

anarchist fortnightly
Freedom

Vol. 55 No. 7

2 APRIL 1994

FIFTY PENCE

"There is enough in the world to satisfy everyone's needs but not everyone's greed."
Gandhi

THE CAPITALIST DISEASE THAT WON'T GO AWAY MASS UNEMPLOYMENT IS HERE TO STAY

The G7 meeting in Detroit last month of the top politicians of the major industrial countries was, as all such 'summit' gatherings invariably are, a huge success ... for the smiling, hand-shaking, champagne-guzzling leaders and their retinues of advisers and other hangers-on.

For the army of the unemployed and the underpaid part-timers-without-rights, the homeless and the sick ('tuberculosis the new scourge' among the poor and the cardboard box residents) there are promises but no solutions. Plenty of promises: the hangers-on will, between now and the

next champagne party in Naples, be studying how to reduce the estimated 30 million unemployed in the G7 countries at present.

Without their expertise, this writer nevertheless has no hesitation in forecasting that by the time Naples is due, our political mafia will have found another excuse to explain why the number of unemployed and the poverty of the bottom 20% has got worse while the profits of the banks are soaring, the speculators and the City yuppies don't know what to do with their bonuses, and privatised public services et alia pension off half

of their top boys with golden handshakes.

Since the politicians go on repeating that they can see light at the end of the capitalist-unemployment tunnel, we surely need not apologise for also repeating our view that short of draconian measures (which would certainly finish off Baroness Thatcher, as Chile-con-carne failed to do recently) unemployment in the Western world will inevitably rise with all its social and other consequences.

Even the bosses are getting worried. Howard Davies, director general of the Confederation of British Industry (CBI), in a lecture last month to the Manchester Business School:

"... called on the government and employers to face up to the consequences of deep-seated economic changes that had transformed Britain into a more unequal and poverty stricken society" (*The Guardian*, 11th March).

As well as distancing himself from the "laissez faire approach followed in the 1980s" he pointed out that:

"the widening gulf between rich and poor had not been matched by a universal increase in living standards. Over the past ten years 'the poorest 10% and some others have become absolutely poorer'. The 1.3 million increase in jobs during the 1980s was entirely accounted for by part-timers, mostly women.

Mr Davies canvassed the idea of a negative income tax, which would top up the pay of those on low wages and thereby drag them out of the poverty trap."

To his perhaps shocked audience he put the rhetorical question: "Or is that too much like socialism?" And then to reassure them he defended management on their pay increases saying there was "little evidence that overall there was one law for the rich and one for the poor". Which in this writer's opinion is a *non sequitur*. On that subject, though, the law may apply equally to rich and poor, as *Freedom's* 'legal adviser' pointed out
(continued on page 2)

THE LATEST SCIENTIFIC ASSAULT CHIPS-ON-THE-BRAIN GALORE!

In the last issue of *Freedom* we gave our front page to 'The Laser Gun' and called for scientists and technologists engaged in such anti-social activity to be publicly exposed. Now as well as having Mothers' and Fathers' Days we have also had a Science Week. As if we haven't suffered enough from the scientists' brainstorm!

The latest is the medical implant of a computer chip in the brain. Colin Humphreys is his name and he is Professor of Materials Science (whatever that may be) at Cambridge University. He is described in *The Independent* as a 'leading scientist' and quoted as saying that it was realistic to envisage a day when surgeons would be able to attach tiny memory circuits etched onto microscopic silicon chips to the living circuits of the brain. Addressing a medical conference at Hammersmith Hospital he maintained that:

"If we can understand the interface - the boundary between silicon chips and brain cells - then there is a prospect of implanting silicon chips into the human brain."

Like the laser research which can be used to cure people with cataracts as

well as used in a gun to burn out the eyes of 'enemy' troops (or why not demonstrators?), the Professor's brainstorm could, in his words, "be a possible partial treatment for Alzheimer's disease, the degenerative brain disorder in the old. Or it may be a way in the future for man to extend his intelligence". The latter gives even the Professor food for thought when he acknowledged such work would raise important ethical problems "such as the prospect of people being able to control the minds of others".

Presumably he means the *wrong* people. After all, we already have more than enough people and institutions bombarding us daily with what we should do and think without introducing chips-on-the-brain.

Before the scientists are let loose with their implants what about a moratorium. All the experts, scientists, economists, politicians, church and other do-gooders and the mass media just *shut up* for one year and allow us to rehabilitate the human brain to help us to deal with our daily lives and to enjoy life! It's about time we were left in peace by
PROGRESS!

THE CAPITALIST DISEASE THAT WON'T GO AWAY MASS UNEMPLOYMENT TO STAY

(continued from page 1)

when four editors were arrested during World War Two: "You will get as much law as you can afford". If anything, things have got worse. What the CBI chief didn't mention was how the rich and influential can try to bypass the law. It's not just in those Mediterranean countries where to have the 'right connections' is sometimes more valuable than having the right lawyers. As we write, it would appear that the Tories' chairman Norman Fowler put in a good word for a firm of architects who were about to be made bankrupt by Customs and Excise for non-payment of £40,000 in VAT. As he pointed out, as an MP he does this kind of thing for many of his constituents, and this is very noble of him. The actual facts are that the architect in question is not one of his constituents! He is however living with Mr Fowler's long-standing Commons Secretary! Since publicity has been given to Mr Fowler's appeal for his non-constituent, it now transpires that this was the second communication. The first, according to *The Guardian* (22nd March), was written:

"... in 1992 on official House of Commons notepaper about mounting VAT debts facing London-based architects Ketley Gould Associates. Sources close to the case claimed officials 'softened their approach' after receiving the letter. This was denied by Customs and Excise."

Customs and Excise can go on denying until they are Tory-blue in the face but why have they still not taken action?

Obviously mealy-mouthed Fowler did the right thing. He used his 'influence' to oblige his secretary, who had served him loyally, etc., for sixteen years. The only reason for pin-pointing the Fowler affaire (after all, there must be thousands of similar cases of using one's influence, or in business it's blackmail pure and simple) is because at the same time we read in the newspapers in connection with our over-populated prisons that almost 600 people were last year given prison sentences for not having paid fines for non-payment of television licences! Only a little bit of mental arithmetic told us that 600 people went to jail over some £48,000 they owed *between them* while *one man*, the boyfriend (as described by the media) of the secretary of the Tory Party's top man, owes £40,000 in VAT which he has collected from his customers - apologies, his clients - and has used it for other purposes. On what grounds does the Chairman of the Tory Party excuse this blatant capitalist fraud? How can the Chairman of the CBI declare that there is not a 'law for the rich and one for the poor'?

The negative income tax proposed by the CBI director-general is obviously not a solution for unemployment. It is simply an attempt to prevent the poor from resorting to desperate actions, but without making any changes in the balance of power: the rich remain rich, the

poor grateful for the extra crumbs from the rich man's table. But surely somebody has to provide the 'negative income tax'? Within the capitalist system it can only be the rich. They can't squeeze the poor any more without them starving or blowing everything up!

Will Hutton, Economic Editor of *The Guardian* who is more than ever uncomfortable with the capitalist system, writes:

"Mr Davies knows the answers. The rise in poverty to which the government has been indifferent is absolutely offensive. The poor need to be empowered to get back to work - and as he said the responsibility falls to the state."

And, given the powerful forces promoting income inequality, the correct response is now to raise the top rates of tax to fund the relief of poverty - the redistribution of income against which Mr Davies' predecessors so frequently raged. The director-general of the CBI cannot be expected to call for this outright - but his questioning last night was the next best thing. How the intellectual pendulum is swinging!

In our opinion, no Western government can control the economy, short of nationalising the whole financial system. The money markets, the banks, the pension funds are all a law unto themselves, as are also the multinationals and transnationals. The present government is obviously hand-in-glove with them, they are part of that mafia. But we have no illusions that a Labour government would or could produce fundamental changes to the grossly unequal distribution of wealth. The ramifications - worldwide - of capitalist interests are such that before any legislation could be put into effect the 'enemy' would have long before transferred all the assets elsewhere. (Already it's happening in South Africa, and you can bet your last Hong Kong dollar that there won't be much left there when the 1997 transfer takes place. So much for Chris Patten introducing 'democracy' in the last years of 150 years of British colonial domination!)

Talking of which, a relevant news item which will surely influence the whole approach to unemployment in the Western world, appeared in *The Sunday Express* (20th March) and we quote:

"China's economic muscle is now developing each year by the equivalent of the entire Italian economy."

At this rate of progress, the 'Sleeping Giant' will overtake America early next century to become the world's leading economic power. Astronomical sums will be spent on infrastructure to keep this extraordinary industrial revolution on track.

Over the next decade, for example, China plans to install new capacity of at least 17,000 megawatts annually. That's fourteen times the output of Britain's new Sizewell B nuclear power station.

Add to that new roads, railways, telecommunications, water and sewage and the bill over the next ten years will be at least £200 billion. China's export success is evident everywhere. A few years ago it was mostly shoes, clothing and toys. Today it's telephones, computers and electronics as well.

Attracted by the vast market and seemingly endless pool of cheap labour, foreign investors have poured in, bringing skills and know-how. In the past ten years, ninety million Chinese have left to work in the new coastal factories. It is the biggest migration of all time - and it's accelerating.

With all this flood of low-wage workers released on to the labour markets, it's little wonder that at the recent 'Jobs Summit' in Detroit, the leaders of the developed world had few answers about how to maintain the jobs and far higher wages of their unskilled workers."

And one last statistic and forecast from a report published by the Low Pay Network last week. All the rosy official employment figures showing more people in work give only half of the picture. Employment figures show a fall of 113,000 in full-time jobs between March and September last year, but a rise of 210,000 part-time jobs.

"In a case study of 91 supermarket vacancies in the Stirling constituency of the Employment Minister, Michael Forsyth, it was found that all jobs were part-time, with an average working week of 11.4 hours and average wage of £39."

Only four jobs paid above £56, the threshold below which neither worker nor employer pays National Insurance and the employee does not pay tax. Many workers on such low incomes would be eligible for means-tested benefits."

The report forecasts that on the present

figures, by 2003 "three out of every ten men and 45% of all employees would be part-time".

We believe that today the basic necessities of life can be produced for all the inhabitants of this planet, without damaging the environment and allowing more and more leisure for everybody.

Under capitalism, as always, the idle rich get richer, millions starve at the same time as millions of productive acres are set aside - by order - and farmers' bank accounts reap this dishonest harvest. Under capitalism production has no relation to need: only to profit. Hence a multi-billion pound advertising industry to create a demand for goods and services we can easily do without while the army of homeless increases and we are short of hospital beds for the sick ... and so on and so on.

