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Dangerous Illusions Debate
Anarchism as an Ultra-leftist Stunt
I condemnation of the Labour Party as a supporter your ideas, especially your number of recent union battles, is not, the last few months. I can't help but has been excellent and I've learnt a lot in what the original author actually said rather than at long-distance mind-reading, the editors

**THE FREEDOM DEBATE**

Please note that, as we warned in the previous Freedom, this is the last time we are going to publish the very long 'debate replies' that come in. The reason is that they are impossible to anyone who hasn't read the original article to which they often bear precious little relation.

We do welcome genuine articles that stand up by themselves [preferably] under 1,000 words, above which they have a strong tendency to go off. For the moment we wish to continue the debate under the broad title of Organising Anarchists (see, I'm not paranoid) but is it not anything we can do about it at this late stage beyond a brief note explaining that I've not cracked up under the strain. What I would most favour is for it to be reprinted, leaving out the last third about the CNT to save space, but this may tax your readers patience I suppose. I've enclosed an appeal from Strike which you may be able to give some publicity to (it would be a great shame to lose it). Similarly, your readers may be interested to know the result of the DAM ballot was 31 to 10 in favour of my expulsion. Speaks for itself really. A bit of feedback. I can't believe how good Freedom is these days, but the tendency towards front covers which Arthur Scargill continued to oppose. If he hadn't acted so hand over hand this and explained the justification of violence in such a struggle, much more support from the public would have come forth. After all, we've experienced the inhumanity military-like policing in Britain today. Reading your newspaper has shown me that there's more realisation of the true Britain we're now living in. I shall continue to show my support for your paper in the future. We've got a lot to learn from libertarian thought.

Bill Micklethwaite

Dear Freedom,

I was fortunate enough to come across a copy of Freedom, and this is the one which got me to work my mates as well. Your in-depth coverage and analysis of the miners' strike has been excellent and I've learnt a lot in the last few months. I can't help but support your ideas, especially your leadership of the Labour Party in the recent past. I was glad to see Stu's article on power. A tentative beginning to what I hope will become a more thorough exploration of anarchist attitudes towards solutions to this most difficult social form. I do think that one of the most salient factors missing in Stu's article was the omission of consideration of the physical structures of society. I think that if anarchists try to solve problems of power in the format of our large metropolitan organised societies, they will find the problem insolvable. I think that we must address first things first, and the need to decentralise the social structures of society and thereby simplify the discovering of non-authoritarian forms of function, is the key. I hope that Stu's challenge (if formulated in a somewhat abrasive style) results in a lively discussion. When I was in Venice I met a group of young German comrades who were saying much the same as Stu, except that they thought the great failure of anarchists was in developing a coherent theory of economics. There is a rebirth of interest in Benjamin Tucker in Germany because they find in him and in Proudhon an attempt to deal with the realities of economic structure. Lastly, about 'Growing from our Roots ...' I think that it is pretty clear in my article that I believe in cutting off only those who have said that my ideas have not nourished our ideas, and those that are moribund and suck our vitality.

David Kovan

**LETTERS**

Dear Freedom,

I was in Lucknow in February and I do believe you've realised yet but my article in the last Freedom was totally copped up at the layout stage, so much so that the main point has been lost completely. Obviously a very unfortunate accident (see, I'm not paranoid) but is there anything we can do about it at this late stage beyond a brief note explaining that I've not cracked up under the strain. What I would most favour is for it to be reprinted, leaving out the last third about the CNT to save space, but this may tax your readers patience I suppose. I've enclosed an appeal from Strike which you may be able to give some publicity to (it would be a great shame to lose it). Similarly, your readers may be interested to know the result of the DAM ballot was 31 to 10 in favour of my expulsion. Speaks for itself really. A bit of feedback. I can't believe how good Freedom is these days, but the tendency towards front covers which Arthur Scargill continued to oppose. If he hadn't acted so hand over hand this and explained the justification of violence in such a struggle, much more support from the public would have come forth. After all, we've experienced the inhumanity military-like policing in Britain today. Reading your newspaper has shown me that there's more realisation of the true Britain we're now living in. I shall continue to show my support for your paper in the future. We've got a lot to learn from libertarian thought.

Bill Micklethwaite

**THE FREEDOM EMPIRE**

There are three very autonomous parts to the Freedom organisation. Freedom Press the book publishers is entirely run by Vernon Richards. Freedom Bookshop which is run by the Freedom editorial collective. We took over the paper run by the editors. It helps if you write on separate bits of paper for each part.


