


13992
E



15p

ecology



& anarchism

ÆDITØRIAL \$tatement




'Ecology and Anarchism' is an attempt to spread anarchy among those involved in the ecology movement and vice versa. It is produced by a collective which is contactable via Box 1000, Rising Free, 182 Upper Street, London N1. We would welcome comments, criticism, contributions, etc., and will send further copies on receipt of 15p plus postage (7p in this country, 11p abroad).

We don't want to produce and distribute as many copies as possible; we would rather encourage others to produce their own paper, copying from us whenever they feel like it, as we have done in the case of several illustrations and the article on 'Violence/non-violence?' This is a sample culled from a paper we thought excellent, 'The Daily Barbarian', which can be obtained by sending US stamps and a large envelope to: Queen For A Day, c/o 4403 Second, Detroit, Mi.48201, USA.

Special thanks to Alan (1st of May bookshop, 12 Niddry St, Edinburgh) for the pictures of the Torness occupation.

contents

Torness - a taste of things to come?.....	3
Reflections on the state of the Torness Alliance.....	6
Ecology and the Libertarians.....	9
The Torness Armchair Occupation Game.....	10
Violence/non-violence?.....	12
Strategy for Social Revolution.....	14
Letters, etc.....	18



SOONER OR LATER, THE CONTINUAL DIVISION AND RE-DIVISION OF AGGRAVATIONS WILL SPLIT THE ATOM OF UNLIVABLE REALITY AND LIBERATE A NUCLEAR ENERGY WHICH NOBODY SUSPECTED BEHIND SO MUCH PASSIVITY AND GLOOMY RESIGNATION. THE DESIRE TO LIVE IS A POLITICAL DECISION. RADICAL THEORY BELONGS TO WHOEVER IMPROVES ON IT. IT MUST BRING VIOLENCE TO WHERE VIOLENCE ALREADY IS.

TORNESS:

a taste of things to come?

We could provide our own version of all the arguments why nuclear power is an 'important issue' and why Torness - planned to be the largest nuclear complex in Britain - is or should be the 'focal point' of the anti-nuclear movement in Britain; but then anyone who comes across this obscure journal is likely to know at least as much about it as we do, and the general outlook of the people producing the paper is reflected in all the articles. It isn't in any case enough to point to the life-threatening qualities of the nuclear industry or the planned size and importance of the Torness site - similar arguments support commitment to a large number of campaigns. Our involvement in practice in the Torness campaign - without which this effort at propaganda would simply represent yet another attempt at entertainment and petty stardom - results from these but also other factors: nuclear power is in the forefront of planned economic development and reflects its new criteria - no longer the antiquated rate of profit which in the case of nuclear power is large and negative, but (meet the new bcss...) the calculus of megawatts and police recruitment figures. Besides,

the front-line opponents in any struggle of those who want significant change - those who ask for too little and who don't ask loud enough - are in this case more easily defeated than where they are already organised into a formal hierarchy, usually on the Leninist model.

Our experience of the May Torness 'gathering' is further discussed in a later article. All that needs to be said for now is that it saw the first small crack in the surrealism of the anti-nuclear struggle in Britain so far: £20,000 of damage is symbolic in relation to the total cost of the project, but a good deal less so than anything which had gone on before (and where were the intellectual thugs of the Torness Alliance leadership who had the nerve to attack us afterwards for the 'trivial' nature of the damage?). And - more about this later - anyone who feels that this is not enough to bring down the nuclear industry, nor even the anti-nuclear industry which depends on it, is free to continue the good work - apart from any small group actions there are plans for a 'week of action' in September.

There seems to be an increasing



tendency for political mobilisation to become more symbolic and dishonest: the Torness Alliance claims to be committed to 'oppose construction at Torness by all non-violent means' (and we agree, though as far as the 'non-violent' goes only on tactical grounds - their firepower is greater than ours), and it called on the May gathering to occupy the site (an idea which we thought excellent); but did it mean a word it said? The ideological strength of the 'wreckers' and 'self-confessed anarchists' at Torness, and the reason the would-be micro-Hitlers who manage opinion in the Alliance got so hot under the collar, was that they took the Alliance at its word, and really did occupy the site and do what they could to stop construction. Maybe they should have realised how much more important it is to remain good-natured when confronted by the police, to be well-behaved in front of TV cameras and to do nothing to frighten off 'potential support' (some potential support, which is strictly conditional on inactivity). Perhaps if we do those things then the State will be so overwhelmed with love and gratitude that it will 'stop Torness' of its own accord? Truly a new revolutionary theory based on the principle that if you behave and ask nicely Daddy (or Mummy) will give you money for sweets... combined with filial affection for the State.

