

anarchist fortnightly **Freedom**

Vol. 53 No. 3

8 FEBRUARY 1992

FIFTY PENCE

"Human progress is measured by the extent government power and private property are reduced."

Errico Malatesta

The alternative to the political party circus: **DEMAND THE IMPOSSIBLE!**

Are you happy to live in a country where the gap between rich and poor has become the most severe since records began, not by accident or mismanagement, but because it was planned? Where people, some of them children, sleep on the streets because social security changes give them little alternative? Where housing subsidy has been cut for the have-nots yet lavished on the haves? In which Her Majesty's Inspectors, reporting on the schools to which most of us send our children even if ministers don't, find a quarter unsatisfactory? Where the trains run late, and dirty, or don't run at all, not because we lack an effective Citizen's Charter but because levels of subsidy commonplace in Europe are here

seen as somehow immoral? There is more; much more.

Did any readers sigh and say 'there are the *Freedom* editors belly-aching again'? Well, we purposely omitted the quotes for what is in fact the opening paragraph of a hard-hitting editorial in *The Guardian* ('Debates to disturb a sleepy lagoon', 29th January 1992).

It goes on to ask how is it possible that after thirteen years of mismanagement "we have got a Conservative lead over Labour?" And they agree when "Labour complains of collusion between the Conservative Party and its captive press to present the agenda in purely Tory terms. True and shameful, but it's not the whole answer."

We quite agree. We would even partially agree with *The Guardian* that "the whole purpose of Labour is to build a fairer, more decent society" - but only partially since, with exceptions one can count on one's fingers, Labour politicians are as ambitious to win power as any other politicians. And one has only to observe the number who have used the party and office as a stepping stone to lucrative business appointments.

The Guardian recognises that the Labour lot are "endlessly backpeddling" but that doesn't matter, apparently, if only they could "co-ordinate their approach to ensure that the tale told by one is the tale told by all". Of course the Conservatives are well-trained parrots in that respect.

The editorial concludes:

"Speculation as to what a Kinnock government might do is entirely necessary, but it's not the whole of the story. This election ought also to turn on a national audit of the Conservative years. That is what they are trying to dodge; and what they must now be pinned to."

Surely that memorable opening paragraph sums up the Conservative years for all to see.

And if the Labour Party wins in May/June they will inherit those years of Tory mismanagement (for everyone but the top 1% and the 24% up-and-coming) just as they have on previous occasions. And inevitably they will be the party of austerity and after five years will be back in Opposition for another thirteen years.

The Guardian, as a pillar of capitalist liberalism, had not a word of criticism of the capitalist system as such, though it obviously shared the idea of a "fairer, more decent society".

As anarchists we believe that capitalism will never produce a fair and decent society. Far from being dogmatic or 'fundamentalists' on the
(continued on page 2)

WHERE'S THE ENEMY?

The Russians have made it clear that they are no longer directing their nuclear missiles at target cities in the USA or Britain. The USA and Britain are saying that they are no longer targetting Russian cities. And both Russia and USA are scrapping thousands of their missiles and warheads. Britain and France not only keep theirs, but are actually up-dating them. The Polaris is to be replaced by the Trident with lots of extra warheads.

What we would like to know is: where is the new potential enemy? After all, you can only try to justify all this expensive hardware if you can create, via the media, an enemy. For years it was the Russian bear. Are we going to be told that the new spectre is Iraq or Iran or Pakistan? The other new 'danger' is that Russian nuclear scientists will be selling their know-how to the up-and-coming third world countries - and you can't trust those desperados. The British approach was along these lines, including the fact that the collapse of

the Soviet Union actually added to the possibility of any upstarts in the new republics wanting to rule the world. What nonsense!

It seems that Yeltsin's recent visit with the television cameras showing him and Major grinning like Cheshire cats and patting each other on the back, we are for a brief moment all loving each other! Yeltsin said to Major 'that's alright John, keep your Tridents, we quite understand'. And that joker of a War Minister, Tom King, was pointing out on television that of course all the British warheads were a mere flea-bite
(continued on page 2)

Have you still not renewed your subscription to FREEDOM?

DEMAND THE IMPOSSIBLE!

(continued from page 1)

subject: if only capitalism could do so we would jump on the capitalist band-wagon! But there is no way of reconciling the socialist-anarchist approach of co-operation and production for needs with the capitalist ideal of competition-in-tooth-and-claw and production for profit.

The Labour Party, if and when it wins at the hustings, can only cooperate the capitalist system (assuming - perish the thought - that they were secretly intending to abolish it as their forebears of the Second International more than 100 years ago were sure they could do by the ballot box).

If only they could operate the capitalist system, and with good intentions they might achieve part of *The Guardian's* objectives of "a fairer, more decent society". But governments are impotent in a world increasingly of multi-nationals operating in every currency and playing as important a role as the national banks in the money markets. And with the off-shore havens (and it's not just Maxwell who made profitable use of them) there is no legal possibility of stopping them.

Incidentally, for our young readers, the first thing the Thatcher government did in 1979 was to 'set free' the export of capital - and needless to say it was exported with a vengeance at the expense of investing in industry in this country. It has continued ever since.

One modest Labour proposal, if elected, is to introduce a minimum wage of £3.40 per hour. On the front page of *The Sunday Times* (26th January) a six-column heading reads 'Labour wage plan would kill jobs, say textile firms'.

"Britain's biggest clothing company plans to cut 10,000 jobs if Labour wins the elections and goes ahead with its proposal for a statutory minimum wage."

Coats Viyella, which employs more than 30,000 workers, "says it will shift more than a third of its production abroad". 'Abroad' means where there is cheap labour, and cheap labour is no longer just the Far East and North Africa but *Eastern Europe* as well, as Coats Viyella's boss, Neville Bain, indicated.

Courtaulds, the second largest company with 16,000 workers, "agreed that a

WHERE'S THE ENEMY?

(continued from page 1)

compared with those of the USA and Russia; even if they carried out their intention to scrap about ten times as many warheads as Britain and France possessed, they would still be left with about ten times as many! So our 'nuclear potential' just allows our politicians to sit at the top table at the UN and give themselves airs of grandeur.

But we, the people, are paying for this expensive billionaire's charade. When will we wake up and do something?

minimum wage would cause big job losses but declined to predict a figure". However, they had no hesitation in saying that they "would move some operations to the Far East and close others".

1991 has obviously been a disastrous year not only for small businesses but also for the banks, insurance companies and big business. The liberal *Guardian* provides a daily ration of profits that have been halved as well as massive losses. This not only means reduced revenue from taxes in 1992 but, even assuming an up-turn in 1992, one can be sure that the losses of 1991 will be offset against the profits of 1992. Not to mention that the growing number of unemployed (they are now talking of three million by the end of 1992) not only means less taxes, National Insurance and purchasing powers, but also a few more hundred thousand unemployed queueing up for the dole.

The Labour Party is relying on investment in industry so as to increase profitable production which will create jobs and produce revenue from the profits. Unfortunately for them all the G7 - the major industrial countries of the capitalist world - are saying the same thing and they are all either in deep recession or on the way there.

The crisis of capitalism is of its own making. We would have preferred to say that it was the result of the militancy of the anti-capitalist left, which would be forcing on government a "fair and decent society". It is not the case, and it would seem that the Left in general (some anarchists included, alas) is too consumerist orientated, despondent, apathetic or individualistic to think it worthwhile to 'demand the impossible'.

As we see it, the crisis of capitalism is the result of the insatiable greed of its operators. Mass production has made them forget the first law of capitalism: that of supply and demand. When supply

exceeds demand capitalism is in trouble. And this is the simple, obvious explanation for the 'crisis'. To deal with 'over-production' in the '80s the government (via the money-lenders) opened the floodgates of borrowing. Property prices (not values) escalated, inflation likewise. People bought and sold houses making a profit with each move. It couldn't go wrong, so they were led to believe. Bringing down inflation upset the apple-cart! Now the suckers are stuck with houses they can't sell and with mortgage instalments they can't repay, and banks with outstanding billions. The latest figures give mortgage loans at £300,000 million and plastic card credits at £50,000 million. The farmers, most of whom inherited their land when it cost

According to the latest government figures, the richest 1% of taxpayers - those with incomes over £70,000 a year, have had their standard of living increased through cumulative tax reductions since 1979 by no less than £700 a week.

nothing, got big ideas when from £200 an acre in 1969 it jumped to £2,000 in 1980, and borrowed to the tune of £7,000 million on the strength of it and are now crying their eyes out because land, like the houses, is not a speculator's paradise.

Labour government intent on running the capitalist system better than their Tory opponents will inevitably fail. Were they really socialists and not just at most social-democrats offering the poor, the mums and the oldies a few lollypops, they would have to introduce immediate penal taxation on the 25% of those that we anarchists would call the rich. *The Guardian* (bless them!) refers to these people in a paragraph worth quoting with a wry smile.

"And if higher taxation means too fierce a threat to people who though prosperous are not rich,

who through the years of euphoria have taken on commitments they could barely afford, that caution is defensible. Yet gradualism is only defensible when the eventual destination is not in doubt."

To propose an increase of the super-tax level by a mere 10% is playing with the problem of seeking a real re-distribution of wealth.

The Tories propose a reduction of a penny in the basic (25%) income tax. All the Labour Party are committed to do if elected is to reinstate the basic tax. We would have thought that if their only solution for a 'fairer' society is through taxation then why not leave the Tories' lower taxation and increase the next level. After all, the Tories' reduction benefits more the better-off than the poor, many of whom are too poor to even achieve the heights of the lower taxation level!

If the Labour Party meant business they would also scrap tax relief on all the 'perks' which benefit only the better-off, nor forget the tax allowances on mortgages at a time when council rents are rising rapidly.

But having said all this, we don't believe for one moment that a Labour government would succeed in "taxing the rich while the pips squeak" (assuming they actually wanted to), which was attributed to former Labour Chancellor Denis Healey who strongly denied having said so (and we believe him!).

So apart from a few palliatives - and they might even postpone the Tories, crazy attempts to privatise the railways and postal services - nothing much will change: the poor will get poorer, the rich richer, for the real power lies elsewhere.

Until more people 'demand the impossible' and are prepared to give their time and commitment to bring it about - the politicians won't, and they can't anyway - we shall have these periodical spectacles of politicians denouncing each other and promising utopia for a vote and rewarding the bottom 70% with the stick once elected. After all, they are only operating the capitalist system. If we don't like it why don't we do something about getting rid of it instead of every five years putting a cross on our gravestones as wage-slaves?

Pity the poor rich

Mr Green, the former Public Prosecutor who was caught red-handed by a zealous copper as he was chatting up a prostitute in the Kings Cross area, is again in the news. At the time he did the 'honourable thing' and resigned as Public Prosecutor (we fail to see the connection - after all, the Public Prosecutor doesn't have to prosecute prostitutes; his victims are in a different category altogether). However, his little wife stood by him (as in America Clinton's little wife is doing likewise) and declared her love for him. But alas now that the cameras are no longer focused, Mr and Mrs Green are parting three months after the Kings Cross saga.

What interests us are the purely material details that emerge from these affairs. Sir Allan Green (what will the Queen have to say about the 'Sir' - although she is now probably

more broad-minded thanks to other members of the family). He resigned from a £77,000 a year (£1,480 a week) job.

The protestations of love (before the cameras) in October was followed in November with the news that their five-storey period house was on the market for £725,000. It was sold before Christmas (where's the recession?) and the lady bought herself a house nearby. During the 'crisis' when they were pursued by the gutter press they were able to escape to their 'holiday home' in Minorca.

Ah! The poor rich are really a persecuted minority, aren't they. We are happy to report that he won't be on the dole too long as he is returning to the Bar in April, not as a prosecutor but as an *ami du peuple* - a defence advocate!

The latest FREEDOM PRESS title

STRIP THE EXPERTS
by Brian Martin

70 pages £1.95 (post free inland)

Freedom Press
Bookshop

84b Whitechapel High
Street, London E1 7QX

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



The Rubbishing of Socialism

Socialism is defined as a scheme of social organisation which places means of production and distribution in the hands of the community. This would seem to be a laudable idea provided that a) coercion is minimal, and b) 'community' is limited to small populations.

For the first requirement to be satisfied, the idea would need to have a vast majority in favour of it. The second would depend on many factors, not the least being the practicability of easily and quickly being able to ascertain the informed opinions of every individual in that community.

Unfortunately, socialism has acquired a bad reputation as a result of the usage of its name by national movements in Russia, Eastern Europe, Africa, Asia and China, where 'community' has been translated to mean the state and 'socialism' foisted upon populations at the point of a gun.

Non-socialist leaders tend to have been quick to sabotage the efforts of 'socialists' to consolidate their revolutionary actions, starting with actual military invasions of Russian territory in attempts to prevent its success. This interference in Russian affairs served, among other things, to ensure that 'socialism' in that country became even more oppressive than it might otherwise have been, proving also that it is well-nigh impossible to create and sustain socialism in one country if a significant proportion of the population are not sympathetic to the idea.

It is a strange thing that socialism is acceptable, and widely practised, in family life but is shed as soon as children reach working age. The process creeps in when children leave nursery school, to be streamed and rewarded in the competitive environment of the junior schools, so that they are faced with the dual standard of socialism in their home lives and market forces at school. Competition replaces co-operation; selflessness is okay for Jesus and Mother Theresa, but not for real people in the real world. The best way to be charitable, apparently, is to become so rich that your donations do not hurt your bank balance.

The desirability of great wealth would be plain to see if the Sultan of Brunei, the Queen, Onassis, Getty et alia, could be shown to be divinely happy, but nothing is further from the case. Wealth brings disadvantages like fear of kidnapers, robbers and restrictions imposed for security reasons. Many film stars have died in loneliness after disastrous serial marriages. Many pools jackpot winners have tasted the bitter delights of success. Wealthy people are inevitably under threat from the have-nots. To

suffer in splendour, it is claimed, is better than suffering in poverty, but there are limits and the poor know what genuine friendship means.

Plainly, authoritarianism is inimicable to socialism. Nor can socialists dabble in the Market Economy and compete successfully with non-socialist countries. Success, in the 'real world' of Market economy (i.e. capitalism) depends ultimately upon the threat of war, but socialism can have nothing to do with standing armies, secret services and weaponry.

Socialism, as a creed of co-operation, requires that people behave altruistically. It follows that weaponry has no place in a socialist society. One of the drawbacks of weapons is that the more they are manufactured, deployed and stored, the easier it is for them to fall into the hands of undesirable or opposing factions: one non-socialist with a gun can pose a serious threat to a whole community of unarmed people, but if there are no weapons to be had, the threat does not exist.

What it amounts to is that 'socialism' has deservedly been rubbished because it was nothing like the real thing, but in giving up the socialist ideal (if they ever believed in it, which is doubtful) Kinnock, Hattersley, Kaufman and Co., have thrown out the baby along with the dirty bath water. Real socialism has to be based on a libertarian approach and should be seen as the positive side of anarchism.

The capitalist leaders of America and Western Europe are making much of the collapse of 'socialism', but this must not be allowed to invalidate the real thing.

EFC

TWO'S COMPANY

Some anarchists may have noted that nowadays there are not merely two Workers' Revolutionary Parties, two Communist Parties of Great Britain (despite the fact that the largest of such is now the Democratic Left), innumerable SDPs, but also two SPGBs. Since we have a long history of battling with one SPGB, the reaction 'so what?' to this last is to be expected; but it's worth a little interest.

The majority SPGB has long professed to be more influenced by William Morris than Karl Marx, has long insisted that it does not interpret Clause Six of its statement (which says that socialists must take control of government) literally, since forming a government would be in their view a denial of Clause Five (which quotes Marx that the working class must emancipate itself), their party having for a long time insisted that:

a) there can be no transitional period in which a revolutionary government exercises power;
b) the existence of a government is evidence of the existence of class divisions.

The minority SPGB has been formed resurrecting the insistence (more or less unknown in SPGB literature since the mid-50s) that the party's aim is to take over government (and with it control of the armed forces, police, law courts and other instruments of state control). It still denies any intention of creating a transitional regime. It denounces the majority, who it claims falsely pretended adherence to the party statement (no doubt Clause Six is meant) in order to acquire the party's assets.

Obviously both parties are putting their own interpretations on these two clauses, which cannot be read absolutely literally be reconciled.

The minority has in the current issue of its paper (*Socialist Studies*) come up with two supplementary theories:

Since in recent years the majority SPGB has woken up to the dangers of environmental destruction and has seen that capitalist (private or state) accumulation is generally achieved at the expense of ecological destruction, the minority has obviously felt itself compelled to deny that capitalism as a system (as distinct from the odd uncontrolled individual capitalist) does anything so

vile. They brand the Green interests of their former comrades as unmarxist. Obviously they have not read Marx's *Grundrisse*, still less Engels' study on the subject, and the marginal comments on this which Marx wrote and Dunayevskaya published a year or so before she died, criticising Engels for failing to go far enough.

Likewise, as some members of the majority SPGB argue that the rich constantly accumulate a higher percentage of total property (and as Adam Buick takes a mid-position accepting that some statisticians deny this, when talking of the top 20%, but pointing out that it is obviously true when talking of the ultra-rich, say the top 0.02%) they launch an all-out accusation of dishonesty. Their arguments are regrettably limited to the wealthy western world, failing to note the extent to which the third world has provided a sub-proletariat for the west. They also depend on 'de iure' ownership, neglecting the extent to which the wealth of the 80% is lodged in building societies, pension funds, insurance, banks, etc., where it is controlled by very small managerial-capitalist elites, who have the use, and frequently enjoyment (not merely in the Maxwell sense), of this wealth, so that if not 'de iure' at least 'de facto' the elite owns the property of the many.

But though these points, and others, may well in due time become the central issues in debate between the two parties, they are at the moment only side-issues. The main point is that two diametrically opposed interpretations are put on two clauses; neither of which in strict logic can be justified from the plain meaning of the words. How has this happened? Let us briefly look at the party history.

The SPGB was formed in 1904 under the influence of the then Socialist Party of Canada. There Laurence Gronlund, a right-wing reformer, decided that the way to get capitalists to accept a Fabian pattern of reformism would be to create a mass workers' party on a revolutionary programme, frighten the capitalists into seeking Fabian allies. Naturally the party he created for this limited purpose immediately broke with its founder. It was in its early days allied with the

(continued on page 4)

Towards an Anarchist Economics: some observations

I suspect that the development of an anarchist version of the 'mixed' economy is an underlying assumption of both John Griffin in his pamphlet *A Structured Anarchism*¹ and the now voluminous series of essays on economic and related issues by Colin Ward as featured down the years in *Freedom*, *The Raven*, *New Statesman* and *Society* and elsewhere.

It is perhaps surprising that it has taken anarchists so long to come to this position. Anarcho-communism's traditional rejection of money and wage labour as a means of exchange and distribution of goods and services implied the development of some sort of 'planned' economy, albeit a decentralised and anarchist one. However, as Griffin and other writers pointed out, the only briefly extant example of an 'anarchist' economy in operation, i.e. Republic Spain 1936-39, maintained the widespread use of 'money' as a means of exchange. True there were rural collectives which did establish 'communism' internally, but these relied on the use of money in their relations with the wider economy. Moreover, Gaston Leval's *Collectives in the Spanish Revolution*² cites the existence of non-collectivised enterprises and self-employment within the Spanish Republic's economy functioning alongside the collectives.

Even today with the use of computers, information technology, et al, I do not believe that a centrally planned economy can satisfy the 'wants' as well as the needs of a society's population. Just look at what happened in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. If we are to gain wider acceptance of anarchism as

a social philosophy we need to come up with an anarchist economic approach which people could see might actually work, which will provide the food, the goods and services we associate with a civilised standard of life. To say in effect that 'it will be all right on the night' and refuse to set up blueprints is to dodge the issue.

I believe that an anarchist economy could function as a mixture of worker's collectives/co-operatives, a large number of self-employed both in industrial and farming/small-holding activities, and a small private sector. This mixed economy would continue to use money as a medium of exchange and distribution, though its value would be more directly linked to the volume of goods and services produced than is currently the case. Production would be for need as much as for profit. We would be seeking to match production with consumption, which in a society with a less material ethos would hopefully be at a lower level than at present. The goods produced would no longer have 'built in obsolescence', worker's collectives would not waste their time producing useless or harmful goods and services; we would seek to minimise humanity's ecological impact on our fragile world. Workers would continue to be paid wages;³ there would continue to be banks, though these would be community controlled.⁴

An anarchist mixed economy would still have work, wages, factories, modern transport, production and consumption. However, the purpose and conditions of work would be different with useful goods and

services, reducing working hours and a dramatic increase in leisure and the quality of life.

This altered vision of how an anarchist economy could function is not in conflict with either the 'evolutionary' or 'revolutionary' paths to change. The point of many of Colin Ward's articles about matters economic is the possibilities offered by anarchist methods now. Worker co-operatives already exist, many people are already self-employed, and there is already a non-state 'black economy'. An evolutionary path of change can build on these existing facts. And what of the revolutionary and insurrectionary path? Well, the collectivised and *mixed* economy of Republic Spain was established in the aftermath of a popular insurrection, so both approaches are possible.

I personally prefer the evolutionary path, but what matters is that the concept of an anarchist economy is seen as viable. Unless our version of society can be seen as capable of feeding, housing, clothing people and meeting all their other needs, why should people trust our vision any more than the stale offerings of the political parties?

Jonathan Simcock

THE RAVEN - 16
ON EDUCATION (2)
96 pages, £2.50 (post free inland)
from FREEDOM PRESS

FREEDOM PRESS new titles

- **Children in Society: a libertarian critique** by Stephen Cullen, 43 pages, £1.20
- **Freedom to Go: after the motor age** by Colin Ward, 112 pages, £3.50
- **Work, Language and Education in the Industrial State** by Michael Duane, 36 pages, £1.00
- **Wildcat ABC of Bosses, cartoons** by Donald Room, 48 pages, £1.95

Please send cash with order to FREEDOM PRESS (post free inland, add 20% abroad)

Footnotes

1. J. Griffin, *A Structured Anarchism*, published by Freedom Press, 1991.
2. Gaston Leval, *Collectives in the Spanish Revolution*, page 6, published by Freedom Press.
3. In the 'collective' sector wage differentials would hopefully be greatly reduced.
4. Proudhon advocated a 'People's Bank' in 1840s France.

A woman scorned

In the past year, since her fall from grace, Margaret Thatcher has made free trips all over the world – seventeen in all – to solicit funds for her own Foundation Trust Fund which has been set up, in her words, to “perpetuate all the kinds of things I believe in”. Among its declared aims, the education of the general public in “the principles of political and economic freedom and market economy; the value of the rule of law and sound defence as a means of securing and maintaining international peace and harmony; the importance of strong international links between Britain, Europe and North America; the need for improved relations with the former Communist countries as they adopt democracy; and the encouragement of projects appropriate to the protection of the environment”.

Among the actual or prospective benefactors visited were the King of Saudi Arabia, the Sultan of Brunei, billionaire LiKa-Shing of Hong Kong, Rupert Murdoch, Sam Walton the richest man in America, and oil billionaires. So it appears that she is seeking the aid of foreigners to further her aims – a process people other than anarchists might call treason. Treason or not, it is sufficient evidence, if any more were needed that xenophobia, which quickly disappears when

money is put on the table, is strictly for use against the masses in order to further the ends of those who rule us. Margaret Thatcher and her titled friends are as patriotic as rattlesnakes. So, what is Maggie up to? Let us first back-track to the 1970s and the serious situation caused by the coal strike. The Monday Club spokesman, Geoffrey Rippon, then Shadow Foreign Secretary, only weeks before a general election in September 1974, was urging the next Tory government to “create a citizens’ voluntary reserve for home defence and duties in aid of the civil power”. Another Monday Clubber and ‘private army’ supporter, George Young, ex-MI6, ex-bank director, was busy enrolling National Front supporters into the Monday Club. Young had links with the retired General Sir Walter Walker who was the Civil Assistance (private army) leader who, among other things, was promoting projects aimed at giving South Africa a nuclear capacity.

Can there be any doubt that our ex-Prime Minister is so determined to get back into the driving seat that she would risk a coup to that end? Can there be any doubt that contingency plans exist, as they appear to have done in the

1970s, for suspension of ‘Parliamentary democracy’ and a resort to military intervention?

In *The Pencourt File* by Penrose and Courtiour, published in 1978, we read that Harold Wilson had suspicions that the deployment of troops on four separate occasions at Heathrow Airport might have been part of a contingency plan for a coup rather than for the protection of the airport itself.

With coups and civil wars creeping all over Europe, the time for complacency and faith in British fair play has passed. Just think about what could happen if Maggie played the race card, which is not very far up her sleeve, and certainly showed itself by way of Ridley. Take a look at the trustees of her foundation: they include her own be-knighted Lord McAlpine the former Tory Party treasurer, Earl Gowrie, Lord Harris of the Institute of Economic Affairs, Sir Geoffrey Leigh, Sir Mark Thatcher, and the Professor of (right wing) History Norman Stone. It is a mob that has Tory right wing written all over it in block letters – a sort of dad’s private army. So obvious is its partisan nature that the Charity

Commissioners refused its application for charitable status.

Mrs T, of course, is not powerful in her own right, her power deriving from a millionaire husband. This lack of personal power makes her determined to once again become the megaphone in that public relations department commonly called the House of Commons. There can be little doubt that she will play the race card in order to achieve that end.

EC

Russian nuclear scientists in demand

According to the Paris correspondent of *The Sunday Times* (26th January) it would appear that Iran is seeking to recruit former Soviet nuclear scientists. “Teams of ‘headhunters’ have offered £200,000 to sign up some of the top brains ... to help build an atomic bomb”.

Not too shocking. After all, the Americans did exactly the same thing at the end of World War Two. They recruited the German scientists involved with the development of the V1 and V2 missiles which killed a few thousand Londoners.

Two's Company

(continued from page 3)

American Socialist Labour Party, which was then coming together under Daniel De Leon’s influence. This latter believed in forming two parallel working class organisations - a socialist party and an industrial union federation - on lines very similar to syndicalism. In his strategy the party was to be elected, would immediately dissolve government and itself, and the union would then embark on a social general strike. The point of telling the boss class just when the strike was to be was that he assumed that the police, army, courts and state forces generally would accept that the revolution had law on its side, and therefore would not act against it.

(De Leon was a university professor, with doctorships of law and of classics. It is amazing how stupid clever people can be. Though part of his trouble seems to have been that he appears to have had a personal dislike of anarchists, whether he ever actually read anything by Kropotkin or Malatesta one doubts, but he continually attacked them for views they never expressed. Anyway, though he constantly insisted that a socialist state was a contradiction in terms, and therefore socialists should never form a government, and though - despite the inefficiency - his revolutionary strategy was a variant of syndicalism, he waged constant polemics against syndicalists.)

In Britain the SPGB was basically formed by dissident De Leonists. Con Lehane, the first secretary, had worked with James Connolly in Ireland. (He had been a provincial organiser, when the bosses’ thugs got a bit too heavy, Con thought it safer to come to England; he didn’t last long in the SPGB, went to the British IWW, then joined the IRA, eventually becoming a Clann na Poblachta member of the Irish Parliament; like his leader Sean McBride, he scabbed on Noel Browne when the latter tried to implement that party’s moderately reformist health proposals, and then engaged in McCarthyite witch-hunts against all leftists in Ireland. Anderson, the main founding speaker, had been a somewhat male-chauvinist SLP party organiser who had decamped with the funds. The party was pulled together (but at the expense of several splits) by a comrade called Fitzgerald; it now liked to think of him as its founder, ignoring his predecessors.

But the price of that refounding was a theoretical contradiction. Fitzgerald took the statement that ‘the emancipation of the working class must be the meaningless profession that Marx himself and every other marxist party makes it, but as a flat statement (very like that of De Leon’s) that there could be no such thing as a transitional socialist regime. But De Leon was attacked (only a minority of the working class was unionised, and so De Leonism was not a class organisation) and they needed an alternative strategy. They got round it by

leaving the matter unstated. It was possible to say we’ll form a socialist government to work a transition, but it won’t be a transitional government; or it was possible to say when we are elected the workers will spontaneously make a revolution, so that through we’ll be a nominal government, nominally in charge of the coercive mechanism of the state, we’ve no illusions that we can actually use them for socialist purposes.

Consequently the party has been through contradictory phases. Until World War One, despite the fact that many party members worked in or with the IWW, the SPGB was almost exclusively of an ‘impossibilist’ electoral party; then after the war there was an approximation to ‘left communism’ (the KAPD then, groups like Worker’s Voice and World Revolution now). In the late thirties and during the war the SPGB’s involvement in the pacifist movement led it to argue that mass individual resistance would prepare the ground and that socialist elections would be the rubber stamp which would legitimise revolution. There was a reaction against this just after the war, which led to Tony Turner being ousted out of the party; and briefly the word ‘impossibilist’ was revived, but revived by people who basically believed in some form of transitional socialist state, and they couldn’t admit such a belief. This created a theoretical vacuum, and eventually the anti-state position was reasserted.

Obviously, for an outsider, the answer is that both the SPGBs should agree to change the clauses of their principles. The minority would say that the emancipation is the task of the working class itself, ‘but nevertheless it will delegate this to a parliamentary elite of SPGB members’; the majority would say that the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest ‘and abolition’ of the powers of government ‘since plainly these intrinsically ruling class powers can never be used to make a classless society’.

An equal accommodation on the name would also, to an outsider, appear simple. Plainly, in fact, nothing of the sort will happen.

LO

By ordering your books through Freedom Press Bookshop you are helping us with our overheads!

News from Northern Ireland

A book review to start! I’ve just read a copy of *Breaking the Deadlock: a way out of the northern impasse* by Robert Heatley, published by Fulcrum Press at £1.50 (contact the Campaign for Democracy, 45-47 Donegal Street, Belfast). In a way it’s one of the more interesting plethora of ideas that seem to be bubbling out of the turmoil of recent times in the north of Ireland. Heatley is described as an economist “with his roots in protestant East Belfast” and his pamphlet is evidence of attempts to revive (maintain?) the tradition of protestant dissent and republicanism that goes back to Wolfe Tone and the United Irishmen (sic!) three hundred years ago. Bold as brass, Heatley claims that only reunification of Ireland outside the UK will solve the Northern Ireland problem, and then he goes on to outline processes and campaigns that would bring this about under the auspices of democracy, which really means parliamentarianism regionalised. So what is an ordinary anarchist to make of this and all the other earnest notions of the way forward? None of them seek what anarchists want, which is the utter transformation of society as we know it, with the abolition of wage slavery and the removal of authority. But might not some of the thinking in some of these groups and campaigns be of interest and worth critically supporting? Or should we strive to build an anarchist movement in Ireland?

statements about the will to make it as easy as possible for the British government to talk to them. Meanwhile, the IRA has continued to bomb the living shit out of downtown Belfast. When new security measures are put in place drawing troops and police into Belfast from other areas, protestant gun men kill a catholic working in a road-side chip van and the IRA blow up a pub, some shops, flats and a pizzeria in Derry. But the commercial targets just get up and on with it, if you’re to believe the minister concerned. However, freezes in government capital expenditure tell a different tale. Is this current phase of IRA activity a prelude to a ceasefire, the war-weary ask. Who can tell? And how will the unionists and loyalists react to any plans to include Sinn Fein in the Talks Process, no matter how far they distance themselves from the IRA? And what has any of this got to do with the building of peace and freedom in Ireland? Not a fucking tosser! It was the IRA who reportedly mounted the big cash robbery in Waterford where they spent the weekend drilling on the roof like workmen getting a bit of overtime. The most outrageous response to the heist of the century must surely have been that of catholic and protestant churchmen in Dublin who described the raid and people who didn’t give information to the Gardai as immoral. These are the same sanctimonious gits who think nothing of the immorality of the activities of the banks from which the money was taken.

Whichever we do, the politicians here are definitely shaping up for election time. Unionist knickers were severely twisted when an independent unionist councillor in Derry advised unionist voters in West Belfast to vote for the SDLP candidate to ensure that Gerry Adams doesn’t get back in. And everyone seems to be jockeying for positions. Cardinals and bishops are regularly on our radios telling us of the circumstances in which they feel Sinn Fein could come into the Talks Process. And Sinn Fein spokespersons have been making amazing

From banks and churches to Marxist-Leninists heading for a split! Despite loud claims to the contrary, it looks like the Workers Party is about to split, reflecting the tensions thrown up by changes in the USSR and so on. It’s the same old story. The boys who got the seats in the Dáil want to make the party a socialist reformers club. But the revolutionary old guard will not let them off so easily. Anyone for building an anarchist movement in Ireland then?

Dave Duggan

Free Love and Anarchism

Free Love and Anarchism

by Martin Henry Blatt

University of Illinois Press, 1989, £27.50

The promise of the title is rather belied by the subtitle, 'The Biography of Ezra Heywood', but the book is actually well worth reading. Ezra Heywood (1829-1893) was one of the remarkable line of individualists and mutualists who contributed so much to American anarchism during the nineteenth century but are little known outside the United States; thus he is well described in James J. Martin's *Men Against the State* (1953) but not even mentioned in standard histories of anarchism (from George Woodcock to Peter Marshall). Martin Henry Blatt has produced the first full-length biography, which is based on an academic thesis (with the usual defects of the genre) but is valuable and interesting.

Ezra Heywood came from a typical background – middle-class ancestors settled in New England for several generations, many respectable relations (the family name was change from Hoar because of its indecent sound!), intended for the ministry and sent to university – and he then followed a typical path away from it. He met the abolitionist leader William Lloyd Garrison, and in 1858 he abandoned the ministry to work for the campaign against slavery. He took a

prominent part in public life for the next half-century.

Heywood was involved in the abolitionist movement until the Civil War, which he opposed, and the emancipation of the slaves, which he welcomed. He then met the libertarian pioneer Josiah Warren and became one of many middle-class reformers in the labour movement, joining the National Labor Union and forming several Labor Reform Leagues, and associating with such like minds as Stephen Pearl Andrews, William Greene and Benjamin Tucker. In 1872 he began a monthly paper called *The Word*, which became the main vehicle of his ideas, together with his Co-operative Publishing Company. He advocated all kinds of reform, always with a strong libertarian element, and gradually adopted the word 'anarchism' as well as anarchistic ideas.

Heywood's main claim to fame, however, was not his general political and economic activity so much as his particular contribution to sexual liberation. He was much influenced by several women. He was originally converted to radical ideas by two women in the 1850s. In 1865 he married Angela Tilton, one of three sisters who were all active with their mother in several reform movements. The Heywoods were a very happy couple who

had four children and made a living by running a holiday home in Princeton. They were drawn into the free love movement by their support for its leading advocate, Victoria Woodhull, during which they helped to form and lead a Free Love League in 1873.

This was only one of their many organisations – in fact, if anything moved in New England a century ago, the Heywoods created a league for it. They were naturally involved in a Free Dress league and various Anti-Tax Leagues. Less predictably, they were involved in mesmerism, phrenology and homoeopathy, and they were active spiritualists, helping to form an Anti-Death League in 1878. Reform movements had strong links with pseudo-science and occultism in those days just as much as nowadays, and even more so in America. (Heywood added a nice touch, linking spiritualism with anarchism in their common struggle against death!) In 1879 the Heywoods joined an attempt to bring all these causes together in a Union Reform League, a precursor of the Progressive League in Britain half a century later.

Heywood came to grief over sex – or rather, over writing about it. His pamphlet *Uncivil Liberty* (1870) was one of the most successful texts in the campaign for women's rights. His sequel *Cupid's Yokes* (1876) went further in its attack on marriage and advocacy of free love, though his language was still mild. (By contrast, Angela Heywood's language in her

criticism of what she called 'heism' and her praise of sex was bolder than anyone else at the time.) *Cupid's Yokes* made Heywood famous – or infamous – because it led to his first arrest by the leading censor Anthony Comstock in 1877 and two years' imprisonment, though he was released by the President after six months.

Imprisonment made Heywood more extreme. He finally abandoned religion, though he remained soft on Jesus. He adopted a new calendar, replacing AD with YL – the Year of Love, counting from the formation of the Free Love League in 1873. (Another freethought and free love propagandist, Moses Harman, preferred EM – the Era of Man, counting from the martyrdom of Giordano Bruno in 1600.) He continued his campaign against Comstock's censorship, and was arrested several more times – in 1882 for publishing some of Walt Whitman's frankest poems and advertisements for a contraceptive douche provocatively called the 'Comstock Syringe', in 1883 for publishing contraceptive propaganda, and again in 1887 – but either he was acquitted or the prosecutions were dropped. But in 1890 he was arrested once more for publishing several frank sexual items and was again sentenced to two years' imprisonment. This time he served the full term, his health was broken, and he died a year after his release, a martyr to the cause of free speech about sex.

Blatt has worked hard in the primary
(continued on page 6)

Teaching and Teacher Training

Recent statements from the Minister for Education concerning the training of teachers are giving rise to much debate and concern about how education in local authority schools, i.e. for the great majority of children, is regarded by the current Conservative government. The general trend of those statements indicates that there should be far more time spent in actual teaching practice, supervised by competent teachers, and far less time spent in the study of theory. In no statement so far are we enlightened as to what the Minister himself means precisely by 'competent teacher' or by 'theory'.

The concept 'competent teacher' is full of ambiguity, riddled as it is with notions of 'good disciplinarian' that comes from the Victorian age. Then a teacher was held to be 'good' if he could keep order among a hundred pupils in the same room by compelling them to recite endless tables or copy bills or business letters by the hundred in 'copperplate', the compulsion operating, if not by the frequent use of the cane, though unmistakable body-language accurately read by the pupils to mean 'if you cause me the slightest embarrassment not only by failing to keep silence and good order, but by appearing not to be interested in everything that I say while this unwelcome visitor (inspector, head teacher or whoever) is present, you will have me to reckon with when they are gone, and you know very well what that means!'

Such methods of keeping order among large numbers derived directly from the social class structure of society where the lower orders were to be 'schooled' (as in animal training) to become 'disciplined', a euphemism for 'blindly obedient', in preparation for the factory work that so often consisted of mechanical responses to the movements of machines, and where any failure immediately to comply with orders might mean the destruction of great quantities of materials and a loss of profits.

In the public schools of the time disorderly behaviour, or near riots, were kept in check by prefects who had the power to use the cane, since those teachers who were not of the same social class were 'servants' and therefore not empowered to beat their pupils. The good teachers, those who held the attention of their pupils by interest in their subject, tended to be members of the same social class as their pupils and had chosen to teach rather than go into business, the church or the forces because they had leisure for writing or pursuing their own interests untroubled by lack of money. They had often been educated in the same school. Their pupils accepted them because they were from the same background. It is significant that, until recently, public schools did not require that applicants for appointment to their staffs should have had teacher training.

For the upper classes the reason for sending their young to

school was not so much so that they should be educated – they had already had nannies and tutors to give them basic literacy, their own houses had no shortage of books, conversation and leisure and they travelled about the country and abroad. They went so that they should meet with others of their class and form friendships that would be useful in later life, whether in business or politics. Above all that they should receive a training as an élite and be accustomed, as early as possible, to the idea that they were the ruling class. Hence the stress in those schools on distinctive styles of dress, accent, mannerisms and behaviour towards their 'inferiors'.

As to 'theory', there can be few members of the present or past government whose education has not been dominated by theory at the expense of practical experience. The progressive school movement arose as a protest against such domination in the education of the very young and was reinforced by the life work of Jean Piaget who demonstrated with crystal clarity how abstract thought arises for infants, without effort, out of the experience of manipulating objects. So the primary meaning of 'theory', according to the OED is: "A conception or mental scheme of something to be done, or the method of doing it; a systematic statement of rules or principles to be followed". The Minister, on the other hand and for his own political purposes, chooses the debased sense, viz: "the formulation of abstract knowledge used as implying unsupported hypothesis and opposed to 'practice'." Does the Minister object to the fact that chemists and physicists spend much time on theory, or does he think that all the major discoveries of the last one hundred years have come about incidentally in the course of activity?

Every good master craftsman in teaching his apprentices uses a mixture of theory and practice to ensure that the apprentice understands what he is doing and why he is doing it in the particular way practised by the craftsman. He aims to lead his apprentice to a more sensitive awareness of the characteristics of both the materials and the tools he is using. Similarly a teacher in training will see his tutor or lecturer take a class of pupils and follow it with a discussion of the methods he used, an analysis of the objects of the lesson, the response of the pupils and whether or not the lesson was effective. Lectures in psychology will be married to actual observation of children in different circumstances: students will, where possible, be set long-term studies of children with whom they are in frequent contact.

There is, of course, more to teacher-training than the passing on of good techniques. The act of communication that is called 'teaching' implies a relationship of trust. Here I will confine myself to the teaching of the young, since that is a form of communication that all adults have experienced at some time because education is necessary for the young to

attain competent maturity in a social group. 'Trust', in this context, means that the teacher is, without reservation, devoted to the welfare of the pupil, viz that the teacher will do nothing to harm or in any way incapacitate the pupil, and will, on the contrary, seek only to benefit the pupil, whether in the acquisition of mathematical or other understanding and skill or in the development of an autonomous and sensitive moral character.

A closer examination of the meaning of 'trust' will reveal that it is closely associated with 'unconditional love' or the most desirable and fruitful feeling that a parent has for a child. It is in this sense that the phrase 'in loco parentis' ('in the place of the parent') has been incorporated into English law as the proper attitude to be held by a teacher towards his or her pupils: in other words the teacher must behave towards the pupil as if that pupil were actually his or her own child.

In turn 'unconditional love' means that however the child responds to the activity of the teacher, whether it co-operates with or rejects what the teacher offers, the teacher must keep firmly in mind the long-term interests of the child and act accordingly, and without regard to his or her own immediate advantage. This is what is meant by 'professionalism' in teaching, a marriage of theory and practice that will ensure the best possible outcome for the pupil in terms of the development and practice of all his or her potential. This is why a substantial part of the time spent in teacher-training should be spent in college or university and away from the busy, workshop-like environment of the school where the pressure of timetable and short-term activity, suitable for younger minds, prevents the more prolonged reflection on experience that is vital in marrying theory with practice and giving thorough understanding.

There is, therefore, no fixed proportion of time as between 'theory' and 'practice'. Each without the other is fruitless in promoting the practical understanding that shows itself in the classroom when children are absorbed in what they are doing and, in consequence of what they are doing, feel a growth in skill and comprehension that makes education for them an exciting and fulfilling experience. The Plowden Report grasped this intermarriage very clearly and was instrumental in bringing about one of the clearest advances in public primary education that this country had seen. If the Minister gets his way there is a danger that public education in this country will be thrust back to what it was in Victorian times. Perhaps that is what he really wants, since the 'reforms' of the last twelve years make clear that an educated democracy is the last thing this government desires. Remember the infamous internal memorandum in the DES to the effect that people had to be taught to know their place!

Michael Duane

(continued from page 5)

sources, though he is unreliable when he ventures beyond them (describing Bakunin as a founder of the First International) and tedious when he repeats secondary material. He insists on calling Heywood an individualist, though he was clearly nothing of the kind, not only calling himself a socialist but defending mutualist and collectivist policies. But he refuses to patronise this strange man, and he also gives proper attention to his wife and children and the various friends who worked with him. Altogether the book is a fitting memorial to a few of the brave people who helped to lay the foundations for some freedoms we now take for granted and for others we still haven't won.

NW

Towards a Transpersonal Ecology

Towards a Transpersonal Ecology
by Warwick Fox
Boston, Shambala, 1990*

'The personal is political' was an important slogan some years ago. Prompted by the feminist movement, it suggested that we should strive to bring about some unity between our personal lives and our political commitments. It was a slogan that most anarchists agreed with. However, in recent years its meaning seems to have shifted somewhat. Instead of implying a unity between the personal and political action,

Gandhian fashion, it now seems to suggest that the personal is the political. Thus some new age enthusiasts have affirmed that we can best oppose the apartheid system in South Africa not by political action but by simply meditating, sending down to South Africa our positive spiritual vibes. With the advent of 'New Ageism' politics is now being 'psychologised' and 'spiritualised'. We are currently experiencing a resurgence of interest in spirit cults and occultism – an interest that eclectically blends Sufism, Buddhism (in all its varieties), Christian mysticism, gnosticism, theosophy, Hinduism, quantum physics and systems theory in a curious and spurious mush. Significantly this 'spiritual' revival is taking place at a time when our personal lives are being increasingly controlled by state 'experts' and by the imperatives of capitalism. While we are being told to pray, to meditate, to get in touch with the goddess, or to expand the self so that it will be in harmony with the living earth (spiritualised as Gaia) so our individual freedoms are being steadily eroded and the whole of social life commodified. A whole battery of experts, 'engineers of the human soul' (as Nikolas Rose calls them) has been foisted upon us, and social and political power has entered into our very being. The two processes are, of course, intrinsically connected, and support and feed off each other.

That 'spirituality' and 'psychologism' inherent in

New Ageism has had a baneful influence on ecology has long been recognised. Over the past decade Murray Bookchin has constantly berated the tendency for green politics to be defined in terms of therapy, life-styles and religious ritual. And the influence of New Ageism is very apparent in Warwick Fox's interesting and important book on deep ecology. Fox is an Australian academic, and his book is essentially concerned with outlining and advocating the kind of eco-philosophy that stems from Arne Naess. It is thus a primer in deep ecology – as a philosophy – which Fox is anxious to rename 'transpersonal ecology'.

The deep ecologists, as Fox seems to define them, are a group of philosophers, therapists and 'venerable teachers' who form a kind of fraternity. They regularly meet up at conferences, either on elite university campuses across the world or in some pleasant mountain retreat, to exchange ideas. They produce philosophical texts and journals like *Environmental Ethics* which support and propagate each other's work. So the cover of this book is adorned with laudatory comments by Roger Walsh, Alan Drengson, George Sessions and Bill Devall, all of which describe the book in glowing terms – "a pioneering work ... a beautifully organised, coherent and lucid book that will facilitate healing ourselves, our communities and our relationships with nature ... destined to be a classic in the field" – while in the text itself Fox spends a lot of pages, with ample quotation, outlining and commending the work of these same writers, all of whom are seen as the genuine deep ecologists.

The first part of the book gives a short but useful critique of anthropocentrism, the idea that humans

(continued on page 7)

ORWELL

Orwell, the Authorised Biography

by Michael Shelden

Heinemann, 1991, 564 pages, £18.50

Writing in 1975, Julian Symons attempted to explain the continuing popularity of George Orwell's writing, especially amongst the young. Symons concluded that "Orwell was a fine and sometimes a great writer, but his genius was for uncomfortable honesty". Michael Shelden comes to much the same conclusion in his biography of Orwell. Indeed, Shelden uses Orwell's public apology to Symons, over an unfounded allegation of literary fascism, as an example of Orwell's relentless pursuit of truth, even when it involved admitting his own mistakes. That incident is, like much else in this biography, well known. In his comments on sources, Shelden highlights the various archives that hold unpublished Orwell material, primarily those in the George Orwell Archive at University College, London, and the Lilly Library, Indiana University. However, despite these and other sources, Shelden has added little to our knowledge of the writer. Shelden's primary contribution here takes the form of snippets of information gleaned from interviews with numerous people who knew Orwell. However, despite his extensive researches and large claims in the introduction, Shelden has been forced to lean heavily upon readily available material, in particular *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. At times I felt that, details apart, Sonia Orwell might have been essentially right when she wrote that with the publication of the *Collected Essays* "the picture is as complete as it can be". Yet in that respect Michael Shelden's researches are valuable, as they show that exhaustive academic ferreting amongst archives has little more to add to our picture of Orwell the writer, or the man. Like many products of the Public School system, Orwell knew how to keep his mouth shut about his private life and feelings, and our guess is as good as Michael Shelden's whether Orwell really was the lover of a *Tribune* secretary, or whether Eileen O'Shaughnessy was the lover of Georges Kopp, or, for that matter, whether Orwell's mother indulged in any fun and games with one Dr Dakin in Edwardian Henley-on-Thames.

Michael Shelden does, however, present us with a coherent view of Orwell's life that is, thankfully, free of the type of literary criticism that we might have expected from a Professor of English. Furthermore, he forcefully defends Orwell's reputation in a number of areas. One good example of this concerns Bob Edwards' slighting of Orwell's service in Spain. Edwards was the leader of the ILP contingent that fought with the POUM on the Aragon front, the contingent that Orwell finally served with. In a careful piece of analysis, Shelden shows that Edwards' accusations that Orwell was just a

"journalistic observer" is unjustified. Shelden comments that: "He [Orwell] was there to fight fascism, and he did it bravely, as Edwards was well aware. He did not show up at the front, write a few things and then leave after six weeks. But that is what Edwards did." After Edwards returned to Britain, Orwell continued to serve (for a total of 115 days at the front, as well as his involvement in the 'May Days') and was elected leader of his contingent. Orwell had only just begun his second period in the line when he was wounded. Not that Victor Gollancz was impressed by that record when Orwell produced *Homage to Catalonia*, Gollancz's comment being that Orwell's book would "harm the fight against fascism". Gollancz's refusal of *Homage to Catalonia* was not the first, nor the last, attempt at censorship that Orwell had to contend with. Orwell's contention that the truth mattered often fell on deaf ears. The truth about imperial Burma, the truth about events in Republican Spain, or the truth about wartime Britain often proved to be too much for Orwell's opponents.

Like most people who strive for some semblance of the truth rather than following a 'party line', Orwell is hard to place in any particular box. There are plenty of tensions in both his writings and his life, but that is to be expected, it is a guarantee of the integrity of the man. Some might object, but Orwell was a revolutionary and his aim was 'democratic socialism'. You can argue about the meaning of that phrase, but Orwell's vision of 'the revolution' is made clear in an important letter to Dwight Macdonald that Shelden presents on page 407 of his book. Writing about the meaning of *Animal Farm*, Orwell concludes: "What I was trying to say was, 'you can't have a revolution unless you make it for yourself; there is no such thing as a benevolent dictatorship.'" One might comment, 'that's anarchism!'

Despite the odour of academic point-scoring, this book is, I think, ultimately successful. Successful because the moment I finished reading Shelden's biography, I wanted to re-read Orwell. And, occasionally, a 'new' fact adds something to that reading. One of my favourite pieces by Orwell has always been his 1946 *Tribune* article 'A Good Word for the Vicar of Bray'. In it he writes of the importance of gardening (something for which he had previously been castigated by an irate *Tribune* reader who had said that roses were bourgeois). Orwell lingers over the description of roses and fruit trees that he had planted ten years before "at a cottage where I used to live". Having read Shelden's book, I now know that the roses and trees were planted in the first year of Orwell's marriage to Eileen O'Shaughnessy, and that the "plantings had prospered though the hopes had died". There is nothing in the article that conveys Orwell's personal sorrow, yet it says a lot about the man and, thanks to Michael Shelden, it now means even more.

Steve Cullen

Recent additions to Freedom Press Bookshop stock.

Communitas: ways of livelihood and means of life, by Percival and Paul Goodman, Columbia University Press. First published in 1947, and now reissued in a new format, it is still as relevant as ever. Lewis Mumford said of it: "Communitas stands in a class by itself: a fresh and original theoretic contribution to the art of building cities. Such a book does not appear often ... a witty, penetrating, provocative and, above all, a wise book, for it deals with the underlying values and purposes, political and moral, on which planning of any sort must be based." Illustrated, 280 pages, £9.95.

The Modern School Movement: anarchism and education in the United States, by Paul Avrich, Princeton University Press. Now in stock again, this title has increased in price to £15.50.

Anarchy and the End of History,* edited by Mike Gunderloy and Michael Ziesing, Factsheet Five / Lysander Spooner Press. An interesting and provocative collection of articles by over twenty writers including George Woodcock, Michael Ziesing, Robert Shea (who contributes a contentious piece called 'The Joy of Baking Pie in the Sky'), David Koven, Hakim Bey and Mary Webb (who writes on 'Feminism and Anarchism' and is one of only two female contributors). Mike Gunderloy kicks off with an opening chapter entitled 'Closing the gaps: challenges for the anarchist movement'. 143 pages, £6.00.

Terror or Love: the personal account of a West German urban guerrilla by Bommi Bauman, John Calder Publishers. This account of the career of a urban guerrilla, with a foreword by Heinrich Böll, gives many insights into the psychology and motivation of terrorism. Although not a new book, it has been absent from bookshops for a considerable time and has recently resurfaced. There is a supporting statement from Daniel Cohn-Bendit at the back of the book. 127 pages, illustrated, £4.95.

Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution: the political trials of Ricardo Flores Magón in the United States by Colin Maclachlan, University of California Press. A new perspective on Flores Magón, Mexican anarchist. Caught in the confusing events of the Mexican Revolution of 1910 and the anti-anarchist hysteria that swept the United States in the first quarter of this century, he became a victim of judicial repression and died in Leavenworth Federal Penitentiary in 1922. Maclachlan analyses the Federal court records to point this tragic, fascinating story of Flores Magón – persecuted, ironically, for his activities in the USA –

highlighting new information regarding the importance of his early work with Mexican and Mexican-American labour and political issues. 185 pages, £8.95.

Housmans Peace Diary 1992, Housmans Publishers, 39th edition. Includes World Peace Directory of peace, environmental, human rights, etc., groups as in previous years, and the diary is a week-to-a-view. Although articles are omitted this year on the grounds of cost, the *Peace Diary* is still excellent value for money as a resource alone, with plenty of room in the diary for appointments, notes, etc. £4.95.

No Longer Silent, number 3 of (very) occasional magazine from Tucson, Arizona, edited and published by Eliza Blackweb. Well produced – "no computers used in the production" – and lively, with good artwork and illustrations and an attractive cover. This issue (Winter '89) is the latest available. Contents include various perspectives on revolution and anarchy in everyday life; an attack on the resurgence of hippy culture; a critique of that year's US Anarchist Convention and day of Action; an amusing illustrated guide to direct action for anarchists, and more. A5 format, a good 32 pages worth for 75p.

Without a Trace by Moriarty. At last for all those people who've been enquiring about it ever since the original Hooligan Press edition went out of print, here is an (anonymous) reprint – at a lower price but still good quality – using the original plates. For the uninitiated, this is a guide to how to go about direct action and get away with it. It covers all those things of interest to forensic 'scientists' such as traces of wood, dust, glass, hair, blood, fibres, etc., and how not to leave any. It also covers surveillance by the police and 'security' forces, including police communication codes and call signs, and there is an interview with an ALF activist. Motto on the cover: "To live outside the law you have to be honest". A5 pamphlet, 32 pages, illustrated, £1.50.

The Levellers and the English Revolution by H.N. Brailsford, Spokesman Books, edited by Christopher Hill. Unfortunately the publishers of this worthy tome after selling it very cheaply for years have put the price up – by £3. We are continuing to stock it as a valuable addition to the literature on the subject, and it is still very good value for 715 pages, but the price is now £9.95.

KM

Titles distributed by Freedom Press Distributors (marked*) are post-free inland (add 15% towards postage and packing overseas). For other titles please add 10% towards postage and packing inland, 20% overseas. Cheques payable to FREEDOM PRESS please.

Towards a Transpersonal Ecology

(continued from page 6)

have dominion over the world, and that nature is simply a resource for human use. Fox introduces and discusses the various typologies that have long been articulated in the ecology movement, between environmentalists and social ecology (Bookchin), between technocentrism and ecocentricism (O'Riordan) and between shallow and deep ecology (Naess and the deep ecologists).

In Part Two Fox asks the question as to why deep ecology has become so influential – in contrast to Bookchin's ideas which he suggests have been ignored – ignored that is by the academic philosophers. And he comes to the rather shallow conclusion that deep ecology has become influential because it has become the subject of critique and of interest to academic philosophers, and has been propagated with such commitment and fervour by such people as Devall, Sessions, Drenson, and of course himself, all members of the deep ecology fraternity. Fox makes no attempt to answer the question he poses in terms of social and political factors. With its spiritualist leanings and its focus on extending consciousness, deep ecology – like New Ageism – presents little threat to capitalism or to the state structures that support it. It is certainly less of a threat than Bookchin's social anarchism. Many deep ecologists, including Naess himself, have of course been prominent as political activists, but this political dimension is completely ignored by Fox, whose interests seem to be purely philosophical. That 'eco-warrior', and perhaps the most well-known of the deep ecologists, Dave Foreman, only get three lines, then only to note that his publication *Earth First!* carries articles and reviews about deep ecology. Criticisms of deep ecology – which are political and not philosophical – by Bookchin and the eco-feminists Fox completely ignores in this text, simply referring the reader to articles in *Environmental Ethics*. His antipathy to Bookchin is quite pronounced. But his mode of responding to Bookchin's critique of deep ecology is both un scholarly and petty – quite out of tune with the general tenor of the book. He spends a whole paragraph on Bookchin's "vitriolic claims", citing the anarchist's strident and invective prose. And then ends with the word 'indeed'. Indeed! In the process of scoring such literary points he completely ignores of course the substance of Bookchin's critique of deep ecology. George Bradford's critique of deep ecology doesn't get a mention.

In Part Three Fox presents a good but dense account of Arne Naess's eco-philosophy. Fox writes as a philosopher and seems to be largely addressing his academic colleagues, but the account is nonetheless a useful one. He distinguishes three senses in Naess's deep ecology – a formal sense which suggests that 'deep' means asking questions that go beyond the everyday, technical and scientific; a philosophical sense which is related to Naess's key concept of 'self-realisation'; and a popular sense which refers to the basic principles of the deep ecology movement. The discussion of Naess's philosophy

is at times confusing as Fox tries to draw together – like Naess – what are essentially incompatible as ontologies (as theories of existence) – namely Buddhism, which denies the reality of self (whither self-realisation) and advocates detachment (not identification) with the world; Gandhi's religious affirmation of both theism (karma yoga) and theological absolutism (Advaita) which denies the reality of the world; animism (which is an imminent conception of spirit or deity); and Spinoza's pantheism. Spinoza of course was a this-worldly philosopher, and his so-called pantheism – god is nature – is essentially an atheistic doctrine. Fox's suggestion that it means god 'in nature' is quite misleading. As he (and Naess) want to advocate a this-worldly conception of the self and its identification with nature, one wonders why on earth they should want to hold fast to all these defunct religious notions?

Part Four of the study is mainly for philosophers: in it Fox outlines quite lucidly the various ethical theories relating to the environment. He discusses three theories of instrumental value (unrestrained exploitation – which he interestingly links with the frontier spirit and not with capitalism – resource conservation and resource preservation) and four theories of intrinsic value, the notion that the non-human world has value in itself, irrespective of

humans. He outlines these four theories in terms of ethical sentimentism (Singer's plea for animal rights), biological or life-based ethics (Taylor, Capra), ecosystem ethics (Leopold, Lovelock), and cosmic purpose ethics (Skolimowski, Bookchin).

The conclusion that Fox comes to is that Naess's theory of deep ecology is a 'psychologically based approach' that has little to do with ethical theory. As Naess wrote: "I'm not much interested in ethics or morals. I'm interested in how we experience the world". It is a kind of 'way', like the Buddha advocated, but instead of involving detachment from the world it implies 'self-realisation', identification with the world of nature. It does not deny the existence of the personal sense of self, but suggests an expansion of this self through the identification (not identity, i.e. conflation) of the self with other forms of existence. Maslow is a key figure here, but self-realisation goes beyond the simple identification with the human species, extending to all the natural world. Fox stresses that self-realisation is a this-worldly path, and has little to do with the 'god-in-the-process-of-becoming' notion of the New Age and transpersonal theorists like Ken Wilbur. Quoting long extracts from the works of all the deep ecology fraternity, Fox argues that deep ecology implies these two basic characteristics – a rejection of any preoccupation

with environmental ethics, and a stress on self-realisation – the cultivation of an ecological sensibility, and an awareness that we are an intrinsic part of nature. This implies an expansive sense of self. Why this should necessarily involve spiritual therapy under some guru, or communing with nature alone on some mountain top (or in some remote forest) – as deep ecologists seem to suggest – has never seemed too clear to me. For ecological sensibility, an awareness of the symbiotic or dialectical relationship we have with nature (in a convoluted discussion Fox writes about our relative autonomy) can surely be experienced by such everyday experiences as digging the allotment, taking the dog for a walk, and chatting with a neighbour. The self as ego is not existential but a function of capitalism. This focus on self-realisation thus has little to do with spirituality, and divorced from social and political engagement with the world – as it seems to be in Fox's writings – could well be counter-productive. And to imply – by leaving our completely socio-economic factors – that environmental problems are simply a function of anthropocentric ideas, tends only to divert attention away from examining those social and political institutions which are primarily responsible for the present ecological crisis. But to bring in capitalism and the state suggests a social awareness that seems to be lacking in Fox's style of philosophy.

Brian Morris

*Not yet available from Freedom Press Bookshop.

Our political masters, the current Tory government, are fulsome in their blandishments expressing concern for 'British interests', in connection with the EC for example. Recently there has been much discussion of the government's refusal to accept the European Social Charter (or is it Chapter?) which lays down guidelines for the humane treatment of those workers with the least bargaining power, and who are consequently the most deprived. The Tories say that these provisions, if granted, would threaten the continued employment of these unfortunate people. Now, 'British interests' here means, as all anarchists are aware, the interests of the bosses. The bosses are now in such a financial mess, however, that they can't afford to pay up if they are to remain in profit, or at least limit their losses. Contrary to all the Thatcherite propaganda of the '80s (remember the economic miracle?) Britain remains a very much second rate European power, whose position continues to worsen relative to our European 'partners'.

When one looks at what the Tories have done to arrest our decline in manufacturing industry, it is impossible to be impressed. Their policy aim of reducing taxation and cutting public services was intended, or so they said, to boost economic growth by getting excessive taxes off the backs of the 'wealth producers'. Benefits would eventually 'trickle down' to the workers. Well, it didn't quite work out like that. Many people wound up paying even more in tax, particularly indirect taxes like VAT, etc. many public assets were privatised, and what was left was cut; companies struggling with very high interest rates shed labour, and unemployment rose inexorably; higher levels of investment, when they were made, failed to make

British Interests

their presence felt in the form of significant new industrial development. In the European rat-race, the poor old British rat looks decidedly undernourished, lame and three parts blind, as it flounders about in a hostile environment; the once soft markets of the old empire and commonwealth being pretty much lost.

One wonders, given the foregoing, exactly what those British interests are if both British workers and their masters have realised so little from their pursuit. Recently I watched the Money Programme's supposedly in-depth analysis of the state of the British economy. Amid all the speculative waffle about the ERM, interest rates and Tory prospects for re-election, I could find no mention of key indicators which exposed our performance compared with competitors abroad. Glaring in the omissions was any discussion of our adverse trade balance, or investment. Yet it is investment, or lack of it, which is crucial to any economy, and capitalism will inevitably function poorly when starved of capital; a fundamental and very simple point that no one on the programme seemed able to make. Perhaps we should be more precise: indigenous British capitalism will suffer if there is a lack of investment on British soil. When they talk about 'British interests' the Tories are in part referring to assets held overseas, returns from which do little or nothing for the general population. One can understand the Money Programme's discreet silence on such a delicate matter as the use of investment capital – it would be difficult for them to show up the Tories of all people as being 'unpatriotic', of handing out tax concessions to the rich knowing full well that the rich are likely to take the windfalls elsewhere.

One of the first major decisions taken by the Thatcher government in 1979, was to remove state controls on the movement of capital. At the time I was dubious of reaching such a conclusion, but with the benefit of hindsight it now seems clear to me that here was the green light for British investors, if they so wished, to get their money out of the country while the going was good. Throughout the '80s capital flowed out of the country like dirty water down the plug-hole. In her last major speech to Parliament, to howls of Labour disapproval and, I suspect, a tight-lipped grim silence from many Tories, Thatcher even had the gall to boast of her success in encouraging the process, claiming that returns on overseas investments were 'good for Britain'. The Tories, it seems, have largely given up the idea of promoting a vigorous British industrial capitalism. They were never really keen and have shown ignorance of industry's needs. Instead, the government is happy to welcome the arrival here of Japanese companies, such as Nissan and Hitachi, to help fill the investment gap and take advantage of the increasingly demoralised and disorganised labour force. How all this must rankle with true-blue patriots, some of whom must have lost loved ones to Japanese barbarism in the Second World War. This way is far easier for the Japanese

than going to war. To European protests, the Tories are insistent that Japanese financed production here is in fact British (it helps the 'presentation' of the balance of payments statistics!) and the Japanese can rely on the British state to 'maintain order' if the workers ever start getting out of hand. How 'cost-effective' for the Japanese, how pathetic of the British.

Unlike the Tories, Labour on the other hand is really keen to revive indigenous capitalism, so as to improve employment prospects and strengthen the position of its friends and paymasters in the trade unions, by now much weakened as a result of the industrial debacle. Labour at least has some concern for what happens to the people; the Tories appear content to see Britain become little more than a tourist trap with its workforce being made increasingly dependent on poorly paid employment in service industries such as hotels, catering, and retailing imported produce.

To return once again to those mysterious British interests overseas; quite where are they, and what do they consist of? Places like South Africa might spring to mind, or what about the once 'socialist' countries of Eastern Europe where just about everything is apparently up for grabs? Cheap and compliant labour is always attractive to capital, but efficient industrial management skills have not been noticeable among British capitalists, especially those spawned in the Thatcher era. No, my guess is that these disgustingly greedy men, shy of risk-taking, will look for easier largely risk-free investment in such areas as banking, insurance and other 'financial services', to coin a phrase redolent of our times. As for farther afield, the EC could become a lucrative area for their attentions. Already some juicy pickings are being found in the property markets of Northern France. Along with others on the continent, the French haven't got quite the same rapacious interest in exploiting housing or property generally as their British counterparts, and so prices in France are relatively low. However, thanks in part to the activities of British property speculators, the cost of housing on the continent is rising, and can be expected to continue rising, perhaps in a quite dramatic fashion once the Channel Tunnel is completed. The French are understandably worried; no doubt they've seen how things operate in Britain.

This sounds a bit more like it don't you think? The really big financiers have largely abandoned industry, and milked both the now privatised state sector and the property market; the latter to the point where prices have been static or falling for a long time; time to move on to pastures new. Yes, and high time that people everywhere woke up to the fact that capital does not respect frontiers or the people it tramples upon, wherever they may be,

John Griffin

Footnote: Nissan have just announced a projected big expansion of their Sunderland car plant, and Amnesty International has reported British 'success' in the export of torture chambers and leg-irons! Aaaggh!!

Business is business

Fortunately Amnesty International is in business to inform the British as to what we export in the way of torture and repression. Apparently the government refuses to give details on individual arms sales or military training contracts. Nevertheless, it has disclosed that between 1979 and 1990 Britain provided military training for 110 foreign forces including the 'Cambodian non-communist resistance'.

A Birmingham based company, Hiatt, supplied leg-irons used in Malawi prisons recently. However, they point out that export of these was banned in 1984. But they nevertheless confirmed that last year a stand advertising 'leg-cuffs' at a Covert and Operational Procurement Exhibition in Miami belonged to Hiatt Thompson, Hiatt's US distributors, where leg-irons are not banned (presumably for recalcitrant blacks).

Amnesty International also informs us that Electronics Intelligence installed an electronic torture chamber nicknamed the 'House of Fun' and designed to terrify victims

without leaving signs of physical harm, inside the headquarters of the Special Branch in Dubai.

And the big building firm Laing, whose motto is 'We build for people', actually built two 12ft high gallows for the Abu Dhabi regime in 1987. Amnesty International in their valuable report add a professional detail which will surely commend Laing to prospective customers: their gallows are resistant to termites and sandstorms.

Apparently