Hello Freedom Collective, I hope everything's going okay. At the moment we're in the process of being evicted by the council from 6 Winchester Court, St Anns, so we're temporarily homeless. This is my first submission to Freedom and I hope you think the copy fits the page so sense of the article (unlike the typos in several times I've used finally)

Patrick Nicholson

**Dear Freedom,**

Dear Freedom, I am just writing to congratulate you all on your forthcoming centenary in '86, and I would like to send you a copy of a book which I believe you will find of interest. It is called 'The Special Branch' and it details the activities of the Special Branch of the British police for the years 1939-45. It is written by Vernon Richards, the editor of Freedom, and it is a fascinating read. I would be very interested to know if you would be interested in publishing it.

Berni W Sussex

**Dear All,**

A new book with the working title of Obedience is a Sin is being compiled by myself, Sarah Hopkins (editor of Greenham Common Action) and as Freedom the paper run by the editors. It helps if you write on separate bits of paper for each part.


Dear Freedom, December's issue of Freedom contained a short letter detailing the state of an anarchist group in Durham. Two of us here in college are desperate to make contact with such a group - we're interested in the narrow outlets existing within the university for political expression and discussion. We're both philosophical anarchists with a bit of practical experience (Stop the City, etc.) so we think we've got something to offer the group.

Anyway, the author of the piece, Mike, failed to give a contact address so I decided to write and see if you could be of assistance. Thanks a lot.

Patrick Nicholson

**Dear All,**

A new book with the working title of Obedience is a Sin is being compiled by myself, Sarah Hopkins (editor of Greenham Common Action) and as Freedom the paper run by the editors. It helps if you write on separate bits of paper for each part.


Dear Freedom,

I tried to obtain an answer from the Special Branch about the Durham address was one of several new ones that I carefully typed out and then left behind in various places where in Hackney when getting drunk with someone from Class War. Could you, whoever you all are, send 'em in again?

Stu

**Dear Freedom,**

I am just writing to congratulate you all on your forthcoming centenary in '86, and I would like to send you a copy of a book which I believe you will find of interest. It is called 'The Special Branch' and it details the activities of the Special Branch of the British police for the years 1939-45. It is written by Vernon Richards, the editor of Freedom, and it is a fascinating read. I would be very interested to know if you would be interested in publishing it.

Berni W Sussex

**The Mary Ward Centre**

Meetings will continue after the Easter break from 26th April. Fridays 8:15pm. 17th May: Ken Weller on 'The struggle against the First World War in London' and 'Anarchism: Theory and Practice' - PAST AND PRESENT. Third series of six weekly talks by Nicolas Walter, followed by discussions on the first occasion at 8:15pm on Tuesday evening, 23rd April 1985. Information from the Mary Ward Centre, 42 Queen Street, London WC2N 3AQ.
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Clem (Freedom February 1985), that the, boring. But we are also fed up with the lies concerning the IWA. Therefore we would like to comment on Rob’s letter.

poll he mentions but that over 150,000

Many kids here are wearing black and red buttons and when being asked why they reply, 'it's only for fun'

organisation without any anarchist pretension. They co operate with the state quite happily. What do you think of this?

3 Yes, the Swedish SAC should be kept as their way to all the CNT-AlT's foreign counterparts. As far as we can see, this

money involved could be huge - £20

syndicalists because the CNT's so

fascists. The current socialist government

is now falling over itself to hand back

international anarcho-national organisations. As far as we can see, this

the CNT-AlT. ,

may be interested in participating in anti-militarist actions.

A demonstration is being held in Bergamo, northern Italy. The CNT-AlT will be encouraging children in schools to release balloons with an anti militarist message. We hope to have a report in the next issue.

The committee hopes to enlarge the area of discussion and to encourage the formation of groups in other areas. Groups are already being formed in Padua and Perugia. There is no reason why this initiative should not extend itself beyond Italy and assume an international character. This would provide an opportunity to break CND's monopoly of the peace movement and promote a specifically anarchist message.

One should note the use of the term 'anti-militarism' which goes beyond a simple opposition to nuclear weapons. It implies opposition to war as such and includes protest against conventional forces as well, and the institutions and attitudes (such as nationalism) that sustain them. To many 'pragmatists' this will appear utopian. It is, however, the anarchist position and we should be shouting it from the rooftops and airwaves.

The address of the CAJA is: CAJA, Piazza Mella, 5-90133 Palermo, Italy (Sources: Umanita Nova and Rivista A).
This Lot Should Change Their Name
Confused? you will be.