The case for 'sabotage'

We've had a good deal of abuse from some Alliance members for advocating sabotage of machinery and installations as a legitimate, non-violent and necessary tactic. These people always agree that damage to property is not 'violent' and 5 minutes later they have a slip of the tongue and talk about 'violence to property'; and no-one verbally defends private property, in fact some are so desperate to counter sabotage now (or last May) that they say it might be OK in 3 or 6 months' time but not now. The idea is that in the present situation we should be very careful not to put people off, we should just recruit more people to the campaign and then when we're numerically stronger we might consider doing something else. So all action becomes symbolic and aimed not at stopping construction directly but at convincing other people that it shouldn't take place, generally by competing for media coverage with those

who think it should. Since we want maximum support we don't want to alienate those who might become opposed to nuclear power but who will always care about private property, so we argue the case against nuclear power but we respect private property.

Well, even if you do get some kind of 'maximum support' that way what sort of support will it be? It will consist of people opposed to nuclear power but committed to private property, and it will never lead to an occupation of the site and the stopping of construction as long as there's a fence (not to mention armed guards, etc.) in the way. Any movement will (at most) only get support in its own image (as liberally interpreted by the media if it's not ignored). If we want a mass movement that doesn't operate solely in symbols but takes direct action (a notion distorted for its own purposes by the no-damagists) we have to act that way now - and we know we'll get a bad press from the Guardian, that's one of the ways we'll know we're getting somewhere!

What's more it seems pretty clear that the way the Alliance is going we won't get much support at all; after all why should someone who believes private property is sacred, that one must be nice to police(women), and that one should smile all the time and turn one's anger onto oneself, not believe everything else the government says, including about the need for nuclear power. Either you believe people are fundamentally anarchists and can become so overtly and you try to be one yourself, or you go home and watch TV. If you assume that people are and will always remain committed to middle class values, you're hardly going to be able to con them into creating anarchy.

The role of 'propaganda'

One starting point is to take seriously what marxists call the 'unity of theory and practice' (something few marxist theoreticians do: you can tell because they refer to theoretical 'activity' or 'work', i.e. as a substitute not a complement to 'practice'). Our role is not to contemplate or reflect passively on the Torness or any other campaign (much less to help or guide it); we're not interested either in contributing to the further passive entertainment of the anarchist or ecological market; and we recognise that if we are to have anything interesting to discuss we have

to go out and create it.


This role becomes more definite with this issue of 'Ecology and Anarchism' - we have become better organised both as activists and as propagandists in the anti-nuclear movement. This means among other things that although there are now more of us producing the paper it has taken us almost as long as the previous issues, as our energies have gone into more practical activities and even our propaganda activities have taken the more spontaneous form of leaflets and graffiti. We are also not interested in producing and distributing as many copies of the paper as possible: we would rather stimulate others to produce their own, ripping off from us whenever they feel like it (as we have freely done with other publications). To the extent that a paper contains news which are of wide-spread interest it may make sense to distribute it as widely as possible, but the same doesn't apply to a paper which is predominantly a vehicle for opinions. Ultimately everyone will write as much, or as little, as they read.

We should add a word here about anonymity. Naturally if any of us writes a leaflet or whatever that advocates anything illegal we don't sign it with names and addresses. We love openness and honesty as much as the next affinity group, but we don't believe in telling the truth to the police (which as someone said is as crazy as telling lies to a

lover), which as far as we're concerned includes those in the Alliance who use anonymity as an excuse for censorship...

'Boredom is always counter-revolutionary'

The above arguments, by providing a justification for our actions and by attempting to answer the arguments of our opponents, run the risk of missing the main point. On at least two occasions at the Torness May gathering, when a meeting decided to occupy on the Sunday rather than the Monday, and when we first entered the inner compound, the atmosphere was ecstatic - in complete contrast to the phoney good-naturedness and idiotic boyscout rituals which predominate whenever the Alliance leaders are in control. It was pretty exhilarating to break through the prohibitions laid on us by both the police and the Alliance and to do what we wanted to do, and directly - not symbolically - attack nuclear power. This was what was most offensive to the Alliance managers: things were really for a while out of control, a lot of people who had followed them were joining us, and they were pretty upset. The fact that it was a good deal more fun to play with the machinery than to role-play for the benefit of the media stemmed from the fact that it really involved changing the balance of power, however temporarily; and it was also the greatest threat to Alliance leaders' control of the situation.




reflexions

SUOIONS

The May Gathering

'And without doubt our epoch...prefers the image to the thing, the representation to the reality, appearance to being...'
(Feuerbach)

Looking back on Torness, I've been at a loss to understand why things happened as they did. When the inner compound was breached and occupied we found ourselves in a classic dual power situation - the legal power of the State/SSEB challenged and overcome by the power of the Alliance. We had in a literal sense reappropriated the terrain of struggle. The site was ours. The collective imagination of the Alliance could, in a single afternoon, have transformed the site beyond recognition.



But in place of a thousand shouts of triumph we were met with a flock of anti-saboteurs chanting 'Out! Out!' for the benefit of reporters' microphones, as they stood outside the now imaginary boundary of the inner compound, and defeat was snatched from the jaws of victory.

What is the explanation for this incredible performance? Why did the Alliance prove incapable of spontaneous action? There is only one answer.

The vast majority of the Alliance are merely playing at opposition. The Torness occupation was nothing more than a ritual designed to stop nuclear power in the same way a rain dance produces rain. Having no commitment to serious opposition, the

majority faction were not prepared to take control of the site for fear of upsetting the powers-that-be. They could not allow the saboteurs to act independently because our actions clearly demonstrated the extent to which they have internalised the limits of disobedience allowed by the State. The SSEB didn't need police patrolling the site because most Alliance members have police patrolling inside their heads.

The Torness Alliance: Personal Deficiencies

'...this miserable petty-bourgeoisie, which, if it had more courage and more intelligence, would not fail to join us in order jointly to struggle...' (Bakunin)

The Alliance is founded on sound principles and high ideals, but too many of those who frequent National Conferences are characterised by an arrogance, obstinacy, and intolerance which produces an alarming discrepancy between theory and practice. To argue with these people is to be met by a total inability or unwillingness to see any point of view but their own. It is impossible even to meet them half way over a point of disagreement. To compromise with them is not to be met with compromise in return, but rather with increased demands for further compromise. Even those who stress the importance of interpersonal relationships are among the first to descend to the level of insult and personal abuse - so that while a policeman in a confrontation may be a fellow human being, an Alliance member with a different point of view is merely 'stupid' or 'macho'.

The main reason for this hypocrisy is, it seems to me, the fact that nearly all these people are politically illiterate middle class liberals who, unable to relate the anti-nuclear movement to the wider social struggle, are incapable of formulating a coherent analysis of the strategies and tactics required. They are in consequence reduced to endlessly chewing over the regurgitated curd of their worthless rationalisations which they defend not with arguments - they have none - but with psychological violence.

Unable to transcend their bourgeois origins the majority of Alliance members pay lip service to direct action but in fact are incapable of genuinely challenging the status quo. They claim to oppose sabotage only on tactical grounds, but insist on referring to it as 'violence to property' - a reification which starkly reveals their political ignorance. And

press releases after Torness abhorring the damage done pointedly failed to mention that the opposition was only 'tactical'.

Even the Alliance's much vaunted commitment to non-violence is a perverted thing. While there are honest pacifists in the movement and many (including myself) who feel that violence would be a tactical mistake, for most Alliance members the espousal of non-violence symbolises not so much an unwillingness to do violence as an unwillingness to risk having violence done to them. The majority faction of the Alliance wears its non-violence around its neck as a talisman to ward off the evil of state oppression. It is inevitable that if and when the Alliance becomes an effective threat to nuclear power the State will respond with overt and violent repression. It is precisely the self-delusion of those who deny this that prevents the Alliance from posing a realistic opposition, and it is up to us as anarchists to radicalise the movement by exposing the nature of the State.

The Torness Alliance: Institutional Deficiencies

'Ideological respect for unanimity of decision has on the whole been favourable to the uncontrolled authority, within the organisation itself, of specialists in liberty.' (Debord)

The major organisational failure of the Alliance is the informality of its decision-making procedure. National conferences are open to anyone whether they are mandated group delegates or not, and an individual's voice carries the same weight as, say, a regional delegate's. While the Alliance is theoretically committed to the rotation of delegates, the same faces turn up at every meeting, and national conferences are in danger of producing an unofficial central committee. Among the worst, though by no means the only, culprits are those national organisations affiliated to the Alliance, whose representatives are not delegates in any meaningful sense of the word.

This core of perennial attenders forms a group of would-be leaders who know and agree with each other, and who band together to browbeat any but the most thick-skinned of opponents into compliance, and then claim unanimity of opinion. Thus democracy within the Alliance is fast becoming a sham. The 'will of the majority' is

manipulated by the leadership who then use it to sanctify their own decisions just as ancient monarchs claimed the 'divine rights of kings' to justify their power. The demand for consensus is merely a smokescreen for the stifling of spontaneous activity (while what to do in the absence of consensus remains unresolved).

It is stated Alliance policy that the basic unit of organisation should be the affinity group, but with the emergent law-giving capacity of the national conference these will become mere executive organs of the unofficial central committee, devoid of any significant function. Consider especially the policing role adopted by the Clamshell Alliance and suggested for the Torness Alliance. The formation of an internal policing body whose authority is external to the groups themselves can only lead to a self-managed repression whereby the sheep elect their own sheepdogs and bleat about the triumph of democracy on their journey to the abattoir.

Proposals

'But when one is convinced that the organisation is pursuing a course which threatens the future and makes it difficult to remedy the harm done, then it is a duty to rebel and to resist even at the risk of producing a split'. (Malatesta)

The various deficiencies within the Alliance are tending to precipitate its slide towards becoming a rigid authoritarian organisation controlled by people who are more interested in leading the opposition to nuclear power than in stopping it. At this moment, that slide is not inevitable, but constructive steps must be taken to avert it.


A commitment to democracy is not of itself sufficient, we need an organisational structure which cannot be subverted. This means that the basic unit of the Alliance must be the affinity/local group. The exclusion of those national organisations whose activities are not based on direct action and whose interests may therefore conflict with those of the Alliance should be seriously considered. (This would not apply to FoE, whose federal structure allows its local groups to formulate their own policy.) Rotation of delegates is an obvious principle, but delegates should also be strictly mandated. This means that an agenda would have to be published well before each national confe-



rence so that topics could be discussed by the groups. (It would probably be best for each conference to draw up the agenda for the next one. Additional topics could be included later providing they were publicised in the Alliance newsletter). Each group should be able to send any number of delegates to a conference but should only have one vote. Regional delegates (if necessary) should have a block vote according to the number of groups in that region. Whether or not individuals not representing groups should be allowed to vote is open to debate. Finally, and most importantly, if the Alliance is to remain democratic then final authority must reside with the affinity groups. The autonomy of the

groups is our only guarantee against manipulation. To impose the will of the majority - even a genuine majority - is not commensurable with libertarian aims (leaving aside the question whether national conferences are representative or not), and we must leave to people the responsibility of acting with due regard for the opinions of others within the Alliance.

In the highly likely event of this restructuring not taking place, it is up to the anarchists within the Alliance to oppose vociferously any and all authoritarian tendencies and to criticise any move which reduces the effectiveness of the Alliance. We must be well organised ourselves - send delegates to every conference, have cogent, well articulated arguments, and most especially we must never for an instant compromise our anarchist principles. (It is after all reasonable for a delegate to refuse to shift her/his position without first referring back to the group). We shall no doubt be loudly calumniated for this by the nascent leadership, but if the Alliance is to be effective it is up to us to put forward constructive proposals with respect to the Alliance itself and to its actions.



Ecology & the Libertarians

Recent British history has seen a variety of causes that the libertarian and authoritarian left have taken up: CND, Vietnam and Chile for example. A common factor with all these is that the Left's interest in them has effectively collapsed despite the fact that none was brought to a satisfactory conclusion. We still have the Bomb, and both Vietnam and Chile are dictatorships with vicious repression of those who threaten the power of the ruling class. Ecology is a relatively new issue but unlike the three mentioned previously it isn't going to disappear (whether we win or lose the ecological battle is another matter). Resource depletion and pollution are going to force themselves on our attention more and more as time passes and this in itself establishes the importance of ecology as a social and economic cause. However an examination of the causes of the (coming) ecological crisis shows that ecology as an issue goes much deeper than this.


The way society is at present organised is creating our ecological problems. Profit making industry wants consumption to increase, thus exacerbating resource depletion. And stopping pollution will cost a fortune, making any maverick company which attempts to stop its own pollution uncompetitive with its rivals. So profit making industry is the first problem.

At this point the authoritarian left points to the State as the alternative to private industry. This however is only theory. In practice the government is helping to make things worse much more than it's making them better (like cleaning up the Thames). All those playing the electoral swindle are committed to keeping down unemployment and raising productivity and the standard of living. (How far they're capable of doing these things is another matter.) All three aims will clearly accelerate both resource depletion and pollution. Thus the State is the second cause of the ecological crisis.


The standard of living is noteworthy on its own account. What exactly does it mean? A second car when you probably

don't need the first one? A colour TV on which to watch trash like Crossroads and Coronation Street? The third cause of the ecological crisis is the pattern of consumption in our society - the system by which people waste their lives doing boring jobs in order to earn money to waste on things they don't really need. This mental outlook, call it false consumption, is a device whereby people are diverted from what is important in society by trivia, and it is an essential prop of our system. As resource depletion increases, consumption must decline and so the ideal of consumption is threatened.

To conclude: the ecological movement threatens profit making industry, the State and the mental habits that condition people to accept our insane society - and it does these things on a permanent basis, not just for the next couple of years. No other issue has one tenth the importance of the ecological movement and we should start working within it now. There are many possible futures, most of them unpleasant. If the ecological movement becomes powerful enough we may be able to choose the nature of the society that will replace this one. Don't forget that the anti-nuclear campaign is only part of the ecological movement.




TORNESS ARMCHAIR



OCCUPATION

GAME



Berthing Facility

Intake Cofferdam

Barge Dock

Grade 3

Limit Of Stage Culvert Excav

+ 9.5

For D
Excav
Org. N°

Quarry Area

10.5

Permanent

12.5

Construction Water Tank

Substation

Bus Park

Weigh Bridge




16.9

Permanent Landfarm


20.6

A1 Roadworks Contractor's Area

Notes


- 1 Site Boundary Shown Thus 
- 2 Quarry Area Boundary Shown Thus 
- 3 Stoned Area Shown Thus 
- 4 Stone armoring may be replaced by 5.4t dolosse depending on availability of suitable stone.

- ++ role play the glorious days of the Torness May 'gathering' in the comfort of your own commune
- ++ feel righteous anger as 'self confessed anarchists' spoil the fun by actually opposing construction
- ++ applaud when responsible members of the Alliance discover an uncut section of fence to climb over
- ++ exchange pleasantries with friendly local police who are 'only doing their jobs'



violence/non-violence?

The following article first appeared in a recent issue of Nuclear Times magazine and came to our attention as a reprinted leaflet circulated at the Midland Anti-Nuke demo by the Ann Arbor No-Name Anarchists. Due primarily to space considerations we have edited this version considerably (down to approximately 1/2 the length of the original) and some minor changes have been made in emphasis.



The anti-nuclear movement, with considerable assistance from the Three Mile Island plant, has lately been much more successful in getting publicity and making nuclear power a public issue. However, the movement is now at a turning point. This is symbolized particularly by the Clamshell Alliance's abandonment of occupation this past summer. In the face of tremendous pressure from the state Clamshell called off its planned occupation of the Seabrook facility even though it had over 5,000 people committed to occupy. This decision created a crisis in the Clamshell's decision-making process. The affinity groups could not make a decision by consensus so the coordinating committee called it off in spite of a lot of occupation.

Since the time Clamshell has been moving away from occupations and toward small, purely symbolic actions and lobbying as strategy. In addition to urging people to send postcards to the NRC they have held only small fence crossings for the purpose of sym-



bolic actions and for getting arrested.


Many clams now fear that Clamshell will never call another occupation at Seabrook. As a result, a group called Clams for Democracy has formed. It seeks a more democratic organizational structure and a more confrontational attitude toward the government.


The divisions now developing in Clamshell are not unique: in the Crabshell Alliance as well there is an ongoing argument between those who see non-violence as a philosophy and those who see it as a tactical question. The former tend to favor cooperation with the government while the latter see the government as part of the en-

emy.

Clamshell is the largest and most developed of the anti-nuclear alliances, and as such its crisis last summer points to a larger crisis in the anti-nuclear movement—a crisis in its dominant philosophy and organizational structure.

As a theory of social change, non-violence suggests that only through disciplined pacifism can people realize their latent power and step out of the old reality and into the new. Accordingly, all changes in human relationships wrought in the past have led to the degradation of today's society because the violent tactics used enabled the most violent to consolidate their power and exert it on a day-to-day basis. Thus, to the pacifist, the roots of present-day inequalities and exploitation are the means by which the present system came into being, and not with the development of the system itself—violence begets violence. . . . Therefore, in order to bring about any real social change, the tactics used must be confined to non-violent ones so that the means used by one group of people to oppress another will not exist.





What many practitioners of non-violence fail to realize is that there are two kinds of violence. The first is the kind used to acquire or maintain personal gain. This type includes not only the violence of warfare but also the violence by which the system maintains itself; the violence of working at breakneck speed in poisonous conditions under the threat of lost livelihood is no less real than the violence of the gun, only more subtle. The nuclear industry uses this sort of violence every day—both to its workers and to the public, over who's head it holds the sword of nuclear accidents.

The second class of violence is the type used by those oppressed by the first to throw off the oppressor. It is a form of self-defense in that its aim is in stopping violence of the first kind. The violence used by the Hungarian and Czech people in an attempt to prevent the Russians from re-instituting state-capitalism in their countries is a good example of this kind of violence. There comes a point in opposing the seekers of cold profit when violence is the only alternative to death. The Vietnam War and hundreds of other similar incidents show that this society is quite capable of killing millions. At that point, non-violence becomes an impediment to the fight against this society.

Just as it is foolish to think that the Viet Nam War was ended primarily by US demonstrators, it would be ridiculous to be-



lieve that armed struggle looms in the anti-nuke movement's near future. However, demonstrations in Europe have shown that the fight against nuclearism will have to become more militant if the movement is to put an end to nuclear plants and weapons. In Germany in 1976, 28,000 people occupied the Wyl nuclear plant site and they physically drove off the police who came to arrest them. Instead of merely making a symbolic statement and then accepting arrest, they utilized the strength of their numbers and collective principles to make an even stronger statement by not accepting the state's right to arrest them. They were ultimately successful as the building of the Wyl plant was consequently canceled by the German Government.

A confrontation of similar proportions was also quite possible at the Seabrook site, where after a demonstration of 20,000 people, 5,000 were committed to "going over the fence." Sadly the Clamshell hierarchy decided to cancel the occupation rather than force a confrontation. Instead of progressing, the Clamshell group has become fragmented and the leaders have gone so far as to propose solutions to the nuclear problem through legislative means. By abandoning the occupation, the Clam has raised the question of whether or not pacifists will be willing to continue the fight against nuclear plants and weapons or will they abandon their principles in confrontation with state violence.

Non-violence became associated with the anti-nuclear movement at the outset because of the influence of pacifist groups in the movement's initial organizing. Because of this historic influence and because of initial success in using symbolic actions, non-violence and no-nukes became virtual synonyms. But while pacifism can offer moral and ethical rationalities as to why activism is important, the pacifist analysis cannot answer the political question of why nukes exist. To fill that void, many people began to look for the economic and political importance to the capitalist system and the state. In doing this, many people began to see that the forces representing nuclear interests would never voluntarily stop producing them. They would have to be forced to stop directly by ever more militant actions.



This all sounds very good on paper, and it seems to have worked at the various demonstrations. It should be remembered, however, that the recent demonstrations across the country were quite different from the conditions of day-to-day life. They were, in a word, ideal. Both sides had an understanding of what was going to happen. For their part, the police and industry powers all cooperated, and quite nicely, to the point that a tacit agreement of sorts was reached allowing the demonstrations to happen if the protesters also cooperated by causing a minimum of obstruction and delay. The police often went so far as to take non-violence training themselves where they learned about the type of people they would be facing and ways to get them to cooperate. By presenting their "human" face the police were able in many cases to elicit cooperation when resistance was supposedly the rule of the day. Forgotten was the fact that under different, non-ideal circumstances the police can act in a quite different fashion in fulfilling their roles as defenders of the arms and energy industries and the status quo in general.



strategy for social revolution



"Those who make a revolution by halves only dig their own graves"

The Torness May Event was a welcome development in the long struggle for an ecologically sound environment. It was part of a process which started long before and which continues. If that process is to be successful then we must sort out our ideas and activity.

Who got us in this mess?

Why are we saddled with this disastrous nuclear technology in the first place? Briefly, technology is developed by the powerful for their own ends - towards more profit, power, control. As capitalism aspired to dominate the world so its technology grew up with it to make that domination possible. In recent decades waste and exploitation of resources have increased as a rampant consumerism has enabled capitalist firms to maintain competition and profits - the worst example is probably the car industry. Due to the complexity of modern capitalism and the resultant need for national and supranational planning and cooperation, the State has become the major force in society, taking over necessary but unprofitable sectors and also providing full social control - necessary because working people now have the means (if not the will) to take over and totally transform this society. So the State centralises to survive. Its technology and hence the environment reflects this. Nuclear power is probably the most advanced example but must be seen as just one part of a deliberately organised whole.

If we are to change things - no easy or short-term task - then we need a constructive and effective long term strategy.

Nothing can be created, nothing move or happen without the consent (grudging or otherwise) of working people. Our labour produces everything. The ruling classes hold their power by exploiting our labour, by buying and controlling, brainwashing and coercing us. However it is this very labour which is our main source of strength, for it is the work-process which brings us together, unites us and makes possible the socialisation of society through those directly involved siezing the means of production and distribution and turning them over to useful ends. This natural step completely undermines the ruling class who are left with only naked force to try to reestablish themselves.

Seeing what is ours and preparing to take it back.

Half-measures, isolated campaigns, inappropriate or out-dated means are either not enough, a waste of energy, or dangerous dead-ends. We have to develop an overall strategy and tactics consistent with our aims. This means organising and preparing for the social revolution. Industry - Workers in each industry and service must encourage each other to question how they are being used and controlled and how their industry relates to others, to society and to the environment. This should be a continuous process of self-education, complemented by the day to day struggle for better conditions; living-standards and so on. This means the growth of a new movement within each industry, to aim and organise for the ultimate siezure of those industries (including services and agriculture) and for their management and coordination by local workers councils and industrial federations.

Our responsibility is to get stuck in straight away creating workers groups and networks within each industry and every town. Their task is to spread ideas and active solidarity. Eventually they will become the focus for the great struggles for control of production. They must be consistently independent and anti-authoritarian and shake off all attempts at take-over (by the Left) or incorporation into safe channels (by the Unions). Without such an organised movement workers will be either coopted, manipulated and demoralised or be unprepared and badly beaten by the present or future rulers. With such organised activity our education and ability, our confidence and supportiveness at work will increase until we are strong enough to win any struggle. This is a call to all wage-workers - Create workers groups now! Link up!

Community - In parallel with workers groups we need community groups to respond to their own and other peoples needs, as regards the material necessities of life and their fair distrib-

ution. They should be making demands and imposing decisions on what is to be produced and built and what services provided. At the same time they are concerned with the environment and all aspects of social life. In fact many community should be (and are) operating in an area to fight particular aspects of local conditions (housing, educational facilities, provision of services etc.) as well as longer-term groups to strengthen local solidarity and mutual aid. Focal points for communication and coordination are crucial - bookshops, cafes, pubs..... Again the ever-present threat of being taken over or coopted into the system must be understood and resisted.

The long-term strategy is for people to create enough confidence, strength and resources to be able, when the opportunity arises, to seize control of whole areas, and when possible and desirable to defend themselves against State forces. It will not be enough to be in control of the workplaces - working people have to have control of the streets.



Political- While workers and community groups are of course inherently political it is of prime importance to create a specifically political movement to continually question, analyse, and argue about all aspects of life. There needs to be constant agitation for an anarchist society and way of life. This can best be achieved through local anarchist groups with regional national and international link-ups. These groups have the task of promoting and defending our ideas (and comrades) against anyone, and seeing that our movement grows and yet stays uncompromisingly hostile to all the institutions and organisations working to control and smash us.

In the day to day struggles, the workplace and community groups will inevitably have successes and failures, growing or collapsing, being taken over or compromised, or even physically suppressed. It is through a strong network of anarchist groups that lessons can be learned and organised agitation and resistance maintained.

It is also crucial that we develop a far more profound libertarian analysis of all aspects of society and not continue to accept shallow slogans and statements (e.g. this article? - Typist). While the fundamental beliefs and instincts of anarchism remain, crystallising the desire for freedom and the will to resist domination, the ability to explain and oppose capitalism is weak. Without tackling this, we will undermine all our efforts.



Ultimately, anarchist groups must prepare both theoretically and practically for the social revolution.


These three fields of struggle-work, community and political-overlap and complement each other and spread the struggle against all forms of domination. With independent resources and media, we can gradually create the basis of the future society, a world without governments, wage-labour, money, classes, pollution, poverty or personal oppression - an anarchist society run directly by the people themselves.

Opposition

The exercise and threat of power is the basis of our enslavement. Power through the monopoly of organised force, control of the management of the economy and control of information, communication, and the education system. Indeed, the very structure of and relationships within society perpetuate obedience. Trying to change things in any way, however small, always meets with opposition. But to seek, as anarchists do, the total transformation of society for the better, inevitably meets the full might and ingenuity of the ruling class and its institutions. We have to understand very clearly how they function - their strengths and weaknesses and their adaptability.

Briefly, we can see the obvious agents of repression - police, judiciary, jails and armed forces. Also the prison-like places of work, education and even entertainment and home-life, each with its chain of command. Backing up this reality is the manipulation of the media to distort and brainwash. This is all blatant. However, the most insidious weapon of the state is the institutionalisation and cooption of all real opposition, drowning us in a sea of bureaucracy, representation and reformism. Trades Union structures integrate workers into the capitalist system. Political parties and their various front organisations absorb activists, turning them towards Social Democracy or authoritarian sects, always controlled by a middle-class intelligentsia. Likewise, reformist organisations like Friends of the Earth, charities, pressure groups. (Religion of course, in its modern trendy forms, continues to seize the minds of the disillusioned.)

Some of the dangerous forms of cooption in the anti-nuclear movement for example



will be:-

a) Voting - Trust in elected representatives to argue for your opinions and legislate. The Ecology Party is the major group pushing this illusion. Don't vote!

b) Lobbying representatives - or candidates. Ask them to change their plans. This is laughable

c) Enquiries - Trust in experts, scientific or sociological, to be objective and find the best solution for all concerned - i.e. the State! Boycott all such enquiries! Set up our own!

d) Joining well-oiled organisations - S.W.P., Fo.E., CND, go with the crowd, follow the leaders, join endless campaigns, recruitment, reformism. Any dissidents inside waste time and energy fighting the bureaucracy above them. Form your own groups!

The anti-nuclear struggle must strengthen the libertarian movement and influence in society - at work, in the community and the anarchist groups and networks. All institutionalised and symbolic 'opposition' only strengthens the power of professionals and the State bureaucracy. It means death to effective independent resistance.

Organise now.

What I have written is intended as a call to action, not an interesting little discussion piece, or something to nit-pick at. It concerns the nature of an effective strategy for overthrowing the system, and is based on my experience of the anarchist, anti-nuclear and workers movements.

With the State intensifying repression, with our increasing alienation from the structure of society, with ecological disaster now a real possibility, it is fucking urgent that a genuine and successful social revolution takes place. While social rupture is inevitable, its favourable outcome largely depends on the groundwork we do today. It is our task and our responsibility both to spread these ideas and spread resistance.

Create anarchist groups, workers groups, community groups, bookshops, centres, papers, leaflets, stickers; support prisoners, write on walls, demonstrate, picket, reclaim the streets, sabotage nuclear construction, argue, analyse, prepare; organise picnics, music, meetings; become stronger, more consistent, tighter, clearer. In this way we will become more influential and effective all the time.

Letters &c.

Since the last E&A was printed we have had a number of contacts with other groups. We don't undertake to print all letters received (or even to produce another issue!), and most of them weren't intended for printing anyway. However we will pass on any information which we think might be useful or inspire.

FROM BELFAST:

"About 30 people from Belfast went down to a Carnival in Dublin over a weekend in June. 8 of us set off on the Friday and staged nuclear "accidents" in some of the towns on the way down. We had 2 vans, one marked as the "nuclear waste" unit and the second as "nuclear recovery". The first van had to drop a barrel of nuclear waste. Both vans then had to block the road with flashing blue and hazard lights on. Both crews blocked the road at both ends with road signs, cones and tape. The drum was then checked. Once this had been done the barrel was placed on a stretcher and put back in the van. While this was going on people were distributing leaflets to the passers by and people in cars. After that we got out as quick as possible.

Reactions differed from town to town. In Dundalk the people watching cheered and waved as we left. In Dunleer a garage owner came at us with a sledgehammer and smashed one of our signs. The town was really packed because of the petrol shortage and the bold flyn (garage owner) had a massive tail back of cars wanting petrol. The police came after us on foot because their car must of been stuck in the traffic jam, we got away.

In Dublin on the Saturday 3 of us walked thru the park in our nuclear suits. People were totally freaked out! Quite alot of people connected our little demonstration with the proposed building at Carnsore Point."



SOME RECENT (RECEIVED 7TH AUGUST) NEWS FROM TORNESS:

"I've just got back from Torness and as promised here are a few of the things I saw or found out. They have been quite busy on site, especially on the sea shore where large amounts of rock have been built up. The quarry area that has been excavated is at least four times the area that we saw in May. A road has been prepared but not surfaced running down to the gate on the Barns Ness side of the site. One of the two cottages by this gate has been modernised and is inhabited by someone who works on the site plus his family and a large black labrador (who is not very friendly). The four caravans that are near this are still empty and neglected (possible accomodation for demonstrators?).

The large fabrication building is now completed and appears to be in use - there are a number of large cranes round this building. There are cranes near the sea shore and in the quarry as well. This includes one very large tower crane (possibilities for occupation?). The vehicles on site are parked in an unfenced area a short way behind the bank that runs along the A1 (this includes large trucks, earthmovers and bulldozers). The Thorntonloch side of the site is very much like it was in May, however they have made a large pile of sand against the fence on the beach which would make it pretty easy to climb over the fence at this point. Security on site seems pretty casual - the only security guards I saw were on the front gate. When the workers were going on site in the morning they didn't seem to check their identity in any way. They were more careful over vehicles however.

This will give you a rough idea of the site at present: →