The shorter working week we advocate has little in common with the part-time racket which the government, and needless to say the employers, are enthusiastic about since it lets them out of paying National Insurance, paid holidays and other entitlements 'enjoyed' by the full-time wage slaves. However, this writer also believes in the leisure society because it not only gives one the time to brew one's own beer, bake one's own bread, boycott the take-away tasteless emporiums and, most important of all, the time to look after one's own children. The latter we are sure will raise the temperature of some readers and we promise to return to the subject while at the same time welcoming contributions!

Who are the real wealth producers?

After three days haggling by the farmers' representative the Agricultural Wages Board decided that farmworkers should get a 4.9% rise in their wages - that is another £6 a week for full-time workers, bringing their princely gross wage packet to £145.

Interviewed by the BBC early morning farming programme, the NFU (National Union of Farmworkers) spokesman said that it would cost the farmers £54 million a year which they could not afford in spite of the fact that farming incomes, thanks to all the subsidies, went up 23% in 1992 and no less than 60% in 1993! The farmworkers' spokesman bemoaned the fact that too few farmworkers belonged to the union and therefore they could not speak with one voice. He also pointed out that farmworkers' pay was £80 a week below that of workers in industry.

Meanwhile in secluded Oxfordshire, Major Bill Lloyd and his wife Liselotte were happily earning (so *The Independent* caption described it) £19,000 a year for growing nothing on their 215 acres of "high quality arable land". Their good luck started six years ago when they were among the first 1,600 British farmers to take the EEC's set-aside policy as far as it would go, moving

all their cropland out of production. They are now applying for another five years of being paid the equivalent of £365 a week to do nothing!

Unlike the average farmworker for whom his £145 is what he is expected to live on, the Major has got other sources of income to supplement his wife's fondness for her horses, and a lot more acres where "organically reared" cows happily ruminant.

The Major, it should be said, does occasionally ruminant on our wicked world: "one feels very slightly like a welfare scrounger ... I don't think one can ever feel happy doing nothing with the land. Something's wrong when there are so many people starving in the world and we're being paid not to grow food."

Which hasn't prevented the Major from applying for another five years guilt-feeling and he is hoping it will be more than £19,000 a year. Inflation and all that, you know, what!

Major Lloyd is, by the Thatcher code, a wealth producer. The humble farmworker, the ne'er do well scroungers, some of them even moonlight and don't tell the tax inspector!

When will we appreciate who are the real wealth producers?



— PERU —

Fujimori's Policies, the Anarchist Movement and the Shining Path

Peru is a country which is currently going through a socially and politically explosive period. After the coup led by Alberto Fujimori on 5th April 1992, in recent months the repression of the Peruvian people has grown; and this after the installation of a dictatorship which suppressed the most minimal rights which guaranteed the constitutional order, which failed to be re-enacted during another attempted coup (a failure this time) led by the military on 13th November '92.

Today, after the major electoral farce of 22nd October '93 which called itself 'The Democratic Constituent Congress', Fujimori's dictatorship can count upon a servile assembly, with an absolute majority to approve the laws which pave the way to murderous and anti-popular economic measures which favour foreign investment, that is to say the selling off of the country to the IMF and the World Bank controlled by the US.

Against this offensive of capital and Yankee imperialism, opposition and discontent is growing every day; assassinations, strikes and an internal war situation, which is a daily reality in the sierra

and the Peruvian forest, constant repression and suppression of human rights puts the country in a pre-revolutionary situation.

In addition to this situation of extreme militancy, the popular organisations are ready to fight back against the bourgeois offensive.

The most powerful opposition is the Shining Path (self-proclaimed 'Peruvian Communist Party') of a marxist leninist tendency, led by Abimael Guzman, today in police custody.

The war initiated by the Peruvian Communist Party twelve years ago is now reaching the towns.

The anarchist movement is not big but it is active. Just in Lima there are three papers, *Bandera Negra*, *La Protesta* and *Collectivizacion*. There are also six collectives federated to the Coordination of Anarchist Groups: this being a federal project which seeks to reach out to a national level, since there are other groupings in other Peruvian towns. Peruvian anarchists' work is aimed at creating active cells in the different sectors of the population, which are already strong enough in organisational and ideological terms to confront the

repression from wherever it may come. The current discontent and generalised misery gives us the unique opportunity to organise and consolidate an alternative base and a radical, revolutionary opposition to both capital and the state. In this context, we anarchists have assumed the difficult task of putting together a revolutionary project in the middle of a difficult situation. We not only have to confront fascist state repression which seeks to block any opposition, but also deal with the authoritarian and sectarian dogmatism of the Shining Path, whose activities do not reflect the aspirations of the general people. After twelve years of political violence, the Shining Path has

failed to mobilise the people around a revolutionary project. It does not attack the bourgeoisie directly and its authoritarian activities lead it at the extreme to kill popular leaders and to threaten any popular organisation which does not obey its line, and in this way it imitates the left-wing oppositional groupings. All opposition which it does not control is labelled 'revisionist' and consequently enemy. It is in this way that we realise the difficult and dangerous situation in which Peruvian anarchists are trying to develop. That is why we are calling for international solidarity for our struggle. We need financial support and information material.

Akefalos no. 4

Report from Chile

The first thing you notice upon entering Santiago, other than the ever-present pollution, is the amount of building construction going on. There are also far fewer destitute people on the street, even fewer than in '91 and especially '88. No mass media propaganda, this place is booming. Adding to the growth are the thousands of exiles who have returned home with their savings who are now investing in new homes and businesses. Development isn't restricted to just the capital either, there is a wave of construction throughout the country, especially in the north, fuelled in part no doubt by laundered cocaine money from Peru. People will even point out a building complex they claim was built from the Mao-fascist drug gang, the Sendero Luminoso.

While poverty has declined from the 50% rate of the late Pinochet years to about a third of the population (still shocking), a great income disparity remains. A nurse in a private hospital or a teacher in a private school might earn five times the amount of his/her colleagues in public institutions. Nurses are imported from Bolivia and Peru to work in government hospitals since qualified Chileans prefer to work for private concerns. The old

state-based section of the 'middle class' remains destitute while a growing new 'middle class' of white-collar workers and semi-professionals get the high wages. Under Allende there were 600,000 government employees, at present the state employs 175,000 people – a serious reduction of the state's influence, but at what social cost?

The recent general election indicates some of the changes this country has undergone. Ideology and the hate it engenders was almost totally lacking and the whole process had a North American feel. All the major parties agreed on the same basic positions; the need for a strong economy, the necessity of helping pensioners, aiding the poor and doing something to improve education. This litany was even chanted by the pro-Pinochet party, which, in order to gather votes, has inculcated an image of social consciousness, if you can believe that! The Stalinists, to their dismay alone, have continued their decline, getting less than 5% of the vote. One surprise was the strength of the ecological party which got about 5% support, more or less similar to the situation in Europe. Let's hope the Green Movement will have a good future in Chile.

(continued on page 4)

Inside India

What is the difference between freedom and oppression? In today's make-believe culture illusion comes wearing the attire of reality and reality itself is often the very opposite of what appears to be real. Nowhere is the reality of freedom as unreal as in capitalism. In capitalist democracy an individual is free to buy anything required as long as he or she has the requisite purchasing power. If you know this, you know how free the person on any Indian street really is.

What is true about individuals in a capitalist democracy is no less true about nations in today's capitalist global order. On paper, India and the United States are equal members of the United Nations. How real this equality is known to any discerning newspaper reader. Falsehood parading as truth and the illusion's illicit impersonation of reality are one of the definitional traits of the so-called modern era. This can be seen on each of modernity's many masks – freedom of expression, personal autonomy and of course human rights.

In the world today the worst violators of human rights are posing themselves as the defenders and enforcers of human rights across the globe, making a mockery of the very term itself. The industrialised West in general and the United States in particular have gobbled up the world's resources, devastated the world's environment, caused the worst wars in the history of the human race and are still sitting on huge piles of weapons of mass destruction. And yet these same nations are holding much of the developing world to ransom by brandishing the gun of human rights. What they are saying in effect is: 'open your markets or else we'll use this weapon against you'.

The United States has wielded this weapon to browbeat China, Russia, Myanmar, Iran, Iraq, North Korea and Malaysia. Currently it is following up success in these countries with a concerted effort in India and Indonesia.

How blatantly and shamelessly the ruling elite of the United States has been using human rights as a crowbar to prise open domestic markets of countries near and far forms the sordid stuff of much of contemporary global diplomacy. It is also the stuff of the United States' media manipulation.

A few weeks ago *Newsweek* carried a cover story on the market reforms in Indochina. Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos have

effectively been forced to liberalise their economies in a similar way to India. *Newsweek* heralded the development: "The new Indochina – Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia join the modern world". Consider the choice of the word 'modern'. What *Newsweek*, one of the most unabashed media mouthpieces of the 'United States first' philosophy, meant was that Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia were hitherto living in a pre-modern, primitive world and now thanks to Western imports and investments they have gained entry into the club of modern nations.

In the entire article there is not a word of regret or condemnation of the war against Indochina waged by the leader of the 'modern world' – a war in which over half a million Indochinese lost their lives. There is only glee that the sustained Western pressure on the three South East Asian countries to improve their human rights record has finally paid dividends in the form of Indochina opening its markets for Western goods, gadgets and investments. The equation is simple: southern nations whose economies are in trouble are forced to take their begging bowls to the West whose response in turn is to turn the human rights screw to engineer the most lucrative terms of trade for their inflated economies.

India has of course been opened up by the West over the last three years. During that time the human rights issue was not on the agenda. Now it is. Not a week goes by without one of the G7 countries blasting on the Kashmir issue. The cries of injustice have a hollow ring to them and often portray an enormous ignorance of the complexity of the situation in Kashmir. The Indian government has a case to answer over Kashmir, but not to the G7 countries. We need to remember that every time the United States in particular makes a loud noise about Kashmir and human rights violations, rest assured that there will be some company angling for a big commercial deal. In this context it is no coincidence that Enron, a United States power generation giant, recently bagged a 9,000 rupees crore project at Dabhol in Maharashtra. The hidden message is: 'give us the deals and we'll stay quiet on Kashmir'. It is a policy that seems to work very effectively, for the United States especially.

John Shotton

— SPAIN —

The authorities declare war on the House of Peace – Zaragoza

This squat, which has been occupied since 12th March 1987, has always been marked by its intense militant activity. Various collectives run the House of Peace organising conferences, exhibitions, various workshops... But His Worship Medrano decided to have them evicted on 27th May 1993.

On 23rd December at 9am, the forces of order began to empty the squat. At about 10am, about 100 squatters, who were on the premises, organised passive resistance. The throwing of a bottle set the police off, charging violently and hospitalising six. Armed policemen chased demonstrators. At 8pm 400 people were in front of the House of Peace whilst the police were cordoning off the area. Some stones were thrown, and the police began charging again and firing rubber bullets. Some containers were set alight and some police vehicles destroyed. One young demonstrator was held and beaten up after these incidents. At about 10pm, a meeting of the occupiers took place in the building, whilst young demonstrators continued to confront the police. Barricades and fires continued until midnight...

The following day five people lodged complaints against the police violence they had suffered from. That same evening at about 8.30pm the mobilisation to save the now empty squat grew with about 500 turning out to protest. A little later, during the demonstration which had been organised, there were confrontations with fascists... One isolated youth was badly beaten up by skinheads; the police didn't intervene. Various incidents took place during the night (Molotov cocktails, smashed shop windows).

On Monday 26th December the collectives of the House of Peace gave a press conference rejecting involvement in the incidents the previous evening and holding the Civil Governor responsible. They called for another demonstration on 7th January. The struggle continues.

To give support to the evicted collectives you can

write to El Acrator, Apdo de Correos 3141, 50080 Zaragoza (Spain).

Source: *El Acrator* no. 35, January 1994

— ITALY —

Opposing squat legislation

Currently attempts are being made to legalise and recuperate squats (of which there are over 100). These moves are being led by the state and parties on the left (Greens, PDS and Rifondazione Comunista). By legislation, the state and these parties are trying to recuperate and control a movement and areas of autonomy which are currently beyond their control. To stifle all forms of revolt, autonomy and self-management, such is their aim.

The left currently devoid of content and trying to regain its virginity finds itself the main supporter of the state in this situation. Now, self-management is the possibility of establishing for yourself the rules of your own existence according to the principle of individual responsibility and consensus decision-making.

The practice of self-management in the squats and other structures is based on a desire to extend the greatest amount of self-management vis-a-vis the state and other authoritarian structures. For self-management cannot but be alien to any form of state interference (grants, administrative control...). We affirm the wider expression of freedom of expression, creativity, decision-making and experimentation in each living space constituted by a squat. We are opposed to all moves towards legislation.

For more information: El Paso, 47 via Po, Buole, 10127 Torino, Italy

How to get away with murder

Currently there is a great furore over the discovery of many bodies in the home of a serial killer. The police are sparing no time or expense while they look for evidence of the crime, and the media gives grisly reports of their activities. Murderers are always pursued, condemned and punished. One would assume that governments, and the public, believe that killing is wrong. But they do not.

Governments do not believe that it is wrong to kill. On the contrary, not only do they believe that it is right to do so but they also know that they could not exist were not people prepared to do so. And while most of the public may be appalled when they hear of murders, they are generally ready to kill foreigners, and even their own countrymen, when they are ordered to do so by their government.

Governments are able to rule us and enforce their appalling double standards on us by controlling the way we think, and one way they do this is by manipulating the meaning of words. Governments not only change the accepted meaning of words, they also use different words to describe the same thing. This imprecision is tolerated only in matters that concern the state. For example, when we communicate with one another by putting words on paper there is only one verb to describe what we are doing. We say that we write. We do not use one word to describe our action if we are happy while we make it and another word to describe our action if we are

sad. Nor do we use one word if we are writing for ourselves and another word if we are writing for a group. When it comes to killing human beings, however, governments have many words to describe the behaviour. In that way they can control the judgement that the public makes about the killing.

If I put a knife in a man's heart during a war, my government says that I have killed him and that my action was lawful. But if I put a knife in a man's heart so that I can steal his money, my government says that I have murdered him and that my action was unlawful. It makes no difference to the man concerned. Either way, he is dead. The action that produced his death is the same in either case, so it ought to be described by one word only.

If an action is approved by a government, they say it is lawful; if it is not, they say it is unlawful, so the dictionary definition of murder is 'unlawful killing'. Lawful killing is okay; unlawful killing is not. Further, what is lawful for one government is often unlawful for another. That is why the IRA killings are, according to the British government, unlawful. That is why the British government describes IRA bombings as murders. In

reality, they are acts of war, and if they are murders then so were the deaths caused by the British airmen in World War Two.

Governments never like to admit that they are in the business of killing people. Their advertisements for recruits always say that in the army there are opportunities to have sports, learn a trade and see the world. They never say join the army and have the chance to kill people.

Murderers and serial killers are being stupid when they act without governmental approval. If they think they would like to kill people and would get pleasure from doing so, they should never do it in their own time. They should do it while they work for a government. Then they will not only be paid to commit murder, they will also have the approbation of other people while they do it. They need not work for their own government: any government will do. If their own government is not at war, then they can easily find some government that is, and so they can be mercenaries. It is always possible to kill legally. It is easy to get away with murder.

Derrick

Labour, too late, discovers The Fuel VAT Racket

In the 8th February issue of *Freedom* we drew attention to the leaflet accompanying our bill from London Electricity telling consumers that they could get round paying VAT in April if they made advance payments. And we pointed out that it was not the poor, who were having difficulty paying their current bills let alone having spare cash to pay in advance.

Only now, within days of the VAT on fuel coming into operation, has the Labour Party discovered the racket! Gordon Brown, their Shadow Chancellor, claimed (21st March) that there was a stampede to settle bills up to two years in advance. According to *The Guardian* report (22nd March) the "windfall to the gas and electricity companies" could be as much as £1,000 million. As many as "300,000 consumers had taken advantage ... with one unnamed Norwich customer paying £7,500 in advance to avoid VAT".

300,000 are a fraction of the total consumers and confirms *Freedom's* conclusion that once more a tax loophole was being provided by the government for those who could:

"... make a profit just by transferring a few thousand pounds from their deposit accounts where at the moment they may be getting 3% net, and pass it on to private enterprise electricity and get out of paying 8% this year and 17½% next year on their electricity bills."

But if the Labour lot mean business why wait until it's too late to make a stink on yet another Tory racket!

escape the Horthy dictatorship and settled in Britain. During the Second World War he worked for military intelligence, and in 1944 he was given the job of de-Nazifying young German prisoners of war. His method of patient argument succeeded in converting several of them not only from Nazism but also to his own idiosyncratic form of philosophical libertarianism. He earned his living as a minor civil servant, and when he retired he founded the Cambridge School of English. During the 1940s he gathered some of his colleagues and disciples in the Bridge Circle, a private discussion group with an internal magazine, which for a time during the 1950s and 1960s played a small but significant part in the radicalisation of a new generation. Reynolds would make contact with young people, draw them into correspondence or conversation, and gently try to clear their minds of cant. As a result the Bridge Circle involved more participants, the *London Letter* was circulated to more readers, and Reynolds himself occasionally spoke at public meetings (using the name Alfred Rajk). Some of his associates later became well known (Colin Wilson often wrote about him), and a few became anarchists. He himself never changed, reading very widely, thinking very deeply, and writing a series of essays and books. The most accessible of the latter was *Pilate's Question*, published in 1964 and in a revised and enlarged form in 1983. His models were such paradoxical thinkers as Heraclitus and Lao-tse, Jesus and Nietzsche, and he himself exerted a quiet influence on several people who were repelled by all the orthodoxies of our age.

At the very end of his life he unexpectedly became famous in his native country, following the rediscovery of the *First and Last Book of Poetry*, which he had published in 1932. He was hailed as the greatest living Hungarian poet, and invited back in the last weeks of his life to attend readings of his writings and make a television programme about his life.

NW

Report from Chile

(continued from page 3)

The far left simply cannot admit that life has improved for many people during the past five years and since the economy is growing at an unprecedented rate (10%) Chile may well be propelled into developing status in a decade or so. They cannot admit these things because nationalism, statism and protectionism are the essential ingredients of their ideology. There is also the arrogance of the left, development can supposedly only occur when they are in charge. Yet Chile had taken a path totally contrary to their dogmas. For this reason anarchists and libertarian socialists should be very careful about swallowing ML and 'Third Worldist' propaganda. We must learn to evaluate these questions on our own and develop independent analyses rather than putting an anarchist gloss on leftist hand-me-downs as is so often the case.

My quarrel with Chile's Friedmanite Revolution is the same quarrel I have with all violent revolutions - an elitist group of know-it-all ideologues treats humanity as means rather than an end. The revolutionaries of 'right' and 'left' are social engineers who think they know what is good for everyone and are willing to impose these fantasies upon us, no matter the cost in human suffering. Present day Chile is the result of at least 3,000 deaths, thousands tortured and imprisoned, hundreds of thousands thrown into poverty, one million exiles and sixteen years of a mentally suffocating dictatorship. Castro can do the same thing of course, and is treated as a hero by the left, but such is the hypocrisy ideology engenders.

Chile once had a vibrant libertarian movement of mutualists and syndicalists. A positive sign, other than the Green Movement, is the existence of neighbourhood movements in the *poblaciones* which reject Leninism and promote a form of decentralism and local cooperation. Now that the authoritarian left is in steep, and hopefully irreversible, decline perhaps a rebirth of anarchism may occur as a response to the social inequalities of the untrammelled free market.

Larry Gambone

— OBITUARY —

Three intellectuals

The past few months have witnessed the deaths of three intellectuals from Continental Europe who had idiosyncratic relations with anarchism.

* * *

Leopold Kohr died in February 1994. He was born in Austria in 1909, and studied in Innsbruck and Vienna. He witnessed the Spanish Civil War as a journalist, learning about anarchism at first hand, and then worked in Paris. When Austria was annexed by Nazi Germany he fled into exile across the Atlantic, working in the United States, then Canada, and then the United States again. He worked from 1946 to 1954 at Rutgers University, where he specialised in the problems of political size, advocating much smaller units than nations, let alone empires. His book, *The Breakdown of Nations*, was published in Britain through the initiative of Herbert Read in 1957, at a time when large size was in fashion, and he never received the credit he deserved. One of his chapters was 'The Beauty of the Small', but it was the book by his pupil Fritz Schumacher, *Small is Beautiful* (1973), which caught the change in fashion and became a popular slogan.

Kohr worked from 1955 to 1973 at Puerto Rico University, where he contributed to local papers a series of essays later collected as *The Inner City* (1989). He then worked from 1968 to 1972 at Aberystwyth University College, where he advocated independence for Wales. (He also advocated the independence of the islands of the West Indies, but Anguilla's secession from St Kitts in 1969 led to a British invasion by Harold Wilson's government!) He wrote several more books - *The Overdeveloped Nations*, *Development without Aid*, *The Academic Inn* - and eventually saw his ideas coming into fashion. He called himself an anarchist, but was really a latter-day distributist, being more interested in the scale and spirit of institutions than their shape or structure, and he was aligned with

Resurgence and the Fourth World movement rather than the anarchist movement. He retired to a Gloucestershire village, where his last years were marred by persecution from local vandals - supporting his thesis that our 'mass society' destroys the 'translucent communities' which regulate social behaviour. He was a very convivial man, with a wide circle of friends and a growing circle of admirers.

* * *

Paul Feyerabend also died in February 1994. He was born in Vienna in 1924, and during the Second World War served in the German army on the Eastern Front, being permanently crippled by wounds received during the retreat from Russia. He completed his education in Austria and was first a distinguished theoretical physicist and then an eccentric philosopher of science. He worked in England for a time and then at the University of California, Berkeley, from 1958 to 1990. He was influenced by Karl Popper and then by Imre Lakatos, and moved away from scientific and philosophical orthodoxy towards unorthodoxy and indeed perversity. At the same time he drifted politically to the left, and turned away from the academic community to the young people of the New Left, in Europe as much as America. In 1975 his book *Against Method* made him famous and infamous, and he became one of the intellectual leaders of the growing unorthodoxy of the past twenty years. He called himself an anarchist, but was closer to Dadaism and nihilism than to traditional anarchism, and he approached irrationalism and obscurantism. His later books included *Science in a Free Society* (1978) and *Farewell to Reason* (1987). He taught that there are no rules and that nothing can be known, but resented it when his own ideas were treated accordingly. He was as eccentric in his behaviour as in his work, but was widely liked as a person even by those who disliked his doctrines.

* * *

Alfred Reynolds died in December 1993. His real name was Alfred Reinhold, and he was born in Hungary in 1907. As a young man he was involved in the literary and artistic life of Budapest, but in 1936 he emigrated to

Send for a free list of our publications
Freedom Press
 84b Whitechapel High Street
 London E1 7QX

The Diversity of Life
Edward O. Wilson
Penguin, £7.99*

The Doctrine of DNA
R.C. Lewontin
Penguin, £5.99*

Hackles will rise at the very mention of Edward O. Wilson. He is reputed to have originated what Lewontin, in *The Doctrine of DNA* and earlier writings, calls "a human nature ideology called sociobiology ... the ruling justifying theory for the permanence of society as we know it".

Wilson's *Sociobiology* (1975) is a comprehensive survey of social behaviour in animals, beginning with ants (on which he is the world's foremost authority) and ending with humans. In the last chapter, Wilson discusses which features of human behaviour are likely to be genetically inherited, selecting those features most frequently observed. Thus he concludes that human aggression is probably genetic, because warfare has existed throughout history, and that slavery is not genetic because it has been successfully abolished.

The argument is of doubtful validity, and of course the conclusion does not commend

Genetics and human nature

itself to those who hope and strive for a radically different society. But the judgement that Wilson is an ideologist of the status quo may well be unfair. Wilson's reputation as a "right-wing zoologist" depends on people taking Lewontin's judgement to be true, instead of reading Wilson's work and judging for themselves.

Wilson's latest book *The Diversity of Life* would be a good place for anarchists to start reading. If it supports any ideology, it is that of the radical green movement. Its message (and it really is its message, not just an aside in the last chapter) is that human activity is leading to catastrophe through the destruction of species.

As in *Sociobiology*, the last chapter includes remarks on 'human nature', for instance:

"People acquire phobias ... to the objects and circumstances that threaten humanity in natural environments: heights, closed spaces, open spaces, running water, wolves, spiders, snakes. They rarely form phobias to the recently invented contrivances that are far more dangerous, such as guns, knives, automobiles and electric sockets."

Note the word 'rarely'. Wilson is still using relative frequency to indicate hereditary

tendency, and the procedure is still of doubtful validity. But far from justifying the permanence of society as we know it, Wilson here argues for a society closer to nature, with an ethic of conservation.

'Green' sentiments are fashionable, but this book is different from the common run of 'ecology' tracts. For one thing, it does not just ignore counter-arguments, but seeks to answer them. There is the counter-argument, for instance, that the destruction of species is not a disaster in the long run, since the surviving species will adapt to fill the empty ecological niches. There is paleontological evidence of huge extinctions from which life recovered completely. Wilson answers:

"A complete recovery from each of the five major extinctions required tens of millions of years ... These figures should give pause to anyone who believes that what *homo sapiens* destroys, nature will redeem. Maybe so, but not so within any length of time that has meaning for contemporary humanity."

The delight of this book, as with Wilson's earlier works, is the wealth of natural history, "ecology expressed in the details of the biology of individual species that still live or have recently perished". Anyone who enjoys reading David Attenborough's *Life Trilogy*, or the works of Stephen Jay Gould, will enjoy *The Diversity of Life*.

Richard Lewontin, a distinguished geneticist, is largely responsible not only for Ed Wilson's undeserved right-wing reputation, but also for that of another popular science writer, Richard Dawkins. Wilson he quotes out of context. Dawkins, more

scurrilously, he misquotes out of context. Dawkins's *The Selfish Gene* (1976) approaches Darwinian evolution from a new angle. Conventionally, we think of organisms as primary and DNA, which carries recipes for the construction of organisms, as secondary. Dawkins reverses the convention, on the principle that "a chicken is the egg's way of making another egg". Chapter 2 of his book argues that the precursors of life must have been bare molecules of some sort, with the property of acting as templates for molecules like themselves, and that Darwinian survivors among these 'replicators' were those which also attracted other kinds of molecules to form protective bodies. The chapter ends with a purple passage:

"What was to be the fate of the ancient replicators? ... Do not look for them floating in the sea ... Now they swarm in huge colonies, safe inside gigantic lumbering robots ... They created us, body and mind ..."

A journal article by Lewontin rendered this as "[they] control us, body and mind", which is not what Dawkins said at all. Dawkins protested, but the misquotation was copied into *Not in Our Genes* (1986) by Lewontin, Rose and Kamin.

Dawkins kept protesting, and in the second edition of *The Selfish Gene* (1989) he carefully explains his position, which does not in fact differ greatly from that of Lewontin himself. Nevertheless, in *The Doctrine of DNA*, Lewontin again repeats his misrepresentation (although this time he corrects the word 'controlled' back to 'created'): "We are, in Richard Dawkins's metaphor, lumbering robots created by our DNA, body and mind".

Neither Wilson nor Dawkins embraces the doctrine which Lewontin attributes to them. It is fine to argue that social improvement is not impossible, and setting up straw men to knock them down is a useful mode of argument. But it looks like slander, to give straw men the names of actual persons.

Donald Rook

* If ordering by mail from Freedom Press Bookshop, add 10% inland or 20% outside the UK cash with order. Pounds sterling only please.

Test Card F

Test Card F - television, myth information and social control
AK Press, 80 pages, ISBN 1 873176 91 0, £3.95 (post free inland from Freedom Press)

From the Institute of Social Disengineering who also brought us *TV Times - a seven-day guide to killing your TV*, this new book is a Situationist-influenced all-out attack on the telly. Good on graphics and cartoons, but also packed with excellent analysis, this book has seen the vacuum behind the glass screen.

The central idea is that television is about social control. Viewers are merely a *tabula rasa* onto which politicians and admen write their messages. The function of the viewer is to consume the image, consume the products on offer, and remain inactive. Television is a substitute for community, the artificial controversies it generates a substitute for consensus. Images are instantaneously obsolescent. In this virtual reality, the past does not exist at all. We are overloaded with this glut of images so much that our understanding fails us. Compassion fatigue sets in. We are passive spectators.

Could television be reformed? Television is in the hands of the multinationals. Programmes and news bulletins are what come between the ad-breaks. Alternative viewpoints are excluded just as the IRA are denied the "oxygen of publicity". Corporate image builders' wishes are paramount while the media hierarchy ensures the message is put across in the right way. Self-censorship works because the managers share the same assumptions of the corporate world and non-compliance will result in the sources of information being cut off. No more media

pool, no more parliamentary lobby briefings, no more leaks. Working for reform within the system can never work because the media and capitalism are "locked together like rutting dogs".

Public access broadcasting is also rejected. Previous experiments using cable in Swindon and Milton Keynes during the late '60s failed because open access tended to merely reproduce and maintain the status quo.

The idea of vox pop and public access was seen as a sop to people. Any idea that they had influence over it was an illusion, nothing more than a tokenistic reciprocity. *Test Card F* is a book that has seen that public opinion is a myth. "What use is public opinion if everybody remains in their armchairs?" The book is not only hostile to the media itself, it also flays political movements who wish to use the media for their own ends. Change will not come about through people watching a different spectacle, but only happens when we take control over our lives. Collaboration in the manufacture of the Spectacle is as futile and counter-revolutionary as selling Malcolm X t-shirts. "Instead of the movement turning over the situation, the media turns over the movement".

Is there any hope? "The whole job's fucked" *Test Card F* tells us. It looks forward to the time when we take back our lives from the image makers. It invites us to discover for ourselves that "the media is not your friend". Standing for nothing, the media can accommodate itself with whatever orthodoxy prevails. The politicians need to image makers. Television executives, after the fall of Ceausescu apologised for their past mistakes, promising in future to bring the truth. I can't help but feel that *Test Card F* is correct when it says the most potent revolutionary image will be the blank screen.

Steve

New titles now available

AGAINST POWER AND DEATH The Anarchist Articles and Pamphlets of Alex Comfort

edited and with an introduction by David Goodway

Articles published between 1943 and 1986 in the journals *War Commentary*, *Freedom*, *Now*, *Peace News* and elsewhere, together with the pamphlet *Peace and Disobedience* (1946).

168 pages ISBN 0 900384 71 9 £5.00

HERBERT READ A One-Man Manifesto and other writings for Freedom Press

edited and with an introduction by David Goodway

The complete texts of all the articles, broadcasts, reviews, poems and speeches of Herbert Read published in the anarchist journal *Spain & the World* and its successors *Revolt!*, *War Commentary* and *Freedom*, from 1938 to 1953, together with the pamphlets *The Education of Free Men* (1944) and *Art and the Evolution of Man* (1951).

208 pages ISBN 0 900384 72 7 £6.00

FREEDOM PRESS

84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX

Legally its Spring so
officially that's the Sun
so don't make a noise
or they will go away.

March winds and
April showers
bring forth the
sweet hay flowers



MY THANKS
TO ALL THOSE
WHO GOT ME
TO CHARING
CROSS HOSPITAL
AND TO ALL
THOSE WHO
LOOKED AFTER
ME IN THERE
AND ALL THOSE
WHO REMEMBERED
ME MY THANKS
ARTHUR MOYSE

why does he keep buying
drinks for every one ????
He 's now 80 and the State
give him 25% increase on his
OAP



ARTHUR MOYSE

The Raven 24 is by far the best special issue produced by the editor John Pilgrim. Much better than his *Raven 19* on sociology, which seemed to try to present sociology as some sort of progressive force for good, and even somewhat better than his earlier *Raven* on anthropology. The reason may have something to do with the fact that while Mr Pilgrim was a professional sociologist, in the realm of science he is a dabbler, an amateur who is whiling away his retirement studying the history of science as a kind of hobby. When one is not affiliated to a profession, and doesn't depend upon it for a living, it is easier to be detached and fearless in one's criticisms.

Consequently Mr Pilgrim is able to say: "The heroic age of scientific optimism ... came to an end about thirty years ago. It appeared to be the end of the idea that science could ultimately solve all our problems. With it came a gradual retreat from rationalism just as dangerous as the elevation of the scientist to a sort of God-Priest with a knowledge of mysteries beyond normal mortals."

Yet I am troubled that he is rather more trusting of the scientific profession than is now fashionable, and simply blames the governments for manipulating science and the scientists, arguing from the time of Galileo they [governments] have been eager for the pay-off, in terms of military and industrial technology, that science can provide. Surely the scientists themselves have some responsibility in this? Mr Pilgrim's reference to Galileo is apt, in that Galileo Galilei represented a great historic compromise between the scientist and the powers that be.

Bertold Brecht has described the scientific dilemma thus: "The fact is that Galileo enriched astronomy and physics by simultaneously robbing these sciences of a greater part of their social importance." Brecht insists that for a while these sciences "stood ... at the barricades on behalf of all progress" instead of a 'revolution' we got a slow forward movement which has "degenerated into a dispute between experts". For Brecht these sciences henceforth lost touch with the people and "they again regained their high position in society".

The Raven, no. 24, on Science - 1
Freedom Press, 96 pages, £3.00 (post free
anywhere)

Science and Society

An issue of *The Raven* devoted entirely to science is quite an event, but one to approach with caution. Will it be just science-bashing or, worse, articles eulogising the benefits of some of the pseudo sciences? Many anarchists are suspicious of both science and scientists and with some justification when one reads media headlines such as 'scientists discover gene for homosexuality' and 'left-handers die young'. And of course it is true that the kind of society we live in profoundly affects the kind of science we get and too many scientists are working for the military or using their skills to increase the profits of the multinational capitalist giants.

All the writers in this issue would claim that natural science as a system of enquiry based on experiment and observation, although not necessarily the only one, has much to offer of benefit to society and the planet. Some offer the hope that recent scientific developments will actually make a free society more achievable and none supports the view current among many anarchists that a return to a simple, low technology, unsophisticated, even primitive existence is an essential prerequisite to a free society. Such a back-to-the-land movement was favoured by the intellectual romantics of the nineteenth century although one suspects that they took their comforts with them, leaving the factory workers to the horror and degradation of the industrial revolution, which generated the profits that provided them with their income. In this issue many important topics are discussed, and some controversial statements are made, but if they provoke discussion in the pages of *Freedom* then this is to be welcomed.

The first essay, by Harry Baecker, opens the argument by suggesting that we are identifiable as a species by our production of artefacts, that is by our technology, and that it is our abilities in this respect that make an anarchist society feasible. Although originally published thirty years ago in *Anarchy* 25, it

is as relevant today as it was then.

Nigel Calder, in a long, thought provoking essay that would stand on its own as a pamphlet, argues that science and the nation-state cannot safely co-exist and that eventually one or the other must disappear. In the course of his argument that it will be the nation-state that will be the loser, he points out that science is essentially anti-authoritarian and non-hierarchical: the job of the new research student is to prove his professor wrong. Certainly science depends on the free exchange of information. A discovery is not accepted until the evidence has been critically examined by others, despite the newspaper headlines, and later independently confirmed. It may still be revised or even discarded as a result of further work. This means that although it may take twenty years for a radical idea to gain peer group acceptance it weeds out sloppy or silly work, but it does notoriously delay the acceptance of new concepts that threaten the peers' own authority.

Despite Calder's impeccable green credentials he has this to say about the eco-environmentalists:

"I have watched the tender shoots of scientific ecology and Earth-system science being trampled by green wellies. And just like their imperial grandparents who bullied the world in the names of religion and commerce, the environmentalists of Europe and North America are having a lovely time telling everyone else how to live. From the comfort of their own deforested continents, where they spew carbon dioxide galore into the air and bleach their remaining trees with automobile exhaust, they reproach the Brazilians for living in Amazonia and the Chinese for burning coal. When the Indians say, very well, we shall use nuclear energy which releases no carbon dioxide, the eco-colonialists throw up their hands in Politically Correct disgust."

When Calder criticises organic farming or suggests that health service cuts might improve the nation's health one has doubts, but there may be a case to answer. Although optimistic overall he recognises a potential for

tyranny from United Nations control of political and military power that could initiate a thousand years of darkness. However he claims that information technology and biotechnology will soon make the world visualised by Kropotkin in *Fields, Factories and Workshops* possible. His image of the future has the nation-states replaced by regional and global confederations of autonomous communes and welcomes an



appearance now of local initiatives which could begin to create a new society in the midst of the old.

Alan Cottey, a member of 'Scientists for Global Responsibility', is more pessimistic than Calder, recognising that science and technology ruthlessly controlled by the powerful has made the world poorer. He is concerned that scientists do not take enough responsibility for the applications others make of their work, even, if I understand him correctly, to the point of not pursuing certain lines of enquiry if the ultimate use of them might be bad.

Kropotkin crops up again in Daniel Todes' scholarly piece on the background to the writing of *Mutual Aid*, which was in response

to an article by T.H. Huxley on Darwinism which applied his Struggle for Existence metaphor to human society. In a detailed investigation of the background to this controversy Todes establishes that the concept of mutual aid in nature was widely accepted by the nineteenth century scientists in Tsarist Russia, including Kropotkin even before he became an anarchist. Whilst accepting Darwin's theory of evolution they considered that he had been too greatly influenced by Malthus and by the capitalist society in which he lived, giving insufficient attention to the role of mutual aid in the struggle of species to survive, which was in any case largely a struggle against an adverse physical environment. Other writers in this collection also expose the fallacies of Malthusianism, which incidentally is one of the main props of Social Darwinism and justification for competitive capitalism.

In the first three shorter pieces the Nobel Prize winner César Milstein, interviewed by Colin Ward, describes the problems he encountered trying to be both a scientist and an anarchist in an Argentina controlled by the military junta. The other two consider the misuse of scientific metaphors and constitute a natural introduction to the next issue of *The Raven* on religion. Brian Martin warns against using the discoveries in quantum physics about the way sub-atomic particles behave to justify strands of Eastern mysticism and goes on to point out the importance of understanding how current social values influence the way scientists model nature, using Darwin and Kropotkin as examples. John Noble complains succinctly and lucidly about writers who use God as a metaphor, particularly when writing about physics and cosmology, when all they want to do is indicate that there are matters of which they are presently ignorant or do not understand.

The editor of this issue is to be congratulated on the way he has assembled a disparate collection of essays into a coherent account of the way science influences society and society influences science. *Raven* 24 deserves to achieve a wide circulation.

Harold Sculthorpe

Science, humanity and the inventive dwarfs

The pendulum of public attitude to science swings to and fro, as does intellectual prejudice, and I suspect Mr Pilgrim gets himself a little over-excited when he goes on about the post modernist distrust of science and rationality, which he claims has "created dangers which now loom ever larger". Indeed, the critics of science may be being more scientific in that they display a greater doubt, and show more signs of seeing through the complacency of the simple-minded scientific cheerleader attitude.

Politics of science

In his *Raven* essay 'Science, Scientists and Responsibility' Alan Cottey shows concern about the moral blindness notion that allows some scientists to come to "the optimistic belief that knowledge necessarily led to 'progress'." Mr

Cottey is a member of Scientists for Global Responsibility. He says, "It is sobering to find that so many of them [scientists] ... can do little more than hope for the best concerning humanity's survival and the planet's ecology".

In Brecht's play *Life of Galileo*, the character Galileo asserts: "Had I stood firm the scientists could have developed something like the doctor's Hippocratic Oath, a vow to use their knowledge exclusively for mankind's benefit. As things are, the best that can be hoped for is a race of inventive dwarfs who can be hired for any purpose".

Mr Cottey says the traditionalists who claim the ground of strong objectivity and rationality deflect criticism by defining science as "systematic and formulated knowledge", as distinct, say, from Brecht's definition "that science's sole aim must be to lighten the burden of human existence". The idea that science is a body of knowledge allows its professional practitioners - the physicist, the

chemist, etc. - to claim establishment prestige and privileges. And, as Orwell says: "In England, a large proportion of our leading scientists accept the structure of capitalist society, as can be seen from the comparative freedom with which they are given knighthoods, baronetcies and even peerages."

Alan Cottey is aware of other possible concerns of scientists, such as "the struggle for status, influence and resources". He quotes from a paper by Sir Ernst Chain where he says that science that has "no moral or ethical quality", is an artificially and unrealistically separated part of human activity. Steve Woolgar, in his book *Science, the very idea*, asserts "... science is infused with politics, not just in the limited sense of funding considerations or government or commercial interests, but in respect of an entire gamut of strategies of argument, mobilisation of resources, rhetoric and so on". And he adds: "Negotiations as to, say, what counts as proof in science are no more nor less disorderly than any argument between lawyers, politicians or social scientists".

As César Milstein says, elsewhere in *The Raven*, the claim that science is free of political reality is itself a statement of political belief.

Some cultural roots

In a short paper, Brian Martin places several scientific propositions in a social setting. It is a warning to fashionable addicts in the realm of ideas. He refers to the passionate desire of many of us to be deceived by some current ideological fad or fancy.

Daniel P. Todes, in a paper on Kropotkin, Darwin and Malthus, discusses the social, geographical and climatic background influencing scientific thinking on evolution and mutual aid. This is a significant work originally entitled 'Darwin's Malthusian

Metaphor and Russian Evolutionary Thought', and Mr Pilgrim claims it changed the mind of Stephen Jay Gould, "one of the most astute commentators of the scientific world", who wrote an essay 'Kropotkin was no Crackpot'.

The Russian Kropotkin, who later became an anarchist, advocated the case for mutual aid in opposition to the English T.H. Huxley's version of evolution in the *Struggle for Existence*. Far from being an oddball, it now seems that Kropotkin's position reflected that of the Russian Darwinists in general. This went unnoticed at the time, because Kropotkin was the only Russian Darwinist writing in English, and few Western naturalists could read Russian. Dr Todes says: "The fate of his [Darwin's] theory in Russia illustrates the effect that culturally specific metaphors can have on the reception and elaboration of scientific ideas".

The English view - 'the struggle for existence' - led to H.G. Wells and Social Darwinism; believing that science could solve all the ills of humanity on the one hand, and Margaret Thatcher type of political ideas about survival of the fittest.

Books reviewed in *Freedom*
can be ordered from

**Freedom Press
Bookshop**

84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 7QX

— open —

Monday to Friday 10am-6pm
Saturday 10.30am-5pm



Scientific fatalism

Discussing the use of the 'God Metaphor' in recent books on science, John Noble claims it is confusing and perhaps in danger of letting religion in by the back-door. Possibly its most notorious recent use was in Stephen Hawking's book *A brief History of Time*. In its celebrated ending he wrote: "Then we shall know the mind of God".

Mr Noble thinks we can avoid this confusion if scientific writers would substitute words like 'Nature' or 'The Universe' or Bohr's 'Provident Authority' for the word 'God'. Alas, in Mr Hawking's case, the problem may be more than one of semantics. In an article entitled 'Master of a Narrow Universe', Bryan Appleyard accuses him of a kind of scientific 'fundamentalism', in that he rejected biology because it was "not sufficiently fundamental". And he took up physics "because it was the most fundamental science". Mr Appleyard claims "this is a statement of faith and of scientific power-play more than it is a meaningful statement about physics".

In Hawking's case it seems he views himself, or perhaps physicists generally, as some kind of 'God'. As where he says: "In that case, we would indeed be Masters of the Universe". Mr Appleyard has it that "Hawking's idea of science is that of a rarefied discipline far above the heads of ordinary people, and infinitely superior to all competing forms of knowledge".

In any case, John Noble is very likely right in saying: "Seeking a purpose to the Universe or a meaning to life is probably futile". He is also clearly on good grounds in arguing that, in Popperian terms, such work is not scientific in that it is not subject to 'falsifiability' and thus not testable.

The longest and perhaps most thought-provoking article in this issue of *The Raven* is Nigel Calder's 'Give Science a Chance'. Frankly I found myself being seduced by Calder, particularly his hostility to green wellies and the authoritarianism of some environmentalists. Mr Calder says: "Environmentalism has become a pagan religion, with the unverified Gaia as its goddess, and its hatred of heresy stifles rational discussion of real

(continued on page 8)

— ANARCHIST NOTEBOOK —

Tilting at Windmills – 1

"The one condition essential to the establishment of such bucolic anarchists is the availability of cheap power. And the source of the power must, of course, be beyond the control of the tyrant, the power-maniac, whether he be a monopoly capitalist or a civil servant. How did we manage at St Maëls? We erected windmills and made them drive generators. They were not the graceful windmills of the traditional Dutch landscape, but machines as efficient as the airscrew of a Spitfire, and designed on the same principles. Mathematically perfect and delivering a well-nigh inexhaustible supply of power ..."

— Edward Hyams, *William Medium* (1947)

Alex Comfort, whose anarchist writings make a welcome reappearance in his new Freedom Press book *Against Power and Death*, once asked in a postscript to a letter "Why is it that anarchists seem to live in or near windmills?" He was generalising from the coincidence that his home was The Windmill House in a village in Kent, while mine was the Old Mill House in a hamlet in Suffolk.

One answer might be that there was a time when every village had one or more windmills out of necessity. His experience and mine is of meeting casual callers anxious to know details of the millers who once lived in the house. I have to tell them that not a trace remains of our mill, which was pulled down or blew down in 1907, but that I have taken the trouble to learn the names and activities of a century of millers, one of whom had the delightfully Orwellian name of Benjamin Clover.

A more fanciful answer might be that there is something attractive to bucolic anarchists about the concept of local and renewable motive power, perfectly illustrated by the quotation from a forgotten novel by Edward Hyams at the head of this column. I used it to introduce a discussion of 'Harnessing the Wind' in *Freedom* for 13th July 1957, at a time when only a handful of anarchists, including me, and a handful of engineers, including T.C. Haldane, were concerned with the potential of wind generation of electricity. Today it has become a topic of highly-charged discussion in upland areas of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, and its ambiguities are worth exploring from an anarchist standpoint. So I have to begin with the historical explanations I was obliged to provide 27 years ago.

Wind-using appliances reached their peak, mechanically, in the nineteenth century in such beautiful and functionally perfect objects as the clipper ships at sea, and on land the windmill. Before their long and gradual decline began, there were about ten thousand windmills (grist mills for flour-milling) in England, and another two thousand marsh mills, for pumping water by wind power, draining the East Anglian fens. There was the same intense exploitation of water power. When I lived in the London borough of Wandsworth, for example, I learned by chance that the river Wandle, in its eight miles or so before it joins the Thames, once had 42 mills and was called 'the most hard-working river for its size in the world'. Apart from grinding grain and pumping water, it was used for grinding everything from stone to snuff, rolling copper, lead and iron, and running power looms and printing presses. In 1993 the performance artists Platform re-exploited it for the first time in a century, setting up a small water turbine providing electric light for a local school.

The millwrights, with the materials of their day – timber, wrought iron and later cast iron – were in the forefront of technological advance. Many of the self-taught technicians whose inventions made the industrial revolution possible were millwrights or millwrights' sons – Smeaton, Cubitt, Meikle and Murdoch. They introduced ball-bearings in the eighteenth century and airbrakes in the nineteenth. The fan-tail device for swinging the mill into the wind (ancestor of the tail rotor in helicopters) was invented in 1750; and by 1790 Smeaton (the builder of the Eddystone

lighthouse) was experimenting with the relationship between the speed of the tips of the sails or blades and that of the wind. There was a steady stream of invention and innovation.

But the revolutionary invention of the steam engine, and the growing dependence on imported grain after the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 (which resulted in the ports themselves becoming milling centres) slowly killed the windmill and interest in it, other than as a historical relic lovingly preserved and operated to astound us tourists. On the other hand (as I explained in 1957) the (war-related) growth of the aircraft industry in the twentieth century, and the greatly increased understanding of aerodynamics and metallurgy that resulted from it, together with the developments in the generation and use of electricity as well as the growing awareness that fuel resources were not inexhaustible, gave a new impetus to efforts to harness the wind.

As a conscript in and after the Second World War I spent several years in Orkney, the group of islands beyond the north of Scotland. Outside the two towns, nobody except the army had an electricity supply, but almost the first thing to catch the visitor's eye was the ubiquity of little propellers raised above the chimneys of houses and crofts, charging accumulators to provide lighting and radio reception. They were mostly 'Freelites', marketed commercially by Lucas before the war, or home-made versions of the same thing. It's a melancholy fact that the first British civilian casualty of the Second World War was a young blacksmith, James Isbister of Brig o' Waith in Orkney, killed by a chance bomb meant for the battleships in Scapa Flow, whose hobby was making wind-generators.

I once dismantled one of these simple devices made by him and blown off a building by high winds. In its way it was a masterpiece of simple ingenuity, and it was this that set off a lifelong interest in wind generation. For as soon as you have seen a few of these little generators which provide a 12-volt electricity supply, or the paddle-wheel type of five-horsepower windpump that you used to see for pumping water on farms, you begin to think about the potential for building them on a grand scale, or connecting them in series, or of developing some more efficient means of storing the electricity they produce than accumulators.

And many backyard inventors have had a go at it, using old hardwood aircraft propellers which you could buy dirt cheap at jumble sales as curiosities. But serious experiments in generating power from the wind moved on to large-scale production. By 1957 I had gathered a variety of reports from France, Yalta (USSR), Vermont (USA) and many other parts of the world. In Britain the generating industry had been nationalised by the post-war Labour government. This move was widely welcomed as it was thought more efficient. All those little local coal-burning power stations would feed more efficiently into a National Grid.

There were many unforeseen results that we never thought about at the time. Most of the pre-nationalisation generators were operated by city and town councils. The same local authorities also operated tramways, powered by cost-price electricity – cheap and simple public transport. The end of local control of electricity spelled the end of trams in the late '40s and early '50s. They have had to be expensively re-introduced in Manchester in the '90s and in other cities in the next few years. Control of electricity supply, like that of gas and often water before nationalisation, meant that councils had another source of income, beyond the control of government. The importance of this was never noticed until central government set about destroying the

possibility of local opposition in the 1980s. This may not be seen as important by anarchists, but it is a factor in the systematic destruction of alternative political policies in towns and cities today.

Paradoxically, it was not until the Thatcher government sold off the electricity generating industry in 1988 that wind generation had a chance to display its potentialities. The Central Electricity Generating Board had a monopoly of supply and was obliged to buy coal from the National Coal Board, owners of the nationalised mining industry, oil and gas from the producers, sometimes nationalised and sometimes based overseas, and nuclear power which had become available as a by-product of the arms industry and the Cold War. There was little room for any consideration of wind power.

All the same, after the Second World War the Electrical Research Association in Britain began investigations into wind-power generation. The enthusiasts reported that a chain of aero-generators along and north and western seaboard (Cornwall, North Wales, the Hebrides and Orkney) would provide between one and two million kilowatts. The Association selected two experimental sites. One was at Costa Head in Orkney, where a 100kw generator made at John Brown's shipyard on the Clyde, was erected in 1951. The other generator was erected in 1953 on the Caernarvonshire coast in Wales where another 100kw generator, made by a now defunct company Enfield Cables, was put up. I actually saw this tower when it was put up for testing at St Albans in 1951.

Needless to say, these experiments were of no interest to the Central Electricity Generating Board. It put its faith in the potential for nuclear power, and there were only two people (both funded by voluntary

organisations) who managed to sit out the entire length of the public enquiry into the proposed building of a further nuclear power station, Sizewell B in Suffolk, which lasted from January 1983 to March 1985. The objections were overridden and today there is a new proposal for Sizewell C, while nobody has any idea of how to cope with the long-term problem of the storage of nuclear wastes.

But in the meantime the Thatcher government privatised the electricity industry, and it emerged that official spokesmen had lied to the Sizewell enquiry about the economic viability of nuclear power stations. No prudent investor would want to buy shares in nuclear power. So the legislation included a requirement that every household in the country should pay an additional levy to pay for nuclear investment.

Dr David Elliot of the Open University's Energy and Environment Unit, explained to Stephen Titherington of Radio 4's 'File on Four' (12th March 1994) how this chance subsidy for non-fossil fuel energy encouraged the commercial development of wind power.

"The government's privatisation programme was faced with the problem of dealing with nuclear power, and the resolution of the problem was to give it a subsidy, firstly in order to encourage private investment, which failed, and secondly to keep it going in the public sector, which is the present situation. To do this they invented this thing called the 'fossil fuel levy' which is a surcharge on all our electricity bills which runs at about 10% of electricity costs. As an incidental part of that they added on renewable sources as beneficiaries of the scheme as well. This was something of a fig-leaf as nuclear power continued to get 95% of this levy (initially it was 98%). That led to projects which have been fully conventional, based on combustion of industrial or domestic wastes as this was now commercially viable. Wind power has been the only other real beneficiary. We now have about 10 megawatts of wind power up already."

At last, many decades after the experiments of enthusiasts, wind power has had an accidental opportunity. In a further article I want to discuss the lessons we have learned.

Colin Wan

Through the Anarchist Press

It occurred to me, the day being the Ides of March, to glance at William Shakespeare's play of *Julius Caesar*. I could not get past the first lines and the significance they hold, which I previously missed.

"Act one Scene one: the scene is Rome. A street. Enter the tribunes Flavius and Marullus, and certain commoners.

Flavius: Hence! Home you idle creatures, get you home:

Is this a holiday? What! Know you not,

Being mechanical you ought not walk

Upon a labouring day without the sign

Of your profession? Speak, what trade art thou?

First commoner: Why, sir, a carpenter.

Marullus: Where is thy leather apron and thy rule?

... Wherefore art thou not in thy shop today?"

Clearly here is a description of communal life as Shakespeare imagined it to have taken place in Rome, but instantly recognisable in his own time. The state was all powerful and the Romans pushed their noses into every aspect of life. How dare a mere carpenter show his face in public, the day not a holiday?

Unfortunately this brutal scene, meant to be funny and vulgar, does not continue in the same vein, even if seriously, to describe the arrangements and working conditions in Shakespeare's England, or in Rome or wherever.

Restrictions on citizens remain, without a qualitative change.

Of all local authorities is the firm masquerading as London Transport the most vindictive? Posters are pasted up everywhere, with typography at its most obnoxious by a very reliable hand, with

warning of instant fines on some poor travellers who cannot afford the fare.

Which reminds me of something a bit more constructive. A visit to the Falls Road, Belfast (*Theatre Ireland*, no. 28, *Duchas na Saoirsí* issue):

"Black taxis picked up passengers. This is a admirable idea born in Belfast, an impromptu community taxi service which went up and down the length of the Falls Road from the city centre to Andersonstown and back. The fare in 1989 was 35p and the first person in decided the direction. Other passengers waited at the kerb, hailing down the taxis. Thus the people have overcome a tardy bus service. Whether it was against the law or not, the people stamped their approval on the scheme and it worked."

Still on transport, it is my impression that this sunny day that by and large the population has not appreciated the seriousness of the situation. To take one example: British Rail is truncated yet again, prior to selling off.

Nuclear waste is transported to Sellafield and back to the ports (Dover) by rail at the moment. In London it is carried on the Northern London Line. If the new owners pass these orders on to road transport, the trucks will use any routes available, neglecting communal safety conditions.

Nuclear waste trains and trucks on motorways, red routes and country lanes will prove the most catastrophic enterprise that the executive have so far sanctioned.

A correspondent writes from Spain "... regarding the obituary of Federico Montseny in *Freedom* (vol. 55, no. 3), there was some follow-up in the Spanish press, some much warmer, and an official commemoration in the national library, rather low key perhaps, but the government is in a bit of trouble."

John Row

Gender-benders and silly cunts

Dear Freedom,
An article of mine, 'Nonsense about Gender: let's stick to plain English' (5th March), provoked some letters in Freedom (19th March). Mary Quintana referred to it as an article on *Newspeak*, agreed with it, and then launched on discussion of other examples of the abuse of language. Fair enough. Then there were two other letters - very silly letters by people who appear to be, shall we say, 'verbally challenged'. It would be simple to 'put down' these two people by going over, point by misplaced point, the many foolish statements in their letters, and readers (if they can be bothered to wade through them) can see this for themselves. But it is not my purpose to 'put down' anyone. I believe that everyone, however semi-literate and 'verbally challenged', should have the right to try to express themselves in Freedom if what they struggle to express is at all relevant, at the risk of making fools of themselves.

My purpose is to instruct, and some people appear to be badly in need of instruction. I wonder how widely known it is that the present fuss about gender was initiated long ago by my old and highly respected comrade Alex Comfort. Reference is made to him in the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* - the nineteen-volume edition - concerning a minor meaning of the word 'gender'.

"In modern (especially feminist) use. A euphemism for the sex of a human being ... Alex Comfort, *Sex in Society* ii, 42. 'The gender role learned by the age of two years is for most individuals almost irreversible, even if it runs counter to the physical sex of the subject'."

Here we have evidence of psychoanalytic thinking in the early Comfort, who used to be a Christian prude and disapproved of pre-marital sexual intercourse; he and I had quite a controversy going in Norman Haire's *Journal of Sex Education* in the 1940s. But Comfort left his Christianity and his prudery behind when he became more involved with the anarchist movement, and he became an active protagonist in the sexual revolution of the 1960s onwards. When he published his two delightful and best-selling books in the 1970s, he did not call them *The Joy of Gender and More Joy of Gender*; he used the big bad word SEX, which our modern neo-Victorian prudes are trying to banish from the language. He was never an advocate of *Newspeak*, the attempt to impoverish the language by outlawing certain words. For a time in the Victorian era there was an attempt to outlaw certain words because of their sexual connotations. Thus 'trousers' became

unmentionable (consider what they covered!) and in polite society they had to be referred to as 'nether garments'.

Many words have two or more meanings, often a 'strong' meaning and a 'weak' meaning, and the OED defines them, giving appropriate examples. Thus if I refer to the undeniable fact that those who are trying to replace the OED with the *Politically Correct Dictionary and Handbook* are silly cunts, I am not making an anatomical reference. I am following the OED which defines a secondary meaning for 'cunt' and gives examples from some of our best-known writers:

- "1932, George Orwell, *Collected Essays* i, 88. 'Tell him he's a cunt from me'.
- 1934 Henry Miller, *Tropic of Cancer*, 'Two cunts sail in - Americans'.
- 1956, Samuel Beckett, *Malone Dies* 99, 'They think they can confuse me ... Proper cunts whoever they are'."

One of the techniques for impoverishing the English language is to try to make the 'weak' meaning replace the 'strong' and then outlaw the 'strong' meaning. As



Please keep sending in your letters and donations

Social freedoms

Dear Editors, Tell me I don't understand anarchism, can't write, have racist beliefs and help to oppress women, and I will bear up bravely. But to say I don't get the joke - that hurts.

Paul P's letter (19th March) introduces a new angle into this discussion of freedom. The letter to which he replies distinguished between social freedoms and personal ones, not between those Paul approves (which he calls social) and those he disapproves (which he calls anti-social). (Society being what it is, surely anarchism, rather than capitalism, deserves to be called anti-social?) Paul shows that, even from this new angle, the assertion that the exercise of one freedom interferes with another remains valid. As he says: "social freedoms ... interfere with anti-social freedoms". Certainly the

Syme, the enthusiastic advocate of *Newspeak* said in Orwell's novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

"We're getting language into its final shape - the shape it's going to have when nobody speaks anything else. When we've finished with it, people like you will have to learn it over again. You think, I dare say, that our chief job is inventing new words. But not a bit of it! We're destroying words - scores of them, hundreds of them every day. We're cutting the language down to the bone."

I suppose, that one must agree that consciously fascist-orientated people are at least consistent when they strongly sympathise with characters like Syme and clamour for an impoverished language that abolishes all the words, the concepts, they disapprove of. But those who do not consciously regard themselves as fascists, yet strive in a muddle-headed way to achieve one of the most important goals of fascism, are indeed silly cunts, and it is very ironic that such views should be aired in Freedom, an anarchist paper of long and distinguished record.

And the 'gender-benders'? Again I must quote the OED:

"Special combination: Gender-bender. *slang*. A person (especially a pop singer and a follower of a pop cult) who deliberately affects an androgenous appearance by wearing sexually ambiguous clothes and make-up, etc."

I doubt if all those who strive to replace the big bad word SEX by 'gender' wear sexually ambiguous clothes and make-up and prance around in this gear. I have no actual evidence to hand. But in speech and print they are certainly

exercise of one freedom may (as he also says) encourage another; for a complete statement we still have to add that it also interferes with the freedom not to have those freedoms exercised. The standard anarchist claim, to support freedoms that do not interfere with others, is meaningless; there are no such freedoms. It seems fair to summarise Paul's letter as saying that anarchism supports the freedoms it values and opposes those it disvalues. On this we agree. It follows that the difference, in this respect, between anarchism and the other political movements, is not that it supports freedom and they don't; it is that anarchism supports freedoms which they oppose and they support freedoms which anarchism opposes.

George Walford

gender-benders, and hence the title of this article. Most committed anarchists, enemies of censorship in all its forms, will regard such silly cunts and gender-benders with ridicule; but I would remind you, comrades, that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

Tony Gibson

Dear Editors, I should like to congratulate Tony Gibson on his excellent piece of parody, 'Nonsense about gender: let's stick to plain English'. I take it this is a subtle strategy to infiltrate the Tory press by offering a concealed step-by-step guide to the processes by which the 'Establishment' maintains itself. I look forward to seeing this article reprinted in *The Sunday Times*.

For the benefit of those who may have failed to see the point, concealed as it was so cleverly, I would like to give a synopsis of Tony's methodology:

How to malign the opposition

- First, gain a spurious sense of self-identification on the part of the reader - Tony's 'schooldays' reminiscence is an ideal strategy.
- Then conflate the issues, and appeal to a patriotic self-esteem (here, English language threatened by Americans).
- Now it is safe to sling some mud and launch into ridiculing terms of denigration, i.e. "the loonier sort of ultra-feminist theory".
- Continue by (mis)representing the opponent's argument - cite one text as if it were the Feminist Koran, presenting two contradictory statements (a sure-fire way of discrediting any revolutionary idea). Two different voices (out of context) instantly invalidate the debate.
- To conclude, set up an unimpeachable authority (in this case the rather slight Concise OED) presented as the absolute final truth (here "the dictionary is our only bastion ...") and end with a final rallying cry, e.g. the "champions of freedom of thought", from which no reader might wish to dissent.

There you have it! Along the way, many further devices can be employed. To take just one example, the casually slotted-in appeal to act in the best protective interests of "children and young people" at risk (nice appeal to 'laudable' sentiment).

All in all, highly amusing and instructive. Thanks again, Tony. 'Education by example' in action!

Carole P.S. Incidentally, applying the term 'gender' to people instead of grammatical abstractions undermines and destabilises the prescriptive mentality. It is meant to be disturbing. See, Tony?

Freedom's future

Dear Comrades, What a splendid idea to use valuable space in Freedom to explain how to make beer. Could we please have further articles on how to grow vegetables, decorate our homes and dress in fashion? I would also like to see a column spent on discussing the problems of those anarchists who are in trouble with affairs of the heart. And I can't wait to see my future in the stars written, no doubt, by Arthur the Anarchist Astrologer.

I look forward to cancelling my subscription to *Women's Own*.

Derrick

Videos wanted

Dear Freedom, I would be grateful to any readers of Freedom with access to video cassettes on anarchism and related subjects willing to loan them for the purpose of showing at meetings in the Midlands.

I can be contacted c/o The Rainbow Centre, 88 Abbey Street, Derby.
J. Simcock

DONATIONS

11th Feb - 24th March 1994

Freedom Fortnightly Fighting Fund

Wolverhampton, JL, £2; Gwynedd, DJ, £5; Aldershot, DNB, £7; Liverpool, MD, £50; Milton Keynes, DB, £1; Beckenham, DP, £30.
Total = £95.00
1994 total to date = £459.00

Freedom Press Overheads Fund

Freedom Press Bookshop bucket, £10; Salisbury, RAFM, £5.50; Wolverhampton, JL, £2; Liverpool, SC, £1.50; Uxbridge, RCS, £10; Edinburgh, SC, £3; Ontario, ND, £10; Rugby, DR, £6; Newport, NF, £5; Cheltenham, TKW, £20.
Total = £73.00
1994 total to date = £294.00

Raven Deficit Fund

Newport, NHF, £4; Farnham, Mrs T, £5; Oxford, MH, £6; Whitley Bay, AP, £8; Beckenham, DP, £30.
Total = £53.00
1994 total to date = £321.00

Thanks! And Please!

Science, humanity and the inventive dwarfs

(continued from page 6)

and urgent problems". His line is leave it to the locals, because ordinary people are okay, and he cites the notion of 'Original Virtue' to support this position.

Mr Calder feels that the threat to life and liberty "flows mainly from the recent yet already obsolescent organisation of humanity in nation-states". He claims that if "science and the nation-state cannot safely co-exist, one of them must go", he expects the nation-state to be abolished. This is wishful thinking in the present climate of world politics. Because he has such faith in the triumphant march of science, Mr Calder is able to advocate what he calls *studious passivity* as a political option. Such optimism boils down to a kind of *scientific fatalism*.

Such is his confidence in the authority of science that he feels able to proclaim: "If human beings are born anarchists ... then science will soon confirm it". Anarchism, and everything else in society, must it seems submit to the verdict of the Supreme Court of Science. This view demonstrates what Bryan Appleyard called "the overwhelming dominance of

and moral force". But Mr Calder departs from the generally accepted scientific methodology when he suggests science may confirm anarchism, just as he does when he says he expects scientific studies to verify 'Original Virtue'.

Surely Popper overthrew this principle of 'verification' years ago! Today, in scientific terms, nothing can be confirmed or verified to achieve the status of certainty that Nigel Calder claims will become possible for science to determine for or against anarchism and 'Original Virtue'.

I ought to say that while Mr Calder is a distinguished former editor of *New Scientist*, a respected journal, I, like Errico Malatesta, am just an electrician with the pretensions of a shopfloor syndicalist. Some subtle point in Mr Calder's argument may have escaped me, but I thought the current claim of science was, according to Popper, that while no generalisation could achieve the status of certainty, the essence of scientific methodology is to produce generalisations which resist attempts to falsify them.

'Science' too serious to be left to the 'scientists'

When George Orwell wrote his essay 'What is Science?' in 1945, he wanted to distinguish between science as a body of knowledge confined to a club of card-carrying physicists and chemists,

etc., and science as a method of looking at the world open to any thinking person. Most anarchists, like Orwell, would prefer to promote the open-minded rather than the closed-shop approach to science. But the demarcation problem remains as to what is to be accepted as science? Naturally many professional scientists want to confine scientific claims to the privileged few within their particular specialist disciplines.

Some of the contributors to *The Raven*, such as Alan Cottey, are uneasy about what has been described as the 'dangerous gung-ho' approach of some scientists. In some respects Nigel Calder is very much in the 'gung-ho' tradition, dismissing some disputes in science lightly, mocking the caution of environmentalists, ecologists and even Colin Ward (who has an interview with César Milstein, the biochemist, in the current *Raven*).

Judging by the bitter disputes manifested only this week on television over Dr Martin Fleishmann, his claims about Cold Fusion and the difficulties of reproducing his experiments, it would seem that Steve Woolgar is right to stress the disorderly nature of the negotiation of a scientific consensus over what counts as scientific proof. Or take the claims of persecution against Professor Peter Dewsberg who, it is said, is being stifled by the scientific establishment because of his claim that HIV is not responsible for AIDS. Or consider the

argument if 'Peer Review' is a good thing in innovative science; does it hold back the advance of innovative science?

Some of the contributors to *The Raven* are worried about the outside critics of science, but people like Paul Feyerabend seem to say that science is threatened from within by its rigid and dogmatic use of self-imposed methodology and laws. No doubt Mr Pilgrim will deal with this tradition in *The Raven* on science part two. But Paul Feyerabend claims: "Science is an essentially anarchistic enterprise: theoretical anarchism is more humanitarian and more likely to encourage progress than its law-and-order alternatives."

By this, as I understand it, he wants anarchism administered as a kind of medicine to the body politic of science. Anarchism in this sense becomes a liberating force in a sick science just as in a sick society. It is not for science to judge humanity, as Mr Calder implies, rather it is for humanity to check and supervise science. Can human beings curb and control the scientists and the specialists? Feyerabend says without hesitation: "Science is not beyond the reach of the natural shrewdness of the human race". And he recommends that this shrewdness be applied to all important social matters which are now in the hands of experts.

Give us more science, COMRADE PILGRIM!
Brian Bamford

The Raven

Anarchist Quarterly
number 24

on

'Science - 1'
out now

Back issues still available:

- 23 - Spain / Emma Goldman
- 22 - Crime
- 21 - Feminism
- 20 - Kropotkin's 150th Anniversary
- 19 - Sociology
- 18 - Anthropology
- 17 - Use of Land
- 16 - Education (2)
- 15 - Health
- 14 - Voting
- 13 - Anarchism in Eastern Europe
- 12 - Communication
- 11 - Class
- 10 - Libertarian Education
- 9 - Bakunin and Nationalism
- 8 - Revolution
- 7 - Emma Goldman
- 6 - Tradition and Revolution
- 5 - Spies for Peace
- 4 - Computers and Anarchism
- 3 - Surrealism (part 2)
- 2 - Surrealism (part 1)
- 1 - History of Freedom Press

£3.00 each (post-free anywhere)
from

FREEDOM PRESS

FREEDOM
fortnightly

ISSN 0016 0504

Published by Freedom Press
84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 7QX

Printed by Aldgate Press, London E1

London Anarchist Forum

Meets Fridays at about 8.00pm at
Conway Hall, 25 Red Lion Square,
London WC1R 4RL (note new
venue).

SUMMER TERM 1994

- 15th April** - General discussion
- 22nd April** - Anarchism and the Gift Economy (speaker: Michael Murray)
- 29th April** - General discussion
- Sunday 1st May** - *May Day Picnic* in Chiswick Park in Chiswick House Grounds near junction of Great West Road (A4 leading to M4) and Chertsey Road (A316 leading to M3) close to North and South Circulars (car park off southern carriageway of Great West Road). LT Tube stations: Turnham Green, Chiswick Park and Gunnersbury (also North London Line) and Chiswick BR Station from Waterloo, Clapham Junction and Reading (via Witton). Good pubs in Chiswick and Strand-on-the-Green for early arrivals. Café and WC.
- 6th May** - Anarchism and Utopia (speaker: Jason Wilcox)
- 13th May** - General discussion
- 20th May** - Talk by a member of the Socialist Party of Great Britain (specific details yet to be confirmed)
- 27th May** - General discussion
- 3rd June** - The Co-op and its Place in Politics (speaker: Tim Pearce)
- 10th June** - General discussion
- 17th June** - History of Native Americans (speaker: Jim Baker of Boston BAD [Boston Anarchist Drinking Club])
- 24th June** - Paganism, Feminism and Ecology (speaker: Daniel Cohen)
- 1st July** - General discussion
- 8th July** - Drawing up the 1994/95 programme
- Monday 29th August** - *Summer Picnic* (venue to be decided)

If anyone would like to give a talk or lead a discussion, overseas or out-of-town speakers especially, please contact either Dave Dane or Peter Neville at the meetings, or Peter Neville at 4 Copper Beeches, Witham Road, Isleworth, Middlesex TW7 4AW (Tel: 081-847 0203), not too early in the day please, giving subject matter and prospective dates and we will do our best to accommodate.

Red Rambles in Derbyshire

A programme of free guided walks in the White Peak for Greens, Socialists, Libertarians and Anarchists.

— Spring 1994 —

Sunday 3rd April: Alstonefield and Lower Dove Dale. Meet at 1pm in Alstonefield National Park car park. Length 4-5 miles.

Sunday 8th May: Cycle 'ramble' on the Tissington Trail. Meet 10am at Ashbourne end of the Tissington Trail. Cycles can be hired at this point.

Telephone for further details
0773-827513



Freedom in Education: Rhetoric or Reality?

a day conference on education
organised by LibED
at

**Friends' Meeting House
Queens Road, Leicester
on**

**Saturday 14th May
10am - 6pm
plus evening entertainment**

further information from:

LibED

170 Wells Road, Bristol BS4 2AG
(please enclose an sae)

Anarchist Discussion Forum

(formerly Northern Research Group)

NEXT MEETING

Saturday 9th April 2-5pm

*

Fiona Weir

**Challenging Conservative
Structures in Anarchist Learning**

*

'The Crafthouse'

(also known as 'The Ruins')

32a Dale Street, Nunnery Lane, York
(please note this is a change of address)

*

The ADF tries to explore new areas of contemporary anarchist thinking and campaigning, using more participatory methods of information dissemination.

For further details or information
ring Jon on 0484 847764

FREEDOM AND THE RAVEN SUBSCRIPTION RATES 1994

	inland	abroad surface	outside Europe airmail	Europe airmail
Freedom (24 issues) half price for 12 issues				
Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	14.00	22.00	34.00	28.00
Institutions	22.00	30.00	40.00	40.00

The Raven (4 issues)

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail
Claimants	10.00	-	-
Regular	12.00	14.00	18.00
Institutions	18.00	22.00	27.00

Joint sub (24 x Freedom & 4 x The Raven)

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail
Claimants	18.00	-	-
Regular	24.00	34.00	50.00

Bundle subs for Freedom (12 issues)

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail
2 copies x 12	12.00	13.00	22.00
5 copies x 12	26.00	32.00	44.00
10 copies x 12	50.00	60.00	84.00

Other bundle sizes on application

Giro account number 58 294 6905
All prices in £ sterling

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To Freedom Press in Angel Alley, 84b Whitechapel High Street,
London E1 7QX

- I am a subscriber, please renew my sub to *Freedom* for issues
- Please renew my joint subscription to *Freedom* and *The Raven*
- Make my sub to *Freedom* into a joint sub starting with number 24 of *The Raven*
- I am not yet a subscriber, please enter my sub to *Freedom* for issues and *The Raven* for issues starting with number 24
- I would like the following back numbers of *The Raven* at £3 per copy post free (numbers 1 to 23 are available)
- I enclose a donation to Freedom Fortnightly Fighting / Freedom Press Overhead Raven Deficit Fund (delete as applicable)

I enclose £..... payment

Name

Address

..... Postcode