Liverpool Anarchist Group has ceased to exist. Several of the two and a half years it was going, since being started in April 1982, it had never really progressed beyond being little more than a discussion group. Although that’s not to say much of the discussion wasn’t worthwhile.

In that time many people’s opinions (including the writers) changed, many drifted away never to be seen again, and the more pacifist-minded people seemed no longer to wish to be involved – which meant that by the end last November it was, in the main, members of Liverpool Direct Action Group who were left holding the fort, which seemed a bit pointless seeing as we all met each other at our weekly meetings anyway.

One copy of a monthly newsletter was produced in an effort to get interest going again, this had little effect so in the end those of us left decided, for the time being at least, to call it a day. During its time, many people criticised it, often for very valid reasons, but often many of the same people made little or no effort to get something going themselves and, if nothing else, it did at least succeed in bringing together a lot of people, many of whom have since gone on to do other things.

Liverpool Direct Action Group still carries on – many of our old posters, speakers, our own postcards, concerts and jumble sales, going down picket lines, and a few individuals have also been involved in the various local miners’ support groups. We produced one issue of a paper, Renegade, last November, which we re-named Agitator after the miners’ strike and publish it regularly since February. LDAG is not part of the DAM, although some of us are DAM members; it is a broad-based class struggle anarchist group with its own separate aims and principles.

Members of Liverpool Direct Action Group have also been involved in other areas: the Black and Red, feminism, prisoners support, etc. Some people are also involved in the peace and animal rights movements. Recently, the DAM members, plus other local DAM members not involved in LDAG, have formed our own separate DAM group – hopefully this will end the confusion, and rumours.

The Black and Red has, since Christmas, been having a break – until then, and particularly towards the end of 1984, we had put on a number of gigs featuring both local and not-so-local bands and performers. The larger ones of these were benefits – for the Merseyside Peace Bus, Liverpool Direct Action Group, Newham Rocking Parks, Parkside Miners, etc. Most raised a fair amount of money, many lost (which came out of our pockets section by section), anyone and everyone, including helpers, pays to get.

Until just before Christmas we has regular weekly gigs in the backroom of The Mitre, a city centre pub – this fell through when it had to be closed for renovations. Our last gig was a benefit for the Murrays’ which lost money. Meanwhile we have put on a number of gigs featuring both local and not-so-local bands and performers. The larger ones of these were benefits – for the Merseyside Peace Bus, Liverpool Direct Action Group, Newham Rocking Parks, Parkside Miners, etc. Most raised a fair amount of money, many lost (which came out of our pockets section by section), anyone and everyone, including helpers, pays to get.

The miners’ strike may be over but a miner’s strike goes on. It is an example of the struggle against one small private pit on the Nottinghamshire-Derbyshire border. When the national strike was called the twenty-six National Union of Miners members at the privately owned and run Doe Lea Colliery came out in solidarity with their trade union brothers and sisters. Two months into the strike the company that operates the site, Hampton Gold Mining, sacked all those on strike. Four of those sacked have since found other jobs, but 22 remain in dispute and are still picketing the mine. Even if there is an amnesty by the national network of miners’ organisations will this mean that any miners will be allowed to return to work? They have just lost their jobs for showing solidarity. They are getting no help from the local union. We know that everyone has worked hard to support the miners over the past year and great results have been achieved.

We ask that you continue this support for these workers in struggle.

Please send donations/messages to c/o Clem Turff 28 Lucknow Road Sutton-in-ASHFIELD Notts NG17 4LS

[Enclose SAE for receipt please]
One of the things which has been most frustrating about the recent re-emergence of CND has been the way that many of the mistakes of the old CND have simply been repeated without anyone much bothering to honestly ask themselves why the old CND declined so drastically in the late '60s and early '70s. Failure to seriously consider the collapse of the earlier wave of CND activism leaves the current movement wide open to a similar rapid decline which would probably prove terminal this time.

At the core of the problem lies the CND's faith in moral pressure and non-violent direct action. Whether its leaders really believe it or not I don't know but there is a widespread belief on the part of CND leaders act as though they believe because they believe that they will have to attract as much support as they can for a number of reasons. Firstly, any illusion of being able to influence events in a well argued and dignified way through the proper channels then a government will be elected which will remove those weapons.

This leads the CND central bodies to welcome as much support as they can and to attract support from such sources (they also appear to believe that one bishop is worth twenty students, two actresses or ten teachers). Such thinking is, of course, nonsense for a number of reasons. Firstly, any illusion of being able to influence events in a well argued and dignified way through the proper channels then a government will be elected which will remove those weapons.

Secondly, it means that you have to accept that the 'acceptable' leaders which ends up lending credibility and acceptance by highly dubious ideas and leaves respectable faction when circumstances offer a deal regardless of whether is obviously hadn't been watching the news lately or been near the picket lines. The only thing it ought to have seen as its main priority — stopping the war. During the Falklands war CND had frequently been called a racket which attracted over 100,000 people. Yet that rally had no impact on the war because the government was able to invoke the terrorism law to prevent it.

There were a minority of anarchists, who were refused to use it to oppose a war. It is using who are not really interested in the morality of their actions. They are also underestimating the size of the task they have set themselves. If it was necessary to think of the hardest issue on which to win a demand for a reform then the demand for the removal of nuclear weapons would surely be it. Mobilising against such a large mass of people as housing or health care might have won significant reforms, but both the last serious CND activism in Britain and the current wave have wrenched not one single reform out of the British authorities which is of any use to any of us. Such a failure does people like us no good. If the authorities are not careful the current wave of CND will simply serve to teach people they are not in control of the facts and that the truth is that collective activity can be enormously effective.

So why is anarchism often confused with the antics of loony terrorist gangs? There were a minority of anarchists, mainly of the 1890s, who are interested in wars. They were elitist, not caring about the innocent casualties of their self-declared wars. They are elitist, under absolutely no control but their own, yet saying they act for the people. When faced with opposition we are not joining up with Reagan's hysterical campaign against the 'terrorist threat'. That man gets my nomination for 'Hypocrite of the Decade'. The American government finances coups, death squads, corrupt dictatorships and mercenary gangs like the one now murdering peasants on the Nicaraguan border. We can understand why in desperation small groups can turn to militarist means. Injustice is found everywhere and there are always those who look for a quick solution. We have to state clearly that killing individual rulers, bosses or their police will never overthrow the capitalist system. They are all replaceable. It can only happen when the job is taken on by a strong and politically aware working class movement. Only such a movement will be able to build a new society of justice and equality where people will come together to manage their own affairs.

In this situation there is likely to be some violence as it is impossible to see the bosses giving up their wealth and power without a fight. The gains of the new society will have to be defended but this will be done by popular organisations which will be democratically controlled. It will not be done by tiny groups of self-proclaimed 'liberators' who are answerable to nobody.
Anarchism as an Ultra-leftist Stunt

I find it strange that the Bedford Anarchists should find so much glee in making a 'shambles of Bedford'. What they did was as action by only a few people in the tradition of propaganda by the deed. Such actions by small numbers are only useful in so much as the concrete effect they have, such as the squatting of factories. Anarchists should find so much glee in being destroyed.

The practical results of the Bedford Anarchists actions are nil. The hope to build a larger campaign out of the arrests is only useful if it is performed by a much more sophisticated idea as workers' control, but this is crying for help. To do so is to patronise the strikers and their families. They are more grown up than I suppose you want to live a life of luxury. Presumably you will have to do some work, but they do not. For David Kovan to claim that the strike had also been a failure is as groundless as the general principles. Pacifism is simply a theoretical standpoint that asks the state to walk over it. Coffee table discussions of pacifism are at a safe place if a policeman is hitting you with his truncheon.

Anarchism as an Ultra-leftist Stunt

VIOLENCE, ENDS AND MEANS

I mentioned earlier what I called sensible ideological agitation. By this I meant ideology that is not ultra-left. One of the problems I see with anarchists is a horridous degree of ultra-leftism which is quite simply unrealistic. Perhaps an obvious case of this is producing agitational leaflets on why revolution is necessary. The essence being that you tell other people they ought to revolt, since reformism doesn't work. Another example would be to tell workers to ignore their unions because they are manipulative, bureaucratic, etc. Yet another case, as in the miners' dispute, is to call for a general strike, which is ludicrous considering the lack of solidarity the miners were getting from other workers.

The approach should be what I would term grassroot reformism, to discriminate from reformism from above (the parallel being revolution from below or from above). Anarchists should be encouraging and helping people to obtain gains for themselves collectively, eg, helping the miners in the case of unions. In the case of unions it is important to point out their deficiencies and the necessity for organisation beyond them, but to suggest workers ignore or do without them at this stage would be to condemn these workers to isolation as a small minority as the time is not right. In a general strike for instance, it would be quite correct to encourage workers to do without their unions.

In short, if a small group goes too far beyond the position of the people, it commits itself to isolation and is ineffectual. Spectacular actions may be good fun, but the sad fact is that lots of boasting tedious work needs to be done before we can take part in such action.

In David Kovan's article he spoke of something which he claims is rooted in anarchist philosophy. He says, 'ends must be commensurate with means', and poses it against what he implies is its opposite, that 'ends justify means'. I don't believe either of these are true all the time. Suppose you want to live a life of luxury. Presumably you will have to do some kind of work to obtain the consumerables for this. It is quite clear that collectively humanity must work in order to enjoy its produce. The means certainly are not commensurate with the ends. Suppose the necessary work has been done, then you must perform whatever actions are necessary for luxury. The means, now, are commensurate with the ends. As a general principle this is an extremely silly one.

The other principle David Kovan gives us is that the 'end justifies the means'. This is not the opposite of the prior principle, it is a value judgement. It is rather strange that this principle should be a phrase used so often by supposedly scientific marxists. It may be true that if you are in a certain position and want to get to another you need some method, a means of achieving this goal. Whether or not this is correct depends entirely on their relative merits, it is not a general principle.

David Kovan's suggestions of non-violent revolution is as groundless as the general principles. Pacifism is simply a theoretical standpoint that asks the state to walk over it. Coffee table discussions of pacifism are at a safe place if a policeman is hitting you with his truncheon.

The practical result of the Bedford Anarchists actions are nil. The hope to build a larger campaign out of the arrests is only useful if it is performed by a much more sophisticated idea as workers' control, but this is crying for help. To do so is to patronise the strikers and their families. They are more grown up than I suppose you want to live a life of luxury. Presumably you will have to do some work, but they do not. For David Kovan to claim that the strike had also been a failure is as groundless as the general principles. Pacifism is simply a theoretical standpoint that asks the state to walk over it. Coffee table discussions of pacifism are at a safe place if a policeman is hitting you with his truncheon.

Socialists and their sympathisers may recoil at the word 'violent', but to accept the necessity for violent revolution does not imply an acceptance of Class War's glorification of violence. There is nothing of intrinsic value in class war. The only value it has is external, it is a means towards an end, to be justified by its actual achievements, to be avoided wherever possible.
COMMENTS ON THE RELENTS TO DELегING POWER

I meant to put in a little warning introduction to my delegating power article to the effect that it contained a genuinely new way of looking at social structure which would be as well to think about for a few weeks before sending in your criticisms. However, pressure of space makes... Talking of space, this lot of replies are far too long. Even for what they actually say and I wish at least one of them had understood the original argument I made before they put pen to paper. It was very straightforward... but new. John Griffin in particular commits the sin of criticising the article I didn't write. John (and everybody else), you could fill a library with things I didn't say. How can you possibly know what my views on... Stu.

SOME THOUGHTS ON POWER

In his article 'Delegating Power' Stu says that Marxists don't have a theory of power. The fact is that even in Marx's time they had one—the problem was that it was wrong, unscientifically abstracted from the authoritarian society in which Marxism developed. In essence, power was seen as a means to an end, like any other tool, when the job was done it could be set aside. Hence the 'withdrawing away of the State'. As I have said before, this sort of drivel still enjoys a lot of currency. However, there is an increased awareness amongst some statisticians of the ways in which power operates.

For example, if we look at social psychological theories of power we find that the focus has moved away from justifying power in terms of the leader's charisma or expertise towards analysing the way in which power permeates everyday life in the way people are related to one another, and that power is not simply corrupted. The sort of things that have been 'discovered' are that: Access to power is usually vested in those who, irrespective of whether it's necessary; 'superiors' start believing that they control the 'inferiors' and therefore are entitled to take all credit; they devalue 'inferiors' and elevate their own self-esteem so that the distance between leader and led gets ever wider. Notice the explanations of why power corrupts, only descriptions. Naturally the sort of nonsense associated with this concept: power awareness, rotation in positions of power, etc take little account of social factors like class, race and gender. Meanwhile differences between leaders and led in...

In contrast, recent Marxist ideas about power have been based on certain factors. Steven Lukes in Power—A Radical View in discussing the relationship between a group of experts and an oppressed group (for the sake of argument let's call these vanguard and proletarian) outlines two alternatives. On the one hand the vanguard might exercise a short-term power over the oppressed group so that it comes to realise its real interests (ie workers councils, abolition of capital and State, autonomy, etc). From this it might see itself as a power in its own right. On the other hand, there is an anarchist defence which states that the oppressed group determine their own power and interest and any exercise of power becomes an attack on that interest. Lukes refers to the so-called 'compromise' where the oppressed group determine their own interests independently of the vanguard, through democratic participation. I take this to mean that there's no education between intelligentsia and 'masses'. Tellingly, Lukes doesn't go into the mechanics of this arrangement. In other words, he ignores the temptations of power that were described above. So, for example, the psychology of Power and Lukes' versions of power is seen as acceptable under the appropriate circumstances. As anarchists we know better. At least we are aware of its tendency to infest everything. The problem is that we've got two sorts of power: power usually vested in the leaders, who can corrupt and allow the workers to take all credit; they devalue 'inferiors' and elevate their own self-esteem so that the distance between leader and led gets ever wider. Notice the explanations of why power corrupts, only descriptions. Naturally the sort of nonsense associated with this concept: power awareness, rotation in positions of power, etc take little account of social factors like class, race and gender. Meanwhile differences between leaders and led in...

...I believe that the organisers will see the advantages of remaining embedded within the community, because the hand workers can provide suggestions to improve methods of working based on invaluable direct experience. The organisation is assisted by this process, just as the hierarchy worker can expect improvements in life style and productivity. When success flows from mutual adaptation of parts are happy and fulfilled—individuals will be unwilling to risk the oppression of working as co-workers and struggle under the weight of competitive hierarchies.

Stu's thinking, (reflected in terms such as 'bottom' and 'upwards') seems to be of an essentially linear nature. What I have described is a form of social interaction that makes the private (family, close relationship to any notions of self-aggrandisement which may appear when an individual takes on such a role. If that person cannot correspond to comrades' wishes, the chances are that within a libertarian culture, she'll resign without even being asked—if not, she's irreplaceable.

The key to ensuring that all decisions flow from the people lies in the fusion of those who organise at workplace, local and national levels, with their own community affinity groups. Stu is afraid of the organisations forming their 'top' and 'bottom' networks which become divorced from those who work with their hands. I believe that the organisers will see the advantages of remaining embedded within the community, because the hand workers can provide suggestions to improve methods of working based on invaluable direct experience. The organisation is assisted by this process, just as the hierarchy worker can expect improvements in life style and productivity. When success flows from mutual adaptation of parts are happy and fulfilled—individuals will be unwilling to risk the oppression of working as co-workers and struggle under the weight of competitive hierarchies.

I believe that the organisers will see the advantages of remaining embedded within the community, because the hand workers can provide suggestions to improve methods of working based on invaluable direct experience. The organisation is assisted by this process, just as the hierarchy worker can expect improvements in life style and productivity. When success flows from mutual adaptation of parts are happy and fulfilled—individuals will be unwilling to risk the oppression of working as co-workers and struggle under the weight of competitive hierarchies.

Stu notes that in delegating power, some form of delegation system is inevitable. Whether...
Camus: An Anarchist?

I didn't know that Albert Camus had written for the French weekly *Le Monde Libertaire*. The Fresnes-Antony group of the Federation Anarchiste have republished three of Camus’ articles which appeared in *Le Monde Libertaire* between 1955 and 1957. Albert Camus *La Libertaire*, their latest publication, also includes articles by Maurice Joyeaux (an old anarchist militant) as well as a number of articles commemorating Camus, which appeared in *Le Monde Libertaire* in 1960, shortly after his death.

L’Atelier de Création Libertaire of Lyog have also published a short book on Camus by Teodosio Vertone called L’œuvre et l’action d’Albert Camus dans la mouvance de la tradition libertaire. Vertone, who teaches at the University of Rome, makes out a well-argued and coherent case for placing Camus firmly within the libertarian tradition. The book contains an introduction by Roger Bonanno. A new cover by Cliff Harper is warmly welcomed.

The courage and dedication of these Spanish comrades continue to provide inspiration and valuable lessons. The reappearance of this book is warmly welcomed.
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L’Atelier de Création Libertaire of Lyog have also published a short book on Camus by Teodosio Vertone called L’œuvre et l’action d’Albert Camus dans la mouvance de la tradition libertaire. Vertone, who teaches at the University of Rome, makes out a well-argued and coherent case for placing Camus firmly within the libertarian tradition. The book contains an introduction by Roger Bonanno. A new cover by Cliff Harper is warmly welcomed.

The courage and dedication of these Spanish comrades continue to provide inspiration and valuable lessons. The reappearance of this book is warmly welcomed.