Grand Camouflage: The Spanish Civil War and Revolution**  
Burnett Bolloten 63/-
- Summerhill**  
A. S. Neill 25/-
- Talking of Summerhill**  
A. S. Neill 25/-
- The Russian Anarchists**  
Paul Averich 60/-

## Freedom Bookshop

# Write or Come!

Editorial office open Friday, November 1, 6-8 p.m. and Monday, November 4, 2-8 p.m.

Telephone: BISHOPSGATE 3015.

New temporary address:  
84a WHITECHAPEL HIGH STREET,  
c/o Express Printers,  
(entrance Angel Alley),  
WHITECHAPEL, E.1.  
(Underground: Aldgate East. Exit:  
Whitechapel Art Gallery. Turn right  
on emerging from station.)

Temporary opening times:  
Tuesday-Friday, 2-6 p.m.  
Saturday, 10 a.m.-4 p.m.

## FREEDOM PRESS

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

## Subscription Rates

FREEDOM only (per year):  
£1 13s. 4d. (\$4.50) surface mail  
£2 16s. (\$8.00) airmail

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

COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION  
FREEDOM & ANARCHY (per year):  
£2 14s. 4d. (\$7.50) surface mail both  
£4 15s. (\$12.50) airmail both

## PUBLICATIONS include

**Berkman's**  
ABC of ANARCHISM 2/6 (+5d.)

**Rocker's**  
NATIONALISM AND  
CULTURE 21/- (+4/6)

**Richards'**  
MALATESTA: His Life and Ideas.  
Cloth bound 21/- (+1/3);  
paper 10/6 (+1/-)

**Bakunin's**  
MARXISM, FREEDOM and the  
STATE 7/6 (+5d.)

**Berneri's**  
NEITHER EAST or WEST 6/- (+9d.)

**Woodcock's**  
THE WRITER & POLITICS 7/6  
and  
Annual Volumes of Selections from  
FREEDOM 1952-1964  
each year's volume 7/6 (+1/-)  
Full list on application.

WE WERE the lost generation that stumbled into early manhood in the grey and bitter years of the nineteenth thirties. Born too late to have died in the last of the great wars, we had to bear the guilt of its betrayal and the repeated dirge that we were unworthy of the legendary dead. Dispossessed within the country that witnessed our birth, and with our unemployment card as our passport to the street corner and the one weekly free bath at the public washhouse, our public protests were bitter and valid.

Month by month the armies of the night crawled across Europe and we marched and we protested as the bastions of liberalism fell in each fresh headline, and the empowered Right sent their police to harry us off their streets, and their printing presses mocked the stencilled leaflets that cried of newly minted death. And to the east of Brighton the great European art movements tolled the requiem for the young for the Bauhaus had already become the Valhalla of those legendary ancients whose names now fill the catalogue of the Bauhaus Exhibition at the Royal Academy, Piccadilly, W.1.

We stood in the public libraries and read of the gay wild world of the continental Surrealists and in the pinchbeck London light we made our private and secret foray into the Mediterranean world of erotic fantasy as our paper and our cheap watercolours fought for space upon the kitchen table with the plate of penny chips and twopenny rock salmon. And the world informed us, we of the fifty shilling suit, the empty pockets, and the dole queue shuffle, that we were not only unworthy of the Glorious Dead and the Great Art Movements but that never would their like be seen in our lifetime. Let us spit on the dead and piss against the walls that house the Great Exhibitions for a second universal war purged our guilt when we took our place in the conscripted armies of liberation while the old women and the children mocked the glory squads as they were bulldozed into the mass graves without benefit of flag or the stuttering drum.

Fortunate for the young, the old manufactured traditions do not bind them. They can afford to mock the age that daily demanded penance from the youth whose only crime was that they were too young to die and unwanted in a dying economy and the jingling pockets of today's youth have turned them into brash and vulgar customers for a fresh and personal culture, phoney, cheerful and irreverent but never second hand for the dead weight of tradition has at this moment in time been thrown aside.

In 1919 Walter Gropius was called to Weimar to create the State Bauhaus and on April 10, 1933, two police companies surrounded the old factory in Berlin that was being used as a temporary home for the Bauhaus and arrested 32 students and ended this art movement that shared the birth and the death of the first German Republic.

# HYPOCRISY OF THE BOROUGH OF CAMDEN

An easy victim of the German Nazi Movement, it joined the honourable company of those groups of men and women whose work was publicly labelled *degenerate art* by the scum of bourgeois reaction.

The American writer Erwin O. Christensen in 1964 wrote, with approval, that Walter Gropius created a practical laboratory of design based on a new concept. All arts involved in building and home furnishing were taught for the purpose of developing type forms for industrial productions. Gropius, the spiritual heir of Morris, for the first time related the handicrafts to industrial processes. This of course is rubbish and it is sad to think of William Morris being used in this connotation for he had little use for the German-American obsession with art and the machine for the Bauhaus appeared to have an obsessional desire to eliminate the Mediterranean concept of beauty that has shaped the visual arts of the Western world, for a bleak and

acid Calvinistic approach to the art of living.

They were right, by God they were right, to revolt against the ghastliness of *art nouveau* with its formalised decadence of iron lilies and copper vines and with a germanic thoroughness they stripped away all the decorative vegetation that the German *Jugendstil* had festooned on every chair and table, every gable and door, and in doing so they tore out the heart of the culture that they claimed to heal. Like Durer they stripped away the gross flesh and peopled their world with skeletons. In doing so created for themselves a new and unnecessary discipline that the youth of this day reject for in a world of tubular chairs and austere architecture the young are once more buying the *art nouveau* shirts and dresses and hanging their walls with Beardsley prints. For the Bauhaus was a revolutionary protest against the accepted ideals of the time but they could not learn from history and their revolt

became the new conservatism.

They taught us much but we must never be bound by their teachings for we must take what we need as the moment demands and reject the rest for good or ill. Here then is this Royal Academy Exhibition and it is a matter of some slight historical import for the tragedy is that a greater and more needful exhibition was cast aside for political reasons.

The Camden Arts Centre at Arkwright Road, N.W.3, had made plans for the showing of the photo-montages of John Heartfield. With the emotional panic that accompanied the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Borough of Camden stated that the exhibition of work by the East German artist John Heartfield could not take place because it might give offence to the large number of East European refugees in the borough. Councillor Finsberg held that it would be hypocritical to allow this exhibition of work from East Germany and so the exhibition was cancelled. It was a stupid and irresponsible action by men, let us be charitable, who lost their heads for John Heartfield is dead and we are the losers.

John Heartfield (Helmut Herzfeld) was a man who fought all his life against reaction and it is indeed sad that this man who, at dawn on Good Friday 1933 managed to escape from Germany by jumping out of a bedroom window, wearing only socks, shirt and trousers, when the SS came for him, should finally be censored in Camden Town. This man who fled to Czechoslovakia only to have to flee again in 1938 lived in London until 1950 and the Borough of Camden have censored his exhibition. In photo-montage after photo-montage he lampooned the Nazi political street fighters and attempted to turn Hitler, Streicher and the others into the bestial clowns they were, and the Borough of Camden decided that we must not be allowed to see Heartfield's work as a snub to the brutish politicians of East Berlin.

And do they really care? There were so many easy ways of being nasty so why play the fool by joining the ranks of the jailors for John Heartfield risked his life that clowns in office can sleep safely. From October 18 to 30 the Camden Arts Centre is to give an exhibition in aid of the United Nations Association Czechoslovak Fund and the Tate and the Arts Council of Great Britain have agreed to give their support 'and is intended to show sympathy of artists in this country for the Czechs in their search for creative freedom'. I would suggest, humbly, that Councillor Finsberg's Borough of Camden was not a diplomatic choice.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

# Anarchy Around the World

## USA

THERE are several groups in the USA. In New York there is a Puerto Rican group, the Anarchos Group and the 'Up Against the Wall Motherfuckers' group. Black Militants are in contact with these groups. In Chicago the groups are influenced by dada and surrealism. In Seattle the anarchist group was formerly Marxist. In New Mexico an armed band led by a man named Tijerina has been engaged in guerrilla warfare. At the moment they are in hiding in the remote hills. There is no national organisation.

## EAST GERMANY

There is a group at Magdeburg.

## WEST GERMANY

There are groups in West Berlin, Hamburg, Munich and Iserlohn. The SDS is also showing an interest in Anarchism.

## ITALY

The Anarchist paper *Umanita Nova* has a circulation of 10,000. There are two chief groupings: the FAI and the break-away GAP.

## DENMARK

There are two groups in Denmark: the Anarchist Federation of Jutland and the Zenit group at Copenhagen. Formerly they co-operated with the 'Brand' group of Sweden, but they now claim that 'Brand' is pro-Maoist and pro-Castroite. In August the magazine had not yet appeared this year.

(Trans. from *Congrès International de Fédérations Anarchistes*.)

## JAPAN

Anarchist demonstrations have taken place throughout the country. The black flag has appeared in several towns. Three comrades were arrested at Osaka.

## MOROCCO

Some young Spanish-speaking anarchists want to create an anarchist community\* in France. For information write to Francisco Gonzalez, 111 rue Allal ben Abdallah, Casablanca.

(From *L'Anarchie*, August 1968.)

B.B.

\*This will be a rural community.

## 'Careful' Collins

TAMAR WHITE, a 21-year-old West Indian girl who has lived in this country since she was 2 years old, was told on October 17, by Mr. Seymour Collins, the Magistrate at West Kensington Magistrates' Court: 'You'd better be careful, because you are a guest in this country'.

Tamar was up on a charge of 'assault' during the Czech demonstration. Although witnesses said she assaulted nobody she was fined £20 plus £5 costs and bound over for three years.

If anybody can help with the fine, money can be sent to us and we shall acknowledge and forward it on.

P.T.

# Anarchist Federation of Britain

General enquiries should be sent to the London Federation, c/o Freedom Press, 84a Whitechapel High Street, London, E.1.

**LEWISHAM.** Contact Mike Malet, 61B Granville Park, Lewisham, London, S.E.13. Phone: 01-852 8879.

**S.W. LONDON LIBERTARIANS.** Contact: 14 Clapham Court, King's Avenue (Acre Lane end), S.W.4.

**WEST HAM ANARCHISTS.** Contact Stephen Higgs, 8 Westbury Road, Forest Gate, London, E.7. GRA 9848. Regular activities.

## OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

Every Wednesday at Jack Robinson's and Mary Canipa's, 21 Rumbold Road, S.W.6 (off King's Road), 8 p.m.  
3rd Friday of each month at Donald and Irene Room's at 13 Savernake Road, N.W.3, at 8 p.m.

## REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS

**BEXLEY PEACE ACTION GROUP.** Enquiries to 150 Rydal Drive, Bexleyheath, Kent.

**BIRMINGHAM LIBERTARIAN AND ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Geoff and Caroline Charlton at Flat One, 69 Sandon Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham 17. (Entrance side of house.) Regular discussions being held on Tuesdays, 7.30 p.m., Crown Corporation Street (upper room).

**BOLTON.** Get in touch with John Hayes, 51 Rydal Road, Bolton.

**BOURNEMOUTH AND EAST DORSET ANARCHISTS.** Please contact John McCain, 65 Norton Road, Winton, Bournemouth (B'm'th 95909) or Tim Deane, Juliet, West Moors, Wimborne, Dorset (Ferndown 3588).

**CORNWALL ANARCHISTS.** Contact Arthur Jacobs, 76 East Hill, St. Austell. Discussion meetings on the second Friday of each month at Brian and Hazel McGee's, 42 Pendarves Street, Beacon, Camborne. 7.30 p.m. Visiting comrades very welcome.

**CROYDON LIBERTARIANS.** Meetings every 2nd Friday of each month. Laurens and Celia Oter, 35 Natal Road, Thornton Heath (LIV 7546).

**EDGWARE PEACE ACTION GROUP.** Contact: Melvyn Estrin, 84 Edgwarebury Lane, Edgware, Middx.

**HERTS.** Contact Val and John Funnell, 10 Fry Road, Chells, Stevenage.

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

**KILBURN, LONDON.** Contact Andrew Dewar, 16 Kilburn House, Malvern Place, London, N.W.6. Meetings 8 p.m. every Tuesday.

**LEICESTER PROJECT.** Peace/Libertarian action and debate. Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. at 1 The Crescent, King Street, Leicester.

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

**NOTTING HILL.** Meetings at John Bennett's, Flat 4, 88 Clarendon Road, W.11. Every Monday evening, 8 p.m.

**ORPINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP.** Knockholt,

Nr. Sevenoaks, Kent. Every six weeks at Greenways, Knockholt. Phone: Knockholt 2316. Brian and Maureen Richardson.

**REDDITCH ANARCHISTS AND LIBERTARIANS.** Contact: Dave Lloyd, 37 Feckenham Road, Headless Cross, Redditch, Worcs.

**SELBY ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact D. Mackay, Residential Site, Drax Power Station, Drax, Selby.

**TAUNTON LIBERTARIANS.** Jill and John Driver, 59 Beadon Road, Taunton, Somerset.

## ESSEX & EAST HERTS FEDERATION

Three-monthly meetings. Groups and individuals invited to associate; c/o Peter Newell (see N.E. Essex Group).

Group Addresses:—

**BASILDON.** M. Powell, 7 Lingercroft, Basildon, Essex.

**BISHOPS STORTFORD.** Vic Mount, 'Eastview', Castle Street, Bishops Stortford, Herts.

**CHELMSFORD.** (Mrs.) Eva Archer, Mill House, Parleigh, Chelmsford, Essex.

**EPPING.** John Barrick, 14 Centre Avenue, Epping, Essex.

**HARLOW.** Ian Dallas, 18 Brookline Field, Harlow and Annette Gunning, 37 Longbanks, Harlow.

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

**NORTH EAST ESSEX.** Peter Newell, 91 Brook Road, Tolleshunt Knights, Tiptree, Essex. Regular meetings.

## NORTH-WEST FEDERATION

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

**MANCHESTER ANARCHIST GROUP.** Secretary: Sue Warnock, 9 Boland Street, Fallowfield, Manchester, 12.

Every Saturday: 'Freedom' and 'DA' selling outside Central Library, 2.30-4.30 p.m.

**MERSEYSIDE ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact c/o Liverpool University Anarchist Group.

## SUSSEX FEDERATION

Groups and individuals invited to associate; c/o Eddie Poole, 5 Talbury, Findon Road, Whitebank, Brighton.

**BRIGHTON & HOVE ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Nick Heath, Flat 3, 26 Clifton Road, Brighton, BN1 3HN. Contact Secretary. Regular fortnightly meetings.

## WELSH ANARCHIST FEDERATION

**CARDIFF ANARCHIST GROUP.** All correspondence to—Pete Raymond, 18 Marion Street,

Sploft, Cardiff.

**MERTHYR TYDFIL ANARCHIST GROUP.** Correspondence to Huw Rowlands, 16 Cromwell Street, Mertyr Tydfil.

**SWANSEA ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Ian Bone, 3 Bay View Crescent, Brynmill, Swansea. Weekly meetings, 'Freedom' sales and action projects.

**LLANELLI.** Contact Dai Walker, 6 Llwynnedy Road, Llanelli, Carm. Tel: Llanelli 2548.

## EAST LONDON LIBERTARIAN FEDERATION

Support wanted for numerous activities in area. Secretary: Anthony Matthews, 35 Mayville Road, London, E.11. Meetings fortnightly on Sundays at Ron Bailey's, 128 Hainault Road, E.11 (LEY 8059). Ten minutes from Leytonstone Underground.

**LEYTONSTONE GROUP.** Get in touch with Anthony Matthews or Ron Bailey (address as above).

**STEPNEY.** Trevor Jackales, 10 St. Vincent de Paul House, Dempsey Street, Clichy Estate, E.1.

**NEWHAM.** F. Rowe, 100 Henderson Road, E.7.

**ILFORD.** Del Leverton, 12 Hamilton Avenue, Ilford.

**DAGENHAM.** Alan Elliot, 98 Hatfield Road, Dagenham.

**WOODFORD.** Douglas Hawkes, 123 Hermon Hill, E.18.

**LIMEHOUSE.** M. Solof, 202 East Ferry Road, E.14.

## STUDENT GROUPS

**CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Matthew Robinson, Trinity College, or John Fullerton, Jesus College.

**SUSSEX UNIVERSITY ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Francis Jarman, Red Brick Lodge, 49 Upper Rock Gardens, Brighton. Meetings every second week jointly with Brighton Group; book-stall every second week outside J.C.R., 12-2 p.m.

**YORK UNIVERSITY.** Contact Nigel Wilson, Derwent College, University of York, Heslington, York.

**EAST ANGLIA UNIVERSITY.** Contact Dave Lomax, E.A.S. II, U.E.A., Norwich, NOR 88C.

**LIBERTARIAN STUDENTS FEDERATION.** Contact address: Keith Nathan, 138 Pennymead, Harlow.

**LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact us at the bookstall in the Students Union Foyer every Friday lunchtime.

## SCOTTISH ANARCHIST FEDERATION

Secretary: Dave Coull (see Montrose). Groups and Proposed Groups:—

**ABERDEEN ANARCHIST FEDERATION.** Contact Bob Conrie, 288 Hargate or Ian Mitchell, 3 Sinclair Road.

**FIFE.** Contact Bob and Una Turnbull, 39 Stratheden Park, Stratheden Hospital, by Cupar.

**GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Joe & Kay Embleton, 26 Kirkland Road, Glasgow, N.W.

**HAMILTON DISTRICT FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS.** Contact Robert Linton, 7a Station

Road, New Stevenston, Motherwell.

**MONTROSE.** Contact Dave Coull, 3 Eskview Terrace, Ferryden.

## NORTHERN IRELAND

**BELFAST ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact Robert Dunwoody, 10 Newry Street, Belfast, BT6 9BN.

Meetings every Saturday, 2 p.m., 44a Upper Arthur Street (top floor). Saturday gather same place for 'Freedom' sales. 2-3 p.m.

'Freedom' sales. 2-3 p.m.

## LIBERTARIAN TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION

Meetings—discussions—activities. Contact Peter Ford, 36 Devonshire Road, Mill Hill, London, N.W.7.

## ABROAD

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

**USA.** James W. Cain, secretary, the Anarchist Committee or Correspondence, 323 Fourth Street, Cloquet, Minnesota 55720, USA.

**MELBOURNE.** Get in touch with Bob Hopkins and Margie Rojo, P.O. Box 192, Carlton South 3053. Public meetings at Yarra Bank, Melbourne.

**MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY ANARCHISTS.** Union House, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia.

**DANISH ANARCHIST FEDERATION.** Gøteborgsgade, 27, Viborg, Denmark.

**VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA.** Anyone interested in forming anarchist and/or direct action peace group contact Derek A. James, 184 Grand Boulevard, North Vancouver, B.C., Canada. Tel: 987-2693.

**USA: VERMONT.** New Hampshire Anarchist Group. Discussion meetings. Actions. Contact Ed. Strauss, RFD 2, Woodstock, Vermont 05091, USA.

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

**SWEDEN:** Libertad, Allmänna Vägen 6, Gotenburg V.

**T O R O N T O LIBERTARIAN ANARCHIST GROUP.** 217 TorYork Drive, Weston, Ontario, Canada. Weekly meetings. Read the 'Libertarian'.

**PROPOSED GROUPS**

**MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY.** Contact Mike Don or Bill Jamieson, 14 Victoria Road, Manchester 14.

**LANCASTER & MORECAMBE.** Contact Les Smith, 192 Euston Road, Morecambe, Lancs.

**PERTHSHIRE/CENTRAL SCOTLAND.** Contact Iain MacDonald, Craigreach, Bridge of Gaur, near Rannoch Station, Perthshire, Scotland. NOUR NEW ADDRESS!

**KINGSTON, WIMBLEDON, MERTON.** New Malden, and Surrey. New group forming. Please contact K. W. Bennett, 63 Hook Road, Epsom, Surrey, or G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom, Surrey (after November 5).

# DON QUIXOTE ON A BICYCLE

THE COLLECTED ESSAYS, JOURNALISM AND LETTERS OF GEORGE ORWELL, Vols. I-IV, 1920-50, edited by Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Secker and Warburg, 50/- per volume, £10 the set.

HAVING SPENT ROUGHLY forty years on the left, all the way from the attempt to save the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti, the murmurs of which attempt floated over my school wall, to a demo a few Sundays ago against the war in Vietnam, from the columns of the *Daily Worker* to the offices of FREEDOM, that's a terribly long distance, the best thing I found in it, without any doubt whatsoever was George Orwell.

Funnily enough, he was rather like Bartolomeo Vanzetti himself. Or rather Orwell was the Anglo-Saxon upper middle class version of the kind of man of which Vanzetti was the Latin working class version. There is no exception to Orwell's position of quiet unannounced grandeur, but there are people who equal him in decency, if not in talent, in all countries and all left wing parties, some of whose names I can't even pronounce let alone spell, because they come from Burma, India or Ceylon. But I can spell Matt Kavanagh.

## A BREATH OF FRESH AIR

As one is fingering through the nearly 2,000 pages of this four-volume memorial edition of his letters, essays and journalism, two of his really great sentences jump off the page into one's mind, as if they were, as indeed they are, soldiers setting out into battle to fight meanness, stupidity and greed.

There they are: 'But no wall in the world is well built enough to be allowed to remain standing if it surrounds a concentration camp.' And when, seeing an enemy soldier during the Spanish Civil War, rushing above the top of his own trenches, holding up his trousers, as he had neither belt nor braces, on his way to the lavatory, Orwell says 'a man caught short like that is not a fascist, so I did not fire at him'. After the drivel written by those 'filthy little doctrinaires striving for our souls', sentences like these are indeed like a breath of fresh air.

## ATTRACTED TO ANARCHISM

A word about the editing, to find the right word one would have to borrow one from Blake or Yeats or Dante, for

without the slightest exaggeration it is superb. It is a genuinely fitting monument to Orwell and was shaped into this form out of his own work by his second wife, and his first wife is allowed to walk through these volumes with all the grace and decency, just as she did through the years of their marriage. When you remember that the monuments to Lincoln and Jefferson in Washington would more suitably commemorate a Byzantine tyrant than the authors of the Declaration of Independence or the Gettysburg address, one sees how lucky Orwell is.

All the famous essays are here, and also 'Such, Such were the Joys' which is about the preparatory school he went to and which has not before been published on this side of the Atlantic. But what makes the editing so truly original is that his letters, diaries and notebooks are printed alongside the work he was doing at about the same time. In his correspondence, as in his work, Orwell had diverse interests; there are letters to both the monarchist poet T. S. Eliot and an anarchist photographer.

It is actually quite true to say that Orwell was attracted to anarchism, he says in one of his letters that he wished



GEORGE ORWELL

Photo by V. Richards

he had joined the CNT instead of POUM, he only joined them by chance, but there was no chance at all about the fact that he was there in Barcelona willing to fight for the Spanish Republic, but having joined the POUM he could not desert them in their trouble as anyone who has read *Homage to Catalonia*, his best book, which when it was first published only sold 400 copies, will agree.

## THE FARE TO UTOPIA

The mainspring of all Orwell wrote was his loathing of bullies and his love of decency and beauty. Bullying is often known in left wing circles by its posh name, oppression. Orwell disliked all authority, some, of course, more than others. Like any true radical, unfortunately a rare bird indeed, he saw the mistakes and failings of his own side. The other side he knew to be wrong, but he never lost hope that ordinary people would one day come to live decently and gracefully on this earth. For instance he would have been deeply hurt if he had read that cheap jibe in the *Guardian* several weeks ago calling this journal a sheet and implying that a man who was an anarchist could not be a good doctor. Has no one in their editorial room heard of Dr. Alex Comfort, after all I think he has written 'for' them and they certainly have written about him.

Of course Orwell had his limitations, to begin with he was not primarily an artist. He was a journalist, but only in the sense that Swift and Hazlitt were journalists. The thing that is wrong with *Animal Farm* is that there is not one sentence in the whole lot of it, which suggests that it might possibly have succeeded.

But don't listen to me, just read him for yourself. It will do you more good than a holiday in County Donegal or the coasts of Tuscany. However well edited and properly published these books are, they don't tell the truth about *Animal Farm's* fate before it got published.

These books are too expensive for most people to buy, but you can get them from a library. If one wants to buy them one does not have to buy the whole four at once. They cost fifty shillings each. It's quite cheap really, after all it is the fare to Utopia.

PAUL POTTS.

# THE SPANISH UNIVERSITIES

A TOPIC overshadowed by recent events in France and Czechoslovakia has recently regained enough vitality to be mentioned in the Press. While things have calmed down in the Spanish Universities during the summer vacations, the authorities have obviously not found peace of mind over the student situation. Speculation on the possibility of Governmental concession to the students has gone round in a circle, beginning with a rather spectacular announcement during a speech by the new rector of Madrid University, Dr. Botella Llusía (his predecessor and the two vice-rectors resigned in protest against police brutality towards students and professors), that the students were to be allowed total freedom of association in the coming year. Dr. Botella Llusía was quoted in the Spanish magazine *La Actualidad Española* of 11.7.68:

'I am going to prepare you for the course which is coming. It must be the course of the reform of the University, and therefore, I want you to be genuinely represented, I want to know what the majority wants. You are going to be allowed total freedom of association; I don't believe this has ever existed in Spain before. Use this freedom as the mature men you are. Do not ask of us things we cannot give, do not stand in the way of our wishes.'

The article in *LAE* traces the student problem of freedom of association back in time. The Sindicato Español Universitario (SEU) functioned peaceably from 1939 to 1950 as the means by which the Government encompassed the activities of the students and 'promoted the spirit of the Falange'. In 1943, the Ley de Ordenación Universitaria laid down rules of conduct for this body, and small resistance groups were formed among the students in consequence. Towards the end of 1950, the first violent clashes between Falangists and non-Falangists occurred.

1956 saw a change of head of the Ministry of National Education and the replacement of the rectors of Madrid and Salamanca Universities. From then onwards (says *LAE*), the progressive depoliticalization of the SEU took place, and in 1957, the students gained the right to be represented by elected delegates. These latter, however, were not nominated by the students. In 1964-5, the demand by the students that they should be allowed to nominate their representatives themselves, caused the final split

between the SEU and the students. Free assemblies were created, encompassing a great number of students, and in July 1965, the SEU itself disappeared by decree, to be replaced by a National Commissariat for the SEU, whose functions were purely ministrant. The Asociaciones Profesionales de Estudiantes (APE) appeared.

The APE developed vigorously, but was rejected by the students because it had been formed over their heads, without their participation. The reformation of the APE, in July 1966, accompanied by a change of name to the Asociaciones de Estudiantes (AE), failed to improve the situation, 80% of the student groups refusing to enrol in them. Soon, the Sindicato Democrático de Estudiantes de la Universidad de Barcelona (SDEUB) was formed by the students, followed by its equivalent in Madrid (SDEUM). In the face of the growing student activity, now backed by coherent organisations (although 'illegal'), the authorities began retaliation with sanctions. Many bitter clashes between Falangists and non-Falangists and the latter and the Guardia Civil, followed by the inevitable sit-ins, arrests, brutality and incarceration, paint the picture of the University scene in Spain earlier this year.

Then, on April 18, Lora Tamayo was replaced by Villar Palasí at the head of the Ministry of Education and Science. The 'cultural revolution' of Sr. Palasí was talked about; Dr. Botella Llusía was nominated as the new rector of Madrid University. On July 4 he announced the intended reforms.

Little news concerning the student struggles in Spain has appeared in the British Press since that date. With the Czechoslovak invasion on everyone's mind, a quick glance at Spain immediately focuses on the events in the Basque Provinces. On August 14, however, *The Times*, reporting on the Basque affair, slipped in a comment on an article from a Spanish 'periodical' in which the military governor of Madrid dispenses with the speculation on the granting of student freedom as 'totally absurd'. The military governor says: 'It is not possible to admit different regulations for any particular sector of Spain's national community'. Where that leaves Dr. Botella Llusía's speech is anyone's guess.

It was not until a month later that, Franco having dared to show his snout in San Sebastián (Basque Province of Guipúzcoa), the summer seat of the

Government, the *Observer* (15.9.68) printed a five-line note that, 'General Franco's Government ... last night promised representative and autonomous student unions'. About turn! *The Times* of 16.9.68 followed this with: 'The Cabinet also approved a decree providing for the formation of student associations. Señor Fraga Iribarne, the Minister of Information and Tourism, said they would be inspired by "principles of liberty, autonomy, representation, responsibility, publicity and authenticity".'

Well, it's anyone's guess what actually will happen. Spain under Franco is not exactly renowned for its liberality in such affairs. The issue of *La Actualidad Española* cited above, includes several interviews with students and catedráticos (professors) elucidating the reaction to Dr. Botella Llusía's announcement. Although it is clear that those interviewed were selected carefully so as not to include any of more than moderate hostility to the authorities, several replies give a hint of what might be the widespread reaction.

José María Mohedano Fuertes, Sub-delegate of the Faculty of Law, Madrid University, points out that previously, the authorities persistently told the students that freedom of association was perfectly tangible, although, if they had it then, how could it be given them now? He asks: 'What are my companions, sanctioned and condemned for illicit association going to say? What does Article 16 of the Spanish Statutes do but to guarantee freedom of association within the necessary limits? Perhaps they are not so misguided, those who claim that these limits are such as to practically annul the whole article.' Furthermore, he asks whether freedom of association alone is to be allowed, or also those other 'minimum liberties'—of meeting, expression, information, etc.—without which, that of association is prevented from proper operation.'

Cayetano López, a science student, points out the incongruity of Dr. Botella Llusía's statement that the students are to get total freedom of association with the later one that only that which could

be conceded would be. He is also of the opinion that the return of anything like the SEU or the APES would be totally unacceptable to the students. He suspects that the Government is only prepared to take steps to produce a minimum effect among the students and professors, conceding as little as possible. He believes, however, that the only logical step is to legalize the Sindicatos Democráticos; it would be an unwise

step to rupture the unity which the students have built with these organisations. He adds, finally, the view, held by several of the others interviewed and incidentally, the Military Governor of Madrid, that such freedom as granted to the students could not be true freedom while restricted to one particular minority sector of the population. Perhaps the Government knows this.

19.9.68

R.J.B.

# WHO THE HELL DO YOU THINK YOU ARE?

HOW MANY of your friends or family who are at work would put up with this sort of treatment?

'You boy! Stop talking! Come here. What's that you're wearing? Jeans! How dare you come to school in Jeans! You're a disgrace. And look at your hair. It's far too long. Who the hell do you think you are?'

Well, who the hell do you think you are?

It's pretty clear what a teacher who talks to you like that thinks you are. Many people treat animals more kindly. That teacher obviously does not think that you are human or if he does, he does not think that you are as good a human as he.

But this is all part of a plan. The schools are run by the State and the State dictates what sort of schools there should be. The schools of today train young people to be the citizens of tomorrow. It is pretty obvious what sort of citizens it wants. It wants literate citizens, maybe. It wants educated citizens, maybe. But above all it wants obedient citizens. Citizens who all through their younger years have been trained to obey authority: authority in the form of teachers and headmasters.

All pupils are subjected throughout their school lives to a constant barrage of petty restrictions on their freedom, which are designed with one thing in mind, to make them obedient. You are told to wear uniforms, punished if you do not. Yet there is no law which says you must. You are told to get your hair cut, keep to your own side of the playground, not to enter school during playtimes. Of course you can't go to the toilet! Who do you think you are? Above all, you must never tell a teacher he is wrong, because remember that all teachers are always right.

By the time the pupils reach the fifth year, they have been so conditioned to authority that they readily become members of it as prefects, petty officials who are quite often more vicious than authority itself.

Well, who do you think you are? Are you some kind of robots? Daleks who can only mumble 'We obey', or are you individuals with your own ideas?

Are you human?  
Are you free?

The above article will be produced as a leaflet if enough orders are received from groups and individuals. Price 25/- a 1,000 (plus postage)—Editors.

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

# An Anarchist Looks at the Principles of Marxism

**M**ARXISTS ARE FOND of ascribing to their theory of society and social development the status of 'scientific'. Lenin, speaking of Dialectical Materialism says, 'it is nothing more than scientific method' whilst later-day followers are forever using high-sounding phrases like 'scientific prediction'—all I may hasten to add, uttered with a gravity calculated to impress.

I wish to examine, however, not the psychology of Marxism's super-salesman who gives persuasive definitions in terms of 'science' knowing full well how we will all shudder and suspend disbelief before the Moloch of anything purporting to be 'scientific'; rather I wish to examine just what justification Marxists have for calling their theory 'scientific'. To this end I wish to expose how 'scientific socialism' is just another elaborately worked-out myth created by authority to dupe the people into passive submission and uncritical acceptance of its systems.

Firstly then, at root Marxism has its beloved dialectics. But before examining just what Marxists mean by dialectics (a singularly hard task) it is essential that the reader free his mind from any previously encountered interpretation of the word, for, from Aristotle to Hegel and beyond, there have been as many different uses of the word as there have been users; until now the residue of meaning that is left is such that to view a problem dialectically is vaguely somehow to look for its interconnections. Lenin then quotes 16 Dialectical Principles in his *Use of Dialectics* but most Marxists acknowledge that these can in effect be whittled down to the three Dialectical Principles of Hegel which he chooses to call category statements:

1. *The Law of Transformation of Quality into Quantity*, i.e. changes take place by imperceptible qualitative mutations until a point, a node is arrived beyond which one cannot proceed and yet remain the same. The example chosen is the raising of water from 0°C to 100°C boiling point (quantitative change) whereupon the water turns to steam (qualitative change).
2. *The Law of the Unity of Opposites*. (Lenin himself called this law, 'the very salt of Dialectics'.) The principle itself is self-explanatory.
3. *The Law of the Negation of the Negation* is the familiar thesis, antithesis, synthesis principle; of how from the negation of any situation a new resolved situation emerges which itself contains its own contradiction. The example chosen is that of Capitalism (thesis) which contains its own negations in the form of class struggles (antithesis) which will inevitably result in a new classless society (synthesis) but which contains itself the seeds of its own decay. Thus the triadic movement progresses in a never-ending spiral of development.

Engels then in *The Dialectics of Nature* says the test of dialects is to be found in nature and that an observation of nature will supply evidence that nature's processes are themselves dialectical. In short then Marxists purport to explain the world from these three

well-tried principles. But where Engels takes the principles of dialectics to be empirically observable in nature (and therefore open to test and possible rejection), later Marxists (Lenin and Stalin) stress that the principles of dialectics are necessarily true, and Maurice Cornforth of Communist Party fame goes so far as to place the principles on a logical par with the statements of mathematics and logic. Now if this is so, pretty alarming things emerge (alarming, that is, for any folk who held faith in dialectics):

Firstly, as I touched on above, if the principles are on a par with the axioms of mathematics and logic then, like mathematics and logic, only tautological statements can be deduced from them; they are empirically unfalsifiable. Though clearly a moment's reflection will bring forth cases where they do not hold. For instance, must the negation of the thesis (antithesis) necessarily result in a more forward, a higher synthesis? Moreover cannot the reasoning contained in the law of the negation of the negation be used to demonstrate something as unpalatable as the existence of a future life?

Secondly, an examination of the logical status of the principles of dialectics brings light on the charge of Historicism levelled at Marx and his followers by Karl Popper in *The Open Society and its Enemies* viz: that Marx appears to make sociology into a predictive science. Cornforth, in reply to Popper, in his book *The Open Philosophy and the Open Society* wishes to avoid the issue by saying that Popper conflates 'Marx with Old Moore' i.e. attributes to Marxism and 'its laws' predictive powers which it in fact does not possess; furthermore does not lay any claim to possess. He (Cornforth) claims that all Marxism does, like any science, is to make conditional predictions, but the principles of dialectics cannot both be axiomatic and mere empirical observation-statements capable of falsification. They must be either one or the other. But, manifestly, Cornforth, like most 'double-think' dialectical reasoners, want it both ways; they wish to see the time-hallowed principles of dialectics invested with cold mathematical certainty (calculated to make us frightened) and to possess an element of empirical contingency which enables them to backslide if things don't go according to plan. Cornforth himself, in his earlier book *Dialectical Materialism Vol. 2*—incidentally a text-book for all CP cadres—says, 'all fundamental scientific theory is very general in character and, consequently very flexible'.

At the level of argument then, the above reasoning finds expression in the CP apologist who says 'the revolution must of necessity come, comrade . . . then goes on to qualify it with an 'of course if will only come if . . . They are so blind to the status of their principles that they fail to see that the latter statement impugns that of the former.

My third point is close to, but not concomitant with, the points raised above. Following on them, it can be detected that when the Marxist makes his 'conditional prediction' of the course of events in society, i.e. as late capitalist society becomes more advanced

then there will be increasingly more misery, etc., which will generate class conflict and hence hasten the coming of the socialist revolution. What he is really including in his prediction is something totally unscientific—a statement of intent! 'The revolution will come' not because of the inner necessity of certain basic principles of the world, but 'because if it doesn't come I and others are going to bloody well make sure it comes'.

The nub of the issue is that when the Marxist speaks of the necessity for certain events it is not a logical necessity, but a moral necessity. Change will come about not because of the deterministic nature of social laws and the statements of dialectics which underlie them, for by their own admission they don't possess a rigorous enough system. Rather change will come about because Marxists want to see changes in certain directions. Why, I ask, call this statement scientific at all? For what true scientific statement contains such a thing as a statement of intent? Why don't the Marxists come clean and acknowledge what the principles of dialectics are after all? For patently the scientist couches his conditional predictions thus, 'this ball will run down this slope so and so . . . the pseudo-scientific Marxist is saying something totally different, 'I want this ball to roll down this slope in this particular manner

and here is how I am going to do it . . . In short then all the normal criteria of what we mean by scientific (viz. objectivity; impartiality of conditional predictions; lack of interference by the observer, etc.) have all been abandoned by the Marxist. If a scientist is really sure of his principles (scientific principles that is) and the predictive powers contained therein, he does not need to meddle and manipulate events to his own choosing.

The orthodox Marxist should be confronted with the following question: 'If the contradiction of capitalism must generate class struggle which will inevitably result in the overthrow of the capitalists and hence the dictatorship of the proletariat, if this statement is not to be an unconditional prophecy, you ought to then state those very conditions under which it would not occur. In short, if your theory purports to be scientific, then, like normal scientific theories, it should be stated prospectively; conditions must be advanced under which the communist revolution would not take place, both now and for all time, moreover your proscriptions must follow from the principles of your 'science' i.e. the dialectics, and must not come from auxiliary sources. For true scientific statements are, unlike the meaningless statements of the Marxists, expressed in the form of negations of strictly

existential statements, and there is always contained in them that they can be refuted by experience. Scientific statements, far from being as Cornforth would mistakenly have it, 'very general in character and consequently very flexible' are really very narrow and prohibitive; say nothing more than what cannot be for the time being shown to be otherwise. Now simply because Marxists won't state the conditions under which their theory could be corroborated by tests of falsifiability, it is no better as a theory than any other metaphysical system purporting to 'explain'. It is unsinkable and unscientific, not open to disproof, just as Freud's theory of the Unconscious is unsinkable and unscientific. Small wonder then that Marcuse draws so much on Freudian thinking.

Finally, in conclusion, the anarchist views the principles of dialectics for what they really are; just another attempt by governments, dictators and authoritarian rulers to dupe and bewitch the minds of the people. Governments are all the same, whether right or left; the people in the Soviet Union are fed the myth of 'scientific socialism' and 'dialectics'. The Americans are fed the myth of a 'participatory democracy'. We are fed the myth of 'liberal principles'. All should be exposed for what they are—crap!

IAN WINFIELD.

## Anarchists and Violence

**I**F YOUR PICTURE of an anarchist is that of a bomb-throwing assassin, you would hardly expect violence to be a matter of controversy in the anarchist movement. Yet for a century anarchists have been arguing about violence. This is, of course, as it should be. An anarchist society must be able to tolerate all forms of behaviour (with the necessary exception of behaviour designed to limit the freedom of others) and if anarchists were unable to tolerate a wide divergence of views within their own ranks, how could they expect such freedom in society at large?

### CONTROVERSY USEFUL?

It must be admitted however that the argument has not always been on a useful level. It has often had a psychological basis, stemming from personal attraction or repulsion, which may be reduced to statements such as, 'I like it', or 'I don't like it'. This hardly helps to throw light on the practical difficulties inherent in the question of violence which are important to anarchists. Violence also tends to be considered as a single indivisible concept, yet clearly violence is not all of a kind. It is for instance possible to speak of spontaneous or unorganised violence as opposed to organised violence.

### NON-VIOLENT REVOLUTION A POSSIBILITY?

In order to have a useful discussion on the problems involved, it is necessary to make reasonable estimates of what is likely to happen, based on past experience. In other words, to form probable hypotheses. First of all it has never seemed to me that the notion of a non-violent anarchist revolution, if the phrase is taken literally (and how else should one take it) is a probable hypothesis. The change that anarchists want in society, nothing less than the abolition of government, is a revolutionary change of an extreme nature. It is very difficult to imagine such a change taking place, however it takes place, without violent opposition from those who are losing power and privilege. Even if the revolutionaries themselves do not want violence, they are likely to have it thrust upon them. We are not all Jesus Christs to turn the other cheek. Neither do I think that the notion of a non-violent society is anything more than a chimera. There is no evidence to show that violence will disappear if authority is removed, or that it is solely a product of our social system. There is even a sense in which it is not an attractive notion, for it implies the absence of conflict. A society without conflict could be extremely dull and ossified, with human beings behaving like domestic cattle.

### ORGANISED VIOLENCE

All this, of course, refers to spontaneous violence, which may be regarded as something in the nature of an accident. It is not really possible to argue for or against accidents. The question of or-

ganised violence however is different, and it is here that the real difficulties present themselves. There are some anarchists, not psychologically repelled by violence, who have themselves taken part in armed conflict, who see dangers in the organisation of violence. The problem has been stated by Voline (the Russian anarchist who took part in the fighting in the Ukraine between 1918 and 1921) as follows:

'Among other problems which as far as possible should be surmounted and eliminated in advance, they (the anarchists) must envisage the means of reconciling the need to defend the true revolution with that of avoiding the evils which an armed force engenders.'

It seems that this problem has been obscured by the psychological and absolutist nature of the debate about violence.

### MILITARY UNITS

The difficulty centres around the formation of military and para-military units which some anarchists consider would be necessary to combat counter-revolutionary forces. These same anarchists tend to support units of this type which exist today, such as the Vietcong or the Che Guevara-type guerrillas. In these units the men submit, willingly no doubt, to the orders of a commander. Experience shows that in this kind of situation a number of things may happen. Firstly, sooner or later, the unit becomes an instrument of injustice. All warfare is chaotic and disorganised and men acting, not as individuals but under orders, make mistakes. The innocent suffer with the guilty and this is not justice. Secondly, if the unit remains in existence for a long time, the men are tempted to regard themselves as an elite and so become arrogant. Thirdly, the commander is in a position of power, and as we know to our cost, power corrupts. Power is a heady drug and once on the hook it is very difficult to get off. It will easily be seen that these consequences are not compatible with anarchy. But perhaps the greatest difficulty of all is—what happens if the revolution is successful? Will the units readily disband? Will the commanders readily give up their power? I don't think we can be sure that the answers to these questions will be unequivocal 'yes'. I think, in fact, we are driven back to the dictum that the means must always be consistent with the end, and the organisation of a military unit cannot be consistent with freedom and equality.

### DEFENCE OF THE REVOLUTION

An answer must be found, however, to the legitimate question, posed by Voline, how is the revolution to be defended? In trying to imagine the circumstances of a revolution, of course, we leave the field of the probable, but we can hope to stay with the possible. An anarchist revolution is presumably not possible unless the majority of people are in favour of it. Military action by a

minority merely results in a coup d'état. In fact the real work of revolution is done, not by revolutionaries, but by governments. When a government is sufficiently repressive or incompetent to make the people feel that they lose nothing by getting rid of it, that is the time of revolution. It can be imagined perhaps as starting with the successful takeover of a factory or a number of factories, rapidly followed by more, until a large proportion of the factories and services are in the hands of the people who work in them. At some point the government will intervene with the armed forces.

These forces will be to some extent unreliable and depleted by defections, also they will be uncertain of supplies and services. If opposed to them is a population unorganised into military units, remaining in their homes and work places, operating as individuals, but armed and equipped for sabotage, what is likely to be the result? First of all, one of the ingredients for the military success of the armed forces will be missing—knowledge of the disposition and intentions of the enemy. Secondly, the target for attack will be so diffuse that it will be like fighting a will-o'-the-wisp. Thirdly, the force will, in effect, be surrounded with its supply lines cut off. It is impossible to forecast what would happen in such circumstances, but it seems at least possible that military action would be unsuccessful. To defend the revolution, then, a population of armed and determined individuals is needed.

No doubt those who are not anarchists will hold up their hands in horror at the idea of an armed population and will paint a picture of wholesale murder, pointing to America where arms are freely available. Anarchists, however, believe that when people are united in a common aim, they seek to help and not to kill each other. Also they can point to Switzerland, where the Government issues a rifle to every adult male to keep in his home. Switzerland appears to be a comparatively peaceful country.

### ACADEMIC PROBLEM?

It may be objected that since we are not in a revolutionary situation in this country and have no immediate prospect of being in one, the whole discussion is academic and hardly worth the effort. As Voline said, however, it is a problem that should be surmounted in advance. When it seems relevant it will be too late. Revolutions have a habit of appearing unannounced. They certainly don't give time for lengthy discussions. If these premises are accepted therefore, anarchists will oppose military and para-military units whatever their ostensible purpose. In particular they will resist any attempts to set up such units if the circumstances should arise. For remember that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

GEOFFREY BARFOOT.

## Direct Action in South America

Continued from page 6

Areco is getting a rough time from the students and the workers.

Since the middle of September, Montevideo, the capital, has seen its sixth general strike, called by the National Workers' Convention (CNT), and has been disturbed by student demonstrations. *Le Monde*, the French newspaper, has for the last couple of weeks been reporting almost day after day of riots. It would appear that while workers have seized control of the nationalised Frigidaire factory, in the Cerro district of the capital, the students are controlling the streets around it by erecting barricades all over the place. By September 21, six buses had been burnt in Cerro, apart from another six burnt on the 19th in other parts of the city during a general strike.

Support for the workers, it would appear, is widespread, it being claimed that virtually 100% stay-away took place on the 20th in the majority of the industries. Banks and schools were also shut.

*Le Monde* (22/23.9.68) reports violent clashes between police and students for the third day running, and ventures to suggest that the return to the Presidential system has not sufficed in solving the country's ailments, but has in fact been

accompanied by severe repression.

Such disturbances, of course, have been accompanied by fatalities and many injuries. As far back as August 14, a student, Liber Arce, was killed in a clash with police. A demonstration was held in his honour on September 17. Three days later, on the Friday, two students were killed in clashes with the police. They were buried on the 23rd—their funerals were not attended by as many people as attended that of Liber Arce on the 21st, at which 30,000 were present—by that time, the State had forbidden all commentary on the subject and radio news was restricted to official communiqués. The leftist Christian Democrat evening daily *Extra* was being censored.

And what does the Government say? The Ministers of the Interior and of Defence have promised the workers 'liberty of work' and have called off the siege of the CNT.

As for the students, their organisation, the Federation of Uruguayan Students, has urged the population in pamphlets to 'fight the dictatorship', and, they sum up: 'The Government lies, the Police kill, the students die—better to die than live on our knees.'

R.J.B.

# Czechoslovakia 1968

CZECHOSLOVAKIA 1968 will be remembered as yet one more betrayal of socialism by the Russian Communist Party during the half-century it has held power. It joins a long line which goes from Ukraine 1918 and Kronstadt 1921 down to East Germany 1953 and Hungary 1956. Eventually there will be books about it (there already are in France, Germany and Italy), and then it will be possible to put together and understand all the details of an extraordinary story. In the meantime there are articles in the press, trying to put what has happened into some sort of perspective. We have tried to do this in two articles just after the Russian invasion (FREEDOM, August 31 and September 14); the present article is an attempt to put into focus the events of a whole year.

When Novotny lost power in January, the Communists had ruled Czechoslovakia for twenty years since the 1948 coup d'état, when they overthrew the bourgeois liberal coalition which had been set up at the end of the war. Under the Communist regime, power was held by a single dictator, a Stalinist puppet, who combined the honorific post of President with the effective post of General Secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. The puppet-dictator was Klement Gottwald from 1948 until his death in 1953, and Antonin Novotny from 1953 until his fall in 1968. During the twenty years of Stalinist dictatorship, Czechoslovakia got the reputation of being one of the most docile of Russia's satellites. In fact this reputation was not entirely deserved, for the regime had trouble with both the people and the Party.

## A FORGOTTEN RISING

In June 1953—just before the East German rising—there was a little-known rising in Czechoslovakia. Workers from the Skoda factory led successful attacks on the Plzen town hall and law court, fought the police for two days, and were crushed only by soldiers sent from Prague. And there were attempts to oust Novotny in 1962 and again in 1963, which failed but did force the regime to make concessions—such as the emergence of Alexander Dubcek as First Secretary of the Slovak Communist Party.

More important than either open insurrection or Party splits, there was a sort of underground thaw after 1963. Literary magazines began to discuss unorthodox ideas such as freedom of speech, which is predictable enough, and workers' control of factories, which is not. Not only did 'liberals' come out into the open against 'conservatives', but they gradually took over important posts in intellectual and administrative life, especially in such apparently irrelevant but actually crucial areas as education and economics. As in Hungary—and in Russia itself—it was the intellectuals who took the lead in undermining Communist orthodoxy, but it would be wrong to ignore the vital point that they were supported by the mass of the people. They had taken the lead before in the struggle with the Austrian and Hungarian regime until 1918, and the relative freedom of the independent state which lasted from 1918 to 1938 was not forgotten. Under the frozen surface of the regime its support had melted away.

## THE ICE BEGINS TO CRACK

But the ice didn't begin to crack until—of all things—the Arab-Israeli war in summer 1967. The Czechoslovak government dutifully followed the Russian line by breaking off diplomatic relations with Israel, but the Writers' Union deliberately passed a resolution of sympathy with Israel, and there was a hell of a row. Support for Israel became a symbol of opposition to antisemitism (most of the victims of the Gottwald purge were Jewish) and at a further remove a symbol of opposition to Stalinism (which always tended towards antisemitism). In autumn 1967 a peaceful student demonstration was violently attacked by police, and the young intellectuals were publicly ranged alongside their seniors against the regime.

Another element was Slovak nationalism, as in the widespread resentment Novotny caused by his offensive behaviour during a tour of Slovakia, also in autumn 1967. Dubcek is a Slovak and, although he is not a nationalist, his nationality is certainly a symbol of opposition to 'great power chauvinism' as it was applied in Czechoslovakia—the oppression of Slovaks by Czechs being seen as a reflection of the oppression of both Czechs and Slovaks by Russia.

In winter 1967 it was obvious even to Novotny that his power was crumbling away, and he asked Brezhnev for help against the new attempt to oust him. But when Brezhnev visited Czechoslovakia he told the Party leaders that it was none of his business. When the Central Committee met in December 1967, Novotny expressed self-criticism, but this was no longer enough and he adjourned the meeting. But when the Central Committee met again in January 1968, he was forced to resign as General Secretary, and Dubcek was appointed in his place (as a compromise candidate between an extreme 'conservative', the prime minister Lenart, and an extreme 'liberal', Cernik).

## TWENTY YEARS INTO TWENTY WEEKS

What happened after this was more or less that Czechoslovakia compressed twenty years' experience in Yugoslavia into twenty weeks, and even went beyond Yugoslavia, without actually destroying the Communist regime; and what was new and extraordinary was that the lead in this process was taken by the Communist Party itself. But Czechoslovakia is part of the Russian bloc, and the events in Czechoslovakia threatened the Communist regimes throughout eastern Europe. Four things were particularly dangerous to the Communist system:

1. The Czechoslovak Communist Party went from Stalinism back to democratic centralism and then on to party democracy. In March Ludvik Svoboda replaced Novotny as President, and in April Cernik replaced Lenart as Prime Minister. Long discussions within the Party led to the publication of an Action Programme in April; this went further in the direction of libertarian socialism than any Communist Party in power since 1917. No wonder the Communist leaders of Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria and—above all—Russia were frightened, and those of Rumania and Yugoslavia could hardly have welcomed these developments.

2. The Czechoslovak government allowed freedom of speech. Foreign papers were on sale in Prague in January, and independent papers were published there in February. In March the official censorship was abolished after twenty years, and political discussion was freed from all restraints other than that of caution. Prague Radio became more open to varying points of view than the BBC. The Communist Party paper, *Rude Pravo*, became almost unrecognisable. The writers' paper, *Literarni Listy*, became the forum of the intellectual rebellion against all the old orthodoxies. In June it published the manifesto called 'Two Thousand Words' (after its length), drafted by Ludvik Vaculik and signed by seventy intellectuals, which represented an appeal by both Communists and non-Communists to continue the process of liberalisation—an appeal which was quickly repudiated by the government but for which no one was punished. Czechoslovak intellectuals made contact with those in western countries, and intellectual life in Czechoslovakia became as open as in Hungary between the revolution of October 1956 and the counter-revolution of November 1956. Again, no wonder the Communist leaders of neighbouring countries were frightened, for even in Yugoslavia non-Communists were still imprisoned for questioning Communism.

3. Along with freedom of speech, the Czechoslovak government began to introduce economic freedom. By its very nature, this takes longer to establish and is harder to document, so little is yet known about what happened and what was going to happen; but it is at least clear that this was one of the most important things going on in Czechoslovakia this year. Workers' control of industry and peasants' control of agriculture would, if they had been genuine, have destroyed the economic basis of authoritarian Communism and provided the economic basis of libertarian socialism. The Russian Communists fear nothing more, as they showed in Spain during the Civil War—and in Russia during their own Civil War—and once more no wonder the Communist leaders in neighbouring countries were frightened.

4. Above all, the Czechoslovak government seemed to be allowing political opposition—something which is unique in a Communist country. In June a law was passed to rehabilitate political prisoners, and an organisation was set up to represent their interests; the political prisoners of a Communist regime are not likely to support the Communist Party, even if it is as liberal as it was in Czechoslovakia. There are plenty of Social Democrats in Czechoslovakia, and Liberals, and probably even Conservatives; and there are certainly many non-Communist communists—that is, people who believe in complete socialism without the Communist Party. The Czechoslovak Communist Party maintained support because it was doing what the people wanted, and because it was letting the people do what they wanted; one of the things they wanted was political freedom; political freedom includes the freedom to oppose and to change the system; once they had real freedom, the people might not want the Communist Party. Yet again, no wonder the Communist leaders in neighbouring countries—and even perhaps in Czechoslovakia—were frightened.

## ANY RESISTANCE BETTER THAN NONE

There doesn't seem to have been any hint that Czechoslovakia would leave the Warsaw Pact, break the Russian bloc, and join the West. But on the other hand there doesn't seem to have been any reason why such things shouldn't eventually happen. And this was no doubt the factor which made up the minds of the Russian leaders to threaten the Czechoslovaks in the press and in person, to hold fake military manoeuvres inside Czechoslovakia in May and outside Czechoslovakia in July, and finally to invade in August.

At the time of the invasion, the extraordinary resistance of the Czechoslovak people made it seem that the Russians had made an enormous mistake. But the surrender of the Czechoslovak government made it certain that the Russians would eventually get what they wanted. The people, rightly admiring their rulers for standing up to Russian pressure for so long, wrongly trusted them to go on doing so for ever. During the last two months, all the gains of the last year have been lost. The Party congress fixed for September, which was prevented by the Russian invasion and was partly held underground during the occupation, has been put off, and Party democracy is held in suspense. Freedom of speech is also held in abeyance, and the brilliantly organised underground press and broadcasting of the occupation has come to nothing. The possibility of opposition has ended, and potentially dissenting organisations are quietly dismantled. And the economic reforms, which would have put the seal on all the other reforms, have been put into reverse. Jan Hus has promised not to talk heresy; the Good Soldier Schweik has been promoted; K. has admitted his guilt.

The tragedy of Czechoslovakia 1968 is not that the Russians destroyed the Czechoslovak experiment but that the Czechoslovaks stopped it themselves. For a week they had shown the world how to resist Communist oppression, and had suggested that all the previous attempts, from Kronstadt to Hungary, had been wrong. Now it seems that the sailors of Kronstadt and the students of Hungary may not have been wrong after all. Peaceful resistance is better than violent resistance, but resistance of any kind is better than no resistance at all. In the end the best thing that has come out of Czechoslovakia in 1968 is the tiny protest of a few Russians in Red Square on August 25; on October 11 they were sent to prison or exile, but their demonstration shows that the message of Czechoslovakia 1968 was heard in the East as well as the West: the message of free communism, of libertarian socialism, even—dare we say it?—of anarchism.

As a postscript, it should be emphasised again and again that two of the very few Communist Parties which approved of the invasion of Czechoslovakia were those of North Vietnam and Cuba—that Ho Chi Minh and Fidel Castro, those glorious bearded heroes of the Marxist left, of the armchair guerrilleros in the university common rooms, of the screaming street-fighters in Grosvenor Square, have publicly supported the destruction of free socialism by the Russian Communist regime. If this doesn't teach them, nothing can.

N.W.



## THE POET'S JOB

THE BEGINNING OF THE END by Angelo Quattrochi and Tom Nairn. Panther. 176 pp. 6s.

THE AUTHORS of this paperback may be readily accused of being euphoric about the famous events in Paris last May. But they are at least never dull. Which is more than could be said for one of their detractors: Alasdair MacIntyre, whose review of *The Beginning of the End* in *New Society* caught my eye today.

MacIntyre, once on the board of *Socialist Review*, tore into Quattrochi's prose as 'poetic (ugh!)'. True, Angelo opens the book with an extended essay, in staccato impressionistic style, of the events of May. He took an active part in the work of the March 22 Group and was, in addition, journalistically well situated in that his flat in Place Contrescarpe overlooked the point at which all street fighting seemed to reach its ugly conclusion. MacIntyre seems to think that revolution or street fighting are subjects intrinsically unfit for poetry or indeed prose.

A better literary critic than he or I—William Wordsworth—might have disagreed. Wordsworth responded to the French Revolution (Mark 1) with as fervent and emotional a style as Quattrochi's. It is the poet's job to set down what he feels, not what a newspaper might print, or a dull donnish mind find credible.

Quattrochi's essay is a one-man light-and-colour show, re-animating the bones of that May into a bright new life; unlike the slow drag through each moment to which we will be condemned by scholarly and analytical Trotskyists. (Yes, folks,

MacIntyre ended his discussion of the book with the moving clarion call: 'Back to British Museum and noses down to the words of Karl Marx'.)

Happily, Tom Nairn, whose incisive essay forms the second part of *The Beginning of the End*, paid no mind to such advice. He has here contributed, writing from a classroom during the occupation of Hornsey Art College, one of the best accounts of student revolt to reach a mass audience. Stalinists, like Djilas, and Labour Party stalwarts like to dismiss students because they have 'no programme and no discipline'. (Have the bureaucrats never reflected that a programme is only valuable if it's carried out? That planning to improve the lot of old people is less effective than actually doing it?) Nairn shows clearly that the value of students in a revolutionary situation is precisely their flexibility. Uncommitted to a power group or a trade union they can often see the wood for the trees more clearly than their more politically-sophisticated elders.

And they are better too at learning from a situation (take Strasbourg). Learning is after all what they are good at. Nairn points out that modern students have already a new kind of economic freedom. Given more they will take yet more again; but in a libertarian, not in a power-seeking way.

Unlike many so-called revered freedom fighters they are not, he thinks, playing the power game. They don't just want better jobs. They want workers' control. If the party politicians won the toss the jails would still be filled (with their opponents); the presidential throne kept well warmed.

Nairn believes that the student revolt, which he probably over-plays, is moving towards a rejection of the tyranny of party and closely formulated pre-policy. He concludes: 'The anarchism of 1871 looked backwards to a pre-capitalist past, doomed to defeat; the anarchism of 1968 looks forward to the future society almost within our grasp, certain of success.'

MONICA FOOT.

# THE AGITATORS

EXTREMIST ACTIVITIES IN BRITISH INDUSTRY. Published by The Economic League Ltd., 24 Buckingham Palace Mansions, S.W.1. Price 1s. 6d.

EACH AND EVERY one of us seek a measure of glory for what we have achieved or failed to achieve in the externals of our daily living. To be able to balance life's failures against the knowledge that somewhere, some day, our worth will be publicly acknowledged and men will boast that they knew us and unfortunate children will be encouraged to lip our name at their mother's knee. For the God-lovers there is the outside chance that canonisation might be their reward for all their earthly sufferings, and for the Establishment, the Press, the Civil Service, the brewing industry and the social-minded economic gangster there is the Queen's list of public honours with its coloured ribbon and its polished medal.

There was a time when we, of the extreme Left, could dismiss, with a threatening shake of an ink-stained hand, the unoffered honours that her gracious Majesty might wish to offer us, secure in the faith that we could spit on the Palace steps should any dare to invite us to join the free loaders at the Royal table, but the muffled cries of past indignations still force their way from the bound volumes of ancient FREEDOMS and campaign statements still record that there were those among us who accepted the titled honours of a society that we openly and frequently claim to desire to destroy.

To savage men for failing to live up to our own standards is an enjoyable yet self-destructive process, for we in our turn must be judged by those very same standards and there are very few among us that dare face that test for if each and every one of us steps forward to be judged a hundred comradesly fingers would seek to write a guilt in blood. Little comrade, we must be accepted in spite of and because of our faults and if this is not so then what we advocate is the sour agony of nihilism seeking to destroy, not for the pleasure of the pyrotechnic display, but for the salving of an unhealing wound for we not only have our Lears, our Hamlets and our Brutuses within the movement, but a cast that contains too many Iagos.

That power corrupts is not only a cliché that can be applied to those less fortunate, philosophically, than ourselves but it is an ever-present warning to those within the anarchist movement for in the Quattrocento cloak and dagger work of fratricidal warfare we have nothing to learn from the major or minor political parties. And there are honours for the men and women

within the anarchist movement yet so very few of us have so far qualified. Foremost in propagating this merit system is the Economic League and their monthly Newsletter has these long years been accepted as the left-wing version of the Queen's Birthday Honours List.

To have spent a lifetime as an active militant, to have witnessed a revolutionary takeover of the State, to have had all the State and police dossiers made public, and then to find that one has not even merited a clerk's footnote, must surely be the saddest moment of a successful activist's life. If only for this reason inclusion in the Economic League's monthly exposé is of paramount importance for all those of the Left for their entry in this 'Who's Who' is the mark of public recognition. It must be accepted that over the years the anarchist movement, by ignoring the industrial struggle, have failed to join the ranks of the Conservative Party bogie men but slowly our public image is being refashioned.

In this reprint and updated version of *The Agitators*, the Anarchist Federation of Great Britain has finally made it and now shares a billing with the Trotskyists, the Communist Party, the CDRCU, the Solidarists and the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain as Extremist Organisations currently active in industry and the trade unions. This booklet as a work of social or historical import is completely worthless and its level can be gauged in the use of quotations from Mr. Ray Gunter, Lord Carron and ex-CP Mr. Cannon as authorities and experts on subversive groups operating within the trade union movement. If one needed quotes in the context of this booklet then I, for my part, would accept Peter Simple of the *Daily Telegraph* rather than this trinity. The Economic League operates behind a competent press-cutting staff and their informed and at times inspired leaks from within a number of left-wing and trade union movements justifies one in accepting that they must have a few well-placed informants within the groups that they attack, yet in the main their information comes from a religious reading of the left-wing press and its pamphlets, the filing of the information contained within these writings, and the monthly regurgitation into the monthly Newsletter.

Allowing for the fact that they have a Lieut.-Commander R. O. B. Long and a Major-General T. Brodie as two of their Area Chief Executives, the Economic League managed to give a semblance of urbane detachment as they offer their facts out of contexts with but a minimum of political ranting and for this the credit must lie with that

small back-room staff working at Buckingham Palace Mansions. Always the Economic League has accepted as its two main enemies the Communist Party and the Trotskyists with the anarchists as Johnny-come-lately to the industrial brawl, but in the ten pages that *The Agitators* devotes to the building industry and the Barbican and Horseferry Road strike of 1966, they find time to record that after the publication of the Cameron Report and the call for an intensification of the struggle on the sites the *Anarchist journal FREEDOM* launched a similar attack and called on building workers to 'bring fighting victory to eleven months of struggle'.

But always the Economic League sees the Communist Party and the Trotskyists as its major and mortal enemy and in news-cutting and quotation after quotation they seek to expose their machiavellian undermining of our share-owning democracy as a single-minded and major evil of our time. And always the method is the same in that the Economic League offer fantasy and fiction with mass quotations from the right wing of the trade union movement and a completely honest description of those they love to hate as, for example, in Appendix I that deals with *Extremist Organisations Currently Active In Industry And The Trade Unions* where they describe the Anarchist Federation of Great Britain in the following words: 'The Anarchists are against all governments and believe that all laws exist only to maintain the power of the state over the individual. Their industrial activities are based on the belief that freedom is impossible without control by the workers over the means of production. This belief is implicitly shown in the title of their weekly journal *FREEDOM* for Workers' Control. They also publish *Anarchy* monthly'.

The bannered demonstrations on the crowded streets and the question and answer on the television programmes may be good for our ego but our strength can only lie among the engaged workers not as leaders but as participants in the daily struggle, and the right-wing Economic League screams shall be the mirror of our success.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

# GUERRILLA

HOW DOES MERCIER explain the title of the book: *The Anti-State Technique*? For him this guerrilla movement is not directed against society; neither is it revolutionary as a result of support from the oppressed workers or peasants; nor is it a technique of struggle against society. It is a technique of struggle against certain state apparatus; its sole aim is to take possession of political power.

In studying the social origins of the guerrillas Mercier has shown admirably that they are not workers or poor peasants, but almost always intellectuals and university products who appoint themselves professional revolutionaries (sometimes with the participation of military rebels and deserters). For them the armed struggle is not one revolutionary method among others; it is the only method, to which all other traditional forms of struggle must be subordinated. The only thing that unites the tiny groups of guerrillas in all the Latin-American countries is the exhalation of patriotism and the denunciation of US imperialism.

However the appeals and proclamations of these (and Mercier quotes them abundantly) undoubtedly contain revolutionary programmes, particularly for agrarian reform. The problem which arises, not only in this continent but everywhere, is that of the composition and the forms of struggle of the avant-garde. The Colombian sociologist Orlando Fals Borda thinks that 'the guerrillas are, with the trade unions and the student movements, the forms of social organisations which will try to attain the socialist utopia desired during the first quarter of the present century'.

From the opposite point of view Mercier thinks that the guerrillas have no future. Perhaps one should say that they have no future if they act in isolation.

The second part of the book is a politico-military geography of the South American continent, with detailed information on the situation of the guerrilla

movement in the different countries. We can learn a lot from it. Everywhere the official communist parties, after some waverings and splits, have condemned the guerrilla movements. What strikes me is the similarity of their arguments with those of the French Communist Party against the 'groupuscules' of the Left. What strikes me also, and surprises me, is that in his criticism Mercier picks up certain of these arguments against 'these enfants terribles of the urban bourgeoisie'. He writes: 'The logical destiny of lots of university activists of the extreme left leads them to ministerial positions and administrative committees whether these be within private or state capitalism.' Yes, save for those who risk their skins on these adventures. But I think that the difference between the students of Lima and the Indian peasants of Peru is greater than that between the students of Nanterre and the workers of Renault. We have however known, and will continue to know, ex-workers from Renault and elsewhere, who have become frightful bureaucrats.

Mercier writes again: 'Without doubt Uruguay is the country where the greatest amount of paper has been devoted to the guerrillas, and we can reasonably assume that here there will never be anything else but discussion clubs arguing about armed revolutionary action.' But the day that I read this, August 18, the editorial of *Le Monde* was devoted to the 'deteriorating economic and political situation in Uruguay' where the students of Montevideo are engaged in a struggle together with the Uruguayan workers. Friend Mercier would undoubtedly say that this has more revolutionary significance than the ambushes of guerrillas in the Andean mountains. And I would say that we agree.

Translated from  
*Révolution Proletarienne*,  
B.B.

\**Technique du Contre-Etat* by Luis Mercier Vega.

## A CONTRIBUTION TO LIBERTARIAN DISCUSSION

### 1. Introduction.

This short account of anarchist aims and principles is intended as a contribution to discussion among libertarians. We hope it will lead to more effective practical co-operation and to more theoretical cohesion. We see two points as basic: (1) a fundamental re-examination of all socialist ideas and ideals; (2) a commitment to total revolution, from which the people will never again allow any sort of state to arise. We hope those trained in the Marxist tradition will not find it too vague.

### 2. The Re-examination of Socialism.

For us, this means anarchism and the libertarian wing of Marxism. Anarchism has suffered from an ideological and practical eclipse over the last 50 years, only re-emerging as large numbers of people, especially in the older countries, have become disillusioned with the authoritarian communist road to the free society. Marxists such as Kollontai, Korsch and Pannekoek have however made valuable contributions to libertarian thought, which is being heard again amidst the disintegration of the Stalinist world communist movement, which disintegration we welcome.

The present ideological confusion among libertarians is also in part due to their varied political origins and the fact that the British libertarian movement has been and still is largely an intellectual movement without a mass following. This is why rethinking is necessary. Much has changed in the 120 years since Marx quarrelled with Proudhon, but class society still exists, with the state playing an increasingly authoritarian role in the West, as it already does in the East and parts of the third world. This analysis is, we feel, largely common ground to libertarians, and could be the starting point for further discussions among them. In the meantime, practical co-operation should be pushed forward as much as possible, in the belief of the close unity of theory and practice.

### 3. The Commitment to Total Revolution.

This is the social, cultural, economic, and political emancipation of the vast

masses, the outcome of a class struggle between exploiters and exploited. This is the real theoretical basis for libertarians, along with the firm belief that all states of whatever kind are an almost totally unmitigated evil, and the resulting wish that they should never rise again, however temporarily. This clears away a lot of the mystification that surrounds the idea of 'workers' states' and the like; it is, we think, the dividing line between libertarians on the one hand, and authoritarians of all types, including Communist Parties, on the other; the unity of ends and means, as opposed to the use of authoritarian means to achieve a libertarian society. As states will resist their total overthrow can only come through revolutionary action. This means some violence is almost inevitable, but we strongly believe that violence should not be advocated for its own sake. Final power comes from the gun, the state's gun. This must be destroyed for ever. Violence for its own sake can only lead to civil war and thence totalitarianism.

### 4. Freedom.

The desire of the exploited for total, individual freedom is the only basis for a libertarian revolution; the more society loses its bourgeois democratic facade, the more revolutionary a demand freedom is. The only true freedom is individual freedom, the freedom for one person to decide how to run his life—with others, as we believe most will choose, or by himself. Total freedom can only be a reality on a worldwide scale.

### 5. The Present Situation in Britain.

We welcome the recent opening up of the libertarian left, but this will not be important till it is seen to be effective in action. Here are some suggestions:

(a) common action of libertarians, whether calling themselves anarchists or not, in specific efforts of the exploited to control some part, large or small, of their destiny;

(b) consequent support of student power, workers' power, workers' control, Black power, summed up as 'All Power to the People' (foreseen as being realized in bodies analogous to the soviets and

workers' councils of the past); helping in whatever ways those concerned feel we can be of use, but beware of 'taking over' such struggles;

(c) regular meetings of libertarians and their groups to encourage co-operation at this level, even if nothing comes from the ideological discussions for some time;

(d) our propaganda should be aimed largely in two directions—to give a libertarian basis to the apolitical thinking of large sections of youth; and widespread propaganda for workers' control among older people, to show that they also are thoroughly exploited. The reason for this is the belief that it will be the youth, young workers and students, who will start the revolution but that such will not succeed unless the older people understand what the young are talking about and trying to do, and the old are prepared to help them.

### 6. The Future Society.

To survive, any modern society needs organization. To ensure freedom and equality, this organization must be based on control from the bottom up; we believe there can be organization without government, because we believe that men are basically social, and do not need a state to tell them what is right and wrong. Voluntary association, the abolition of private property beyond the few personal goods available to all, workers' control in the sense of workers' and consumers' control, with representatives at the direct recall of all concerned, the non-coercive bearing and rearing of children without the brainwashing of a state-inspired 'education', and an end to war, we would regard as the concomitants of this type of society. We do not want this society to consist of anarchists only—that would make it dull, stagnant, and decaying. There is nothing sacred about dogmas. Only individuals are sacred.

(Issued by Lewisham Anarchists: 61B Granville Park, Lewisham, London, S.E.13. 01-852 8879.)

The above article will be produced as a leaflet if enough orders are received from groups and individuals. Price 30/- a 1,000 (plus postage)—Editors

## Direct Action in S. America

WHILE the World's eyes are focussed on Mexico and its student troubles, to the South, the vast Continent of South America rumbles ominously. In Brazil, the meeting of the chiefs-of-state of the Organisation of American States, attended by General Westmoreland of Vietnam fame, has provoked student protest. The Venezuelan Government has recently had to take steps to protect polling stations from guerrilla attacks during the electoral campaign. In Argentina, a group of officers who played a leading role thirteen years ago in the removal of Perón, have warned that 'Argentina is again in danger', and accusing the Onganía government of pursuing similar paths to those of Perón. The Peruvian government of Belaunde Terry was overthrown following a scandal concerning certain oil transactions with the USA.

### URUGUAY

But by far the worst trouble has occurred in Uruguay. This normally little-known state is regaining its turbulent character of the last century.

After a stormy history, Uruguay settled down to a period of social reform, while other Latin American states were still in violent confusion. The leading reformer, José Batlle y Ordóñez, was responsible for the establishment of an eight-hour working day, old-age pensions and other welfare measures. By 1920, he had brought into being what can be described as the first welfare-state in Latin America.

Such was Batlle's influence as leader of the main political party, the Colorados, that even after his last period as President, from 1911 to 1915, the country progressed towards and attained reason-

ably honest elections (if there is such a thing) under his advice. Having made an extensive study of the Swiss system of government, he proposed next that instead of a President, power should be invested in a national council. Though he was not alive to see it, this system was finally brought in by the adoption of a new constitution in 1952.

The National Council of Government thus formed consisted of nine members, six from the party gaining the largest number of votes, and three from the next largest. This two-party system also extended to local government and the control of the state-owned industries.

### INEFFICIENCY

Uruguay seemed to be on the road to a society with such beneficence as had never before been seen in the S. American continent. Only a tiny army was maintained, and visitors from Spain were 'disgusted' to find that there was no compulsory military service. Worst of all, no Catholic teaching was provided in schools.

But, according to the history books, government became inefficient, since the nine members of the Council frequently could not reach agreement amongst themselves. Eventually, in 1966, the Presidential system was restored by plebiscite after repeated demands by Colorados and Blancos alike.

### UNGOVERNABLE

In 1880, Latorre, the military dictator of Uruguay, actually resigned, claiming that the people were 'ungovernable'. In 1968, events appear to lend weight to his contention. The Government of Pacheco

Continued on page 3

## Nigeria-Biafra

The Editors,  
The Nigeria-Biafra war enters its bloodiest phase with the prospect of two million people dying from arms and starvation by the end of the year. Even if the war officially ended tomorrow guerrilla action could prolong the agony interminably.

Criticisms can be made of the policies and actions of both sides, but we believe one thing to be beyond dispute: the wrongness of the British Government's supply of vital arms to the Federal forces. This is deliberate tactical support, in the guise of 'restraining influence'.

We would like to hear from as many people as possible within the next week, who would be ready to adopt urgent measures to stop this arms supply, to ensure that the Federal Government halt all advance into the Ibo heartland and allow the massive food-lift needed, to take place, and to urge a cease-fire on both sides.

We envisage such action including non-violent direct action against the arms supplies, if appropriate. If there is sufficient response to this emergency appeal, we shall arrange to meet with those replying in the very near future.

BARBARA HIGGINS,  
ROGER MOODY.

5 Caledonian Road,  
London, N.1.

## (R)EVOLUTION

Dear Friends,  
Do you feel/think/agree that:  
—democracy does not mean the rustle of falling ballot-slips and the grimace on a parliamentary death-mask, but taking our lives in our own hands  
—free speech must be an extension of free action, not a substitute for it  
—the sole value of production, acquisition and consumption lies in what we make of ourselves in the process  
—the slave's hunger was his own; its object, food, was his objective, imposed on him by no one. The wage slave, more subtly exploited, has not probed the ache where hunger used to be; his objectives are imposed on him, diverting him from his own real needs  
—as long as majority wants can be objectively defined in a limited range of goods and services, real power will lie with managers and technocrats—a dictatorship of the competent  
—there are more male prostitutes than female, because more men sell more of themselves for more of their lives  
—opium-religion and other drugs have this in common: they are reminders that there's more to life than shows through a closed system  
—discriminate (symbolic?) violence against property is a logical counter

## PLEASE!

### MOVING FUND

Target is £500.  
Received to Date—£420 2s. 0d.

### PREMISES FUND

Target is £1,000 per year.  
Pledges honoured to date and donations—£481 14s. 7d.

## Better Still!

### FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Estimated Expenses:	
41 weeks at £90:	£3,690
Income: Sales and Subs.:	£3,160
DEFICIT:	£530

### PRESS FUND

Birmingham: G.C. 5/-; Shrewsbury: I.G. 13/-; London, E.C.1: M.D. £1/3/-; Birmingham: E.M. 2/-; London, N.W.1: A.T. £3/6/8; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; J.L.* 3/-; Aberystwyth: R.C. 10/8; Cambridge: J.H. 13/-; Swansea: J.G. 3/8; Selby: C.B. 3/-; Los Gatos: A.G. 4/-; Dartford: R.C. £1; Ontario: L.T. £1.	
TOTAL:	£9 9 0
Previously Acknowledged:	£634 18 4
1968 Total to Date:	£644 7 4
Deficit B/F:	£530 0 0
SURPLUS:	£114 7 4

\*Denotes Regular Contributor.  
Gift of Books—London: M.K.

to a system that uses property to violate humanity—subordinating persons to products, minds to machines, feelings to formulae, bodies to bullets. But if, in attacking the system, we direct our violence at the persons of its defenders we become guilty of the crime we condemn in them (though this does not mean we should stop when obstructed by police in the course of our duty, nor that we should submit to arrest).

If any of this means anything to you, why not contribute to '(R)evolution' with your own ideas on whatever personal/political issues you think most important to yourself and the rest of us. What do we want? What's moving, and what are the blocks? What do we do about it?

**Aims of the paperback:** not to make a profit, but

- to bring together popular thinking from across the disestablished left
- to bring that thinking to a wider public, making our own sense of the beards, banners, and brawls that shock TV audiences

**Send up to 2,000 words, addressed to:** '(R)evolution, c/o 61 Cardigan Street, London, S.E.11. Age, sex and occupation helpful. Names and addresses will appear in the book unless otherwise requested.

GREGORY WILKINSON.\*

\*Ex-newsagency foreign correspondent, seeking alternative to capitalist objectivity.

## Police Complaints

Dear Friends,  
There is an increasing volume of evidence of active prejudice on the part of the police against 'coloured' citizens and members of protest groups. Occasionally serious cases come to light and are aired in public. However, the vast majority of incidents are never reported and the victims suffer in silence. An additional difficulty is that if the complainant is connected with an alleged offence by the complainant and he loses his case in court the prospects for the successful handling of the complaint are very remote indeed.

All this takes place against the background of a complaints procedure under the 1964 Police Act by which the police investigate complaints themselves. They are responsible for the conclusion unless the complaint could conceivably indicate the commission of a criminal offence, in which case the details are passed on to the Director of Public Prosecutions. Whether the complaints are decided by the police or the DPP the outcome is usually the same—the police are absolved. The only way to deal with this situation is to press for an independent system of enquiry. Growing public disquiet about the behaviour of the police may mean that the prospects for an independent system are better than they have been

# The 'Fearless' Labour Left

EVERYONE WHO READ the reports of the Blackpool Conference must have been nauseated by the way that the 'Left', after out-voting the executive on several points, and after hearing Wilson say that he did not intend to take a blind bit of notice of conference, proceeded to give Wilson a standing ovation.

But the full implications of this only became obvious with the announcement of the new talks with Smith. Everyone knows that there can be no compromise between Smith and Wilson on the basis of the six principles or on NIBMAR, since Smith's new constitution has moved yet further from 'democratic' rule, and since what little remained of the Liberal white opposition to Smith has now separated from the African opposition and supports the new centre party,

for some years. First, we must show that the complaints procedure does not work. To do this we need to build up a fund of case histories. At present some complaints are referred to the NCCL, while the majority are not referred to anyone or to an immense number of organisations. If one organisation has only say five complaints in one year this does not amount to a basis for an assessment.

I would therefore like to propose to you that:

1. You encourage members or supporters of your organisation at least to make reports about their complaints, even if they are sceptical of any progress being made.

2. You keep a record of all such complaints.

3. Whatever action you decide to take you automatically send the NCCL a copy of your report. You may require us to take action and this we will do. You may prefer to handle the matter yourself. In either case a report to the NCCL will help us to make the general assessment which we believe to be so necessary.

Reports should of course contain precise details of the nature of the complaint, the name and address of the complainant, names and addresses of witnesses, details of action already taken, the results of such action and the names of police officers concerned (this procedure may of course be extended to cover magistrates, judges, lawyers, immigration officers and other officials).

I do hope that these ideas commend themselves to your members and that we can look forward to active co-operation in this important field of civil liberties.

TONY SMYTHE,  
National Council for  
Civil Liberties.

4 Camden High St., London, N.W.1

which looks to a Tiger-type settlement rather than a majority elected government.

So the only result of the 'Fearless' talks has been another stalemate to demonstrate that talks are a dead loss. Smith has announced that he would take back Britain's proposals for a settlement, and submit them to his colleagues in the Rhodesian cabinet.

There will not be another Labour Conference until 1969, in the Autumn. There may well be a General Election in the Spring of 1970, even if Wilson intends to hang on until the year after, he can let the word go out that he does not want his arms bound. He wants the choice, in which case the cry of unity at all costs will almost certainly go up next year. So what Wilson has brought back from Gibraltar will now be accepted with a certain amount of disappointment, but nothing will be said or done that may risk Labour's chance of re-election next year.

Either explicitly or implicitly the Labour Party and the Labour Government have reached a *modus vivendi* on the basis that Party shall outvote the Government on any issue where failure to do so would lead to a revolt within unions or constituency parties. Union secretaries can tell their members of their own courageous stand at party conference and the fact that they actually carried the day. Branch and Constituency secretaries can hold the fact that the party conference voted their way as an olive branch held out to disillusioned party workers in much the same way as Dick Nettleton fobs off his discontented ranks in CND by pointing to the fact that under CND pressure the Labour Party annually votes against Polaris, without apparently appreciating that the fact that LP does so and Polaris still exists is the measure of the bankruptcy of the tactics used.

Labour Conferences and indeed the whole 'democratic' apparatus of the LP now exists therefore solely to save the consciences of the Labour Leftists who still persist in pretending that despite their membership of their party they oppose the racist bills on Commonwealth Immigrants, they oppose the wage freeze, and are nauseated by Brown's claim that those who voted Labour are better off than ever before when they know that only the Capitalists are. They oppose deals with Smith, and all the rest of Wilson's reactionary policies, but persist in talking of a Labour Party that is not the same as the Government; a sort of party transcendent, vitally different from that manifest here on earth.

M.H.

## NO CHANGE IN VOTING FARCE

BY AN OVERWHELMING majority the people have rejected Fianna Fail's proposal to substitute proportional representation with the 'first past the post' method of election. Fianna Fail failed to get 40% of the voters to support their proposal; the first time that a Fianna Fail vote has gone below that percentage since the early thirties. Nevertheless, the Taoiseach has said that the referendum will not decide the fate of the Government and 'that in 1965 General Election, Fianna Fail was given a mandate to govern until 1970'. So while the first step of Fianna Fail's comprehensive plan to clamp down on civil liberties and the labour movement has failed, it should not be forgotten that Fianna Fail has two bills in the offing which could severely threaten civil liberties, freedom of speech, freedom to demonstrate, trade union organisation and activity.

The labour movement spearheaded the campaign against the Criminal Justice Bill (which threatens civil liberties) and the trade union legislation proposed by Dr. Hillery, the Minister for Labour, who has made no secret of his plans to throttle trade union activity in the interests of the 'nation'. Liberty Hall (Irish Transport and General Workers' Union head office) carried a gigantic poster reading 'Defend PR' on the top floor of their skyscraper building which was replaced by 'Thanks' after the revolt became known. This poster should now be replaced by another reading 'Defend civil liberties' and 'Defend free trade unionism'. The trade union movement should organise for and be prepared to activate a General Strike against both of these proposed bills should Fianna Fail attempt to introduce either of them into the Dail.

### WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE?

There has been speculation as to whether Fianna Fail would now call a General Election. While Fine Gael is

pressing for this, the Labour Party has shown no great enthusiasm. Of course it is in the interests of the workers that Fianna Fail should 'get out' now before either of their bills are presented to the Dail. But this decision rests with Fianna Fail and as Lynch has said they were elected in 1965 for five years. It makes a nice parlour political chess game to discuss the 'ifs' and 'buts' of the reactions of Fianna Fail, Fine Gael and Labour to the referendum results.

But I do not think that we should waste time pressing for Fianna Fail to 'get out' just for the sake of a change of government. A change of government yes, but what is the alternative—Fine Gael? Coalition? National Government? One of these is the only alternative at present and in the case of the Labour Party I think it is even stretching possibility a bit. The resignation of Fianna Fail would be in the interests of the workers, but if the trade union movement mobilises its members against these two bills, then I do not think that Fianna Fail will be able to legislate them.

We already have some of Fianna Fail's 'dead' repressive legislation. The Electricity Supply Act 1966 which jails workers in the Electricity Supply Board for striking was activated earlier this year. Nevertheless you will remember what happened when strikers refused to pay their fines and were jailed. Remember how they were released in the middle of the night with taxis sent to collect them from Mountjoy and how their employer (the State ESB) paid their fines. That was the first defeat for TACA (the group of politically motivated young capitalists who have taken over Fianna Fail). The referendum results are their second defeat.

### ASTOUNDING DECLINE IN CONFIDENCE

As I said in a previous article this was the second time in less than ten years

that Fianna Fail had put the abolition of PR to a referendum. In 1959 the vote for the retention of PR was 51.8%—a majority of 33,000. Last week the vote was 60.48%—a majority of nearly 235,000. This represents an increase of over 200,000 votes.

These figures show an astounding decline in the confidence of Fianna Fail by many Fianna Fail supporters. The labour movement (by which I mean its members as opposed to its bureaucracy) will turn this campaign into a political party battle at their own peril. If anybody thinks that the Labour Party in power in Dail Eireann would respect the freedom of working class organisations any better, they should take a glance back to what happened to Senator Jack McQuillan. Recently he was railroaded out of the Labour Party because of his work as Organising Secretary of the breakaway Post Office Officials Association.

So, do not change masters, get rid of the master-slave system. The Bakery Workers' Union recently called for workers' control of the industry. The trade union movement as a whole should now raise this cry for every industry. Already the Commission established to enquire into labour relations in the ESB after the strike earlier this year has recommended a limited form of workers' control. The trade union movement should take up the cue.

### OPPOSE TOTALITARIAN MEASURES!

What is the alternative to the present Government—Fine Gael, Coalition or National Government? These are the possibilities remembering that, while the referendum figures have shown that many Fianna Fail supporters voted for the retention of PR, it would be dangerously premature to presume that the results point to the end of Fianna Fail. The figures do show that many tradi-

## Book Review

THE POLITICS OF HAROLD WILSON (Paul Foot, Penguin, 6s.) is a merciless attack on the man and the political system he stands for. The author is at pains to point out that Wilson's mistakes have had only a marginal influence on the course of events since he became Prime Minister: 'His personal faults, errors and idiosyncracies would only have been replaced by others, even more grotesque, from Brown, Callaghan, Jenkins, Crossland or Gunter. The casualty of the 1964-68 experiences is not the personality of Harold Wilson, nor even, necessarily, his personal reputation, but the pragmatic, nationalist politics which he represented and which won such widespread support in the Labour Party before 1966.'

The politics of Harold Wilson are the politics of the modern Labour Party: they are scarcely different from the politics of the modern Conservative and Liberal Parties (Enoch Powell and George Kiloh excepted). They consist in trying to improve the efficiency of the state capitalist machine; ensuring that industry is managed by competent professionals and not by unqualified amateurs; increasing exports and trying to achieve permanent economic growth.

The politics of Harold Wilson have given us: 'The encouragement of vast mergers and monopolies under the aegis of the Government-financed Industrial Reorganization Corporation; the complex planning machinery of the little Neddies and of the geographic planning councils; the incorporation of the trade-union leadership into the network of planning on the bogus pretext of "incomes policy"; the interference of the state with almost every major wage dispute through the Prices and Incomes Board...'

The politics of Harold Wilson involve the strengthening of the power of the state; the maintenance of economic and social divisions; the abandonment of even those social welfare objectives traditionally dear to Labour reformists. The politics of Harold Wilson have lost their remote connexion with traditional socialism.

In spite of its theoretical insights this book is not primarily a work of political theory: it is a brilliant piece of journalism which uses the words of Wilson and his contemporaries to prick the bubble of one of the most conceited, shallow and dishonest politicians of all time.

Of all the quotations in the book the ones that do the most damage are taken from Harold Wilson himself:

'One of the greatest of the many inspiring acts of Hugh Gaitskell's leadership was his fight against the Commonwealth Immigration Act.'

'The Labour Party is totally opposed to granting independence to Southern Rhodesia so long as the Government of the country remains under a white minority.'

'There is no question whatever of our being invited or having any opportunity for discussing at present the question of adherence to the Treaty of Rome or in other ways to join the European Economic Community.'

'We must not join with nor in any way encourage the anti-Communist crusade in Asia, whether it is under the leadership of the Americans or anyone else. We must remember that the road to peace in Asia is the way of Nehru, not the way of Dulles. There will be no peace if we talk of arming the Asians to fight one another.'

Paul Foot has done an excellent demolition job. As a professional journalist he ought to be a man after Mr. Wilson's own heart.

WYNFORD HICKS.

tional Fianna Fail supporters have lost confidence in the new leadership—TACA leadership.

Where do we go from here? I think that the only real alternatives to Fianna Fail are a Fine Gael-Labour coalition or a National Government. The first alternative would mean a return to 1954/57 Government and would only be better than a Fianna Fail Government inasmuch as it would not dare contemplate the sweeping totalitarian measures of Fianna Fail. A National Government would be a nightmare.

The way forward is first to successfully oppose Fianna Fail's totalitarian measures and secondly to campaign for industrial democracy at all levels of society. For militant workers to work for a Labour Government would be futile. The evidence is clear from the McQuillan case, we have seen it all before.

DAVID PICKETT.

# The AEF have Won?

THE CHANCES of the engineering strike are now receding rapidly. The decision by the Amalgamated Engineers and Foundry Workers (AEF) national committee to call off the strike due to start on Monday, October 21, means the pressure is off, the voting was again close—29-23. The motion demanding the complete rejection of the package deal and for a national stoppage until the full claim was met without productivity strings was defeated by a 22 majority.

It is fairly apparent that neither the national committee of the AEF nor the executive of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions are overjoyed with the outcome of the week-long negotiations. Engineering employers are reputed to be, next to the ship-owners one of the toughest set of employers in the country.

Reading the national press over the weekend it has been difficult

to decipher what exactly has been achieved by the week-long talks. The *Economist*, on the one hand, criticises the employers for their weakness in surrendering to inflationary claims. Also with the help of Barbara Castle for smashing the Government's wages policy. The *Sunday Times*, on the other hand, claims the 'Incomes policy is bent not broken', therefore the amount that will have to be paid by the employers does not in fact exceed the Government's norm.

Leaving the question of women's pay aside for the moment, the success of the talks from the engineers' point of view is dependent upon the type of 'strings'. One factor that does show up is the employers' keenness to get negotiations for payments away from the shop stewards. The reason they put forward is to prevent 'wage drift', but the fact of the matter is they want to cut the negotiating power of the shop stewards. The employers realise the power of the shop floor at a precise moment, whereas if the power was put at national, or even divisional level, the inevitable delay factor would operate in their favour.

It appears that Scanlon was able to prevent this, but was consistently and inevitably forced back to discussing productivity in some form or other. This was the 'strings'. Introduction of job evaluation and

work measurement. All part of the plan to enable the engineers to pay for their own wage increases and fringe benefits.

The thorny problem was left till last, 'women's pay'; by a strange coincidence it was discovered that the differential between women's and men's pay had widened. This surely is not the object of equal pay. The employers took the initiative, and claimed there was no more cash in the 'kitty'. Barbara claimed that only by a reduction in the men's rates could the women get more, thus putting the ball at Scanlon's feet, leaving him open to the charge of getting an increase off the backs of the women. Of course the industrial bird brains of the press will flog this line to death. It can be used as a dividing weapon, not only between men and women, but between the AEF and the T & GWU, the latter has the most female members in engineering.

Here is an excellent opportunity to sort the 'sheep from the goats' on the question of equal pay. Now is the chance for action to take over from pious past resolutions, particularly the one passed at the last conference of the TUC, 'aid to any union fighting for equal pay'. People will forgive me if I give a wry smile on this one, and I imagine the engineering employers are smiling as well.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

# Freedom For Workers' Control

OCTOBER 26 1968 Vol 29 No 33

## ANARCHISTS AND THE TRADE UNIONS

TODAY THE MOST powerful force for social transformation is the working class movement (the trade union movement) and on its intentions depends, to a large degree, the course that events will take and the objectives of any future revolution.

This was written 41 years ago by Malatesta and, in my opinion, still holds true today. It is also true that there are few signs that workers are looking for a revolutionary alternative to solve their present day problems. For all this, the working class movement remains a valid and useful sphere in which to carry out anarchist propaganda. In order to do this it is more advantageous to be a member of the appropriate trade union.

However, the trade unions are only founded on material interest and as such are only interested in getting the crumbs of the wealth that their members produce. Some even have a clause about 'workers control' in their constitutions, but not one of them is pursuing this point. At the same time I would agree with B.B. (FREEDOM, 28.9.68) that 'the TU leaders are (not) the only thing that holds the "militant" membership back'. Where that militancy is strong and determined enough, it ignores and overcomes the opposition of the trade union officials, but in a lot of cases this very opposition to any direct action is sufficient either to prevent the strike or to get the men back to work.

There are many trade union officials who will support unofficial disputes, using them as a lever to force the strikers' demands from the employers. They will support those in dispute until they are directed by the Executive to get the men back to work. The union can sanction strikes, but often nothing develops and the dispute remains in isolation unless other trade unionists in the area start giving their support, as happened with Roberts Arundel.

The trade unions are not organisations of revolution, neither are they struggling for an ideal. They are described by Comrade D.T. of Lanark, in a recent letter to the editors as 'part and parcel of the State machinery, and are the first enemy the workers have to confront in any militant action. The bosses' best friend is the union official and leader. In any trouble the boss sends for the union leader to discipline the workers and get them back to work'.

While these are generalisations, we know that this is the role of the trade union bureaucrats. They only work within the system and are not willing to challenge that system as such. This

is why it is ridiculous to expect any real challenge from the trade union leaders. Some may get higher wages and better conditions for their members than others, but that is as far as it goes.

D.T. is critical of B.B.'s article and disagrees with the suggestion that anarchists should join the appropriate trade union and gain the confidence and respect of union members, calling this the 'patter and tactics of the political con-men—'Put your faith in me and I will lead you to the Promised Land''. What B.B. means is respect as a human being and for our ideas, and from this follows confidence. It is my experience that although workers may not accept our ideas, at least they respect our position, realising that we have something to offer and that we are not just accepting a steward's job for what we can get out of it.

D.T. goes on to say 'Are we to play their game and become respectable con-men? The Labour Party is now highly respectable, but how far have they travelled from their original ideals?' What were these original ideals? Let's face it, from our point of view, they were not very revolutionary. The Labour Party has always been a coalition of views, ranging from those who wanted to overthrow the capitalist system to those who wanted a few reforms. Like many trade unions, it might have some high sounding ideals incorporated into its constitution, but these are mere words.

It is also a mistake to connect those who join the Labour Party to change its policies, by boring from within, with those anarchists who join trade unions. We are not boring from within, trying to change the leadership or taking them over. Anarchists should not and are not seeking power in the unions. This would be contrary to our ideals. But by being in these essentially reformist organisations, we can influence the members and help to defeat moves that we think are reactionary to the interests of workers. After all, the methods used by trade unions to gain immediate needs are part of the eventual struggle to expropriate capital and abolish the State.

If workers really wanted to do this, they would do it whether they were trade unionists or not. We cannot make the revolution. Only the mass of people can do this and, as a vital section of the population are trade unionists, it is therefore important that our propaganda should reach them. To ignore the trade unions is to miss an opportunity.

P.T.

## Contact Column

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

**Vietnam Vigil in Liverpool.** October 26 and 27. Outside Cunard Building on Pier Head.

**The Origins of the Anarchist Movement in China:** The Origins of the Revolutionary Movement in Spain; The Origins of the Movement for Workers' Councils in Germany; The Truth About the Bonnot Gang. All ready, 2/6d. each from Coptic Press, 7 Coptic Street, London, W.C.1 (by post; shop closed).

**Anarchist Black Cross,** 7 Coptic Street, London, W.C.1. Bulletin No. 1 sold out; Bulletin No. 2 now ready.

**The Crypt,** 242 Lancaster Road, W.11. October 30: The People Band. Admission 2/6. November 7: Theatre by the North End Troupe: 'Tests'. 2/6. 8 p.m. prompt.

**I want to contact** innocent people, convicted and detained. It is essential to have the true facts. I have been a victim myself. Box No. 23.

**Open House** at the LSE on October 26 and 27! LSE Anarchist Group.

**Eve of Demonstration** Folk Social at The Roebuck, Tottenham Court Road, Saturday, October 26, 8 p.m. Admission 3/-.

**Free the Schools!** We are proposing to start an anti-authoritarian schools campaign in S.E. London area. Provisionally to start November 1. Please contact A. R. Sadiev, 90 Ermine Road, S.E.13 (or Mike Rasley, Duncan 1572, after 5 p.m.).

**Selby Anarchist Group** would like to contact Yorks Anarchists with view to discussion/co-operation. Write D. Mackay, Residential Site, Drax Power Station, Drax, Selby.

**Ken McGowan—Split 101,** collect bags Jane 93—John.

**Harlow Anarchist Fed.** need speakers for indoor public meetings. Any offers to: Geoff Hardy, 6 Redricks Lane, Harlow. Please state which evening you would prefer.

**Up tight with the draft!** Call Support, 278 4994, Monday-Friday, 6.30 to 10.30 p.m. 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

**Anarchist publishers** need working manager(ess) to take full charge of office, circulation and distribution. Modest salary and some voluntary help offered. Box 22.

**Elliot Automation.** Non-violent protest against Vietnam complicity, November 4. Information, 3 Caledonian Road, N.1.

**Birmingham Discussion Meetings.** Tuesdays at 7.30 p.m. Venue usually at The Crown, Corporation Street. Further information from Peter Neville, c/o Peace Action Centre, Factory Road, Birmingham, 19. (S.A.E.)

If you wish to make contact let us know.

## THE ORANGE DWARF

### Ulster's Answer to Tariq Ali

TO ANY OUTSIDER 'the 12th' is a quaint local pageant. To the historian it is a matter of incredulous amusement. To the sane Ulsterman it is a most distressing manifestation of the power of the church and the unionist political hacks to distort the truth, dupe the Protestant people of N. Ireland and maintain their longstanding tactics of divide and misrule. But to the loyal working class member of the loyal orange lodge it is his annual chance to reaffirm his undying hostility to 'the papishes and fenians' whom he sincerely believes are plotting to drive him into the sea by uniting with Eire.

The traditional Ulsterman is, quite rightly, noted for his sexual puritanism. He is noted for his almost xenophobic distrust of foreigners. He has never been noted for his sympathy for the physically afflicted.

Yet every twelfth of July thousands of staunch red-faced bowler-hatted Ulstermen march through NI to commemorate the victory of a homosexual Dutch dwarf over a small army of Catholic royalists 278 years ago. The banners, the sashes, the songs, all proclaim a glorious victory for Protestantism. The fact that the Pope blessed some of the banners of 'good king Billy' and that Te Deums and masses were ordered in many European capitals at the news of Catholic James' defeat by the Dutch hero is ignored by the loyal orange order. The fact that

William hated England and the English language and preferred to stay with his various homosexual paramours is never mentioned. How can it be? Did not the 'great victory at the River Boyne' give us our freedom, religion and laws' as the songs say? Of course it didn't.

But doesn't it mean that a country that has 7% unemployment (it's generally nearer 11% and in some towns is as high as 20%) has no viable working class movement? Doesn't it mean that the underpaid and the unemployed will not band together because some are 'teagues' and some are 'prods'. And doesn't it mean that the Conservative and Unionist Party, aided by the grand old orange lodges, have had a stranglehold over the country for nearly fifty years, while the only real opposition has been the Catholic Conservative Party (or Nationalists as they prefer to call themselves). The Labour Party is puny and totally reactionary, falling over its arse to outdo the Unionists in its protestations of loyalty to the Queen. Perhaps the founding of a small anarchist group in Belfast may ultimately be able to combat this political cesspool, but regrettably they won't stop thousands from marching to 'the field' next July and pledging themselves to the maintenance of the status quo, the continuance of discrimination and the denial of civil liberties. Only a miracle could do that.

REV. AUGUSTUS BIRKS.

## Allegory of Industrialism

SMALLCREEP'S DAY by Peter C. Brown. Panther, 5/-.

THIS PENETRATING industrial novel was first published by Gollancz three years ago and its re-issue this year by Panther gives the Anarchist movement a chance to own a masterly study of a factory. Peter Brown was an engineering apprentice and when he describes the machine shops, foundries and assembly lines through which his unhero Pinquean Smallcreep stumbles, gropes and flees on his journey of discovery, he knows the score.

Smallcreep's odyssey from his 'own

corner of bearable noise' through the giant screaming machine tools, each with its own clamour, his trip in a punt across the sea of shit on which the whole factory sits, his encounters with the militant shop stewards and the philosophical moulders, the Negotiator who can talk himself off the ground and the men into banning strike action in return for tuppence farthing an hour and his marvellous encounter with the lonely director isolated above the whole writhing heap of misery, and the visit of the blind and deaf senile HM Inspector of Factories, all these are brilliantly described through the eye of a Bruegel or a Bergman in a

boiler suit.

Brown offers no solutions to the mess, misery and indifference he describes, none of his startling and weird characters wish to change the system or even help to control it. His horrific vision of dumb sheepish terrified men and women caught up in a hell no one understands or benefits from has nothing to do with participation or job satisfaction, profit sharing schemes, PBR or even '4 for monotony'. He is describing in an un-

forgettable way the waste and indignity of workers who don't know what they are making (poor old Smallcreep never does find out) and whose watchword is 'Roll on when we retire'. Whether or not you work in a machine shop or on an assembly line, get hold of this book. It's well written, easy to read and stimulating. Of course the factory where I work isn't a bit like that, for one thing.

SOUTH WESTERN WORKER.

## 'Freedom' Sellers for Oct. 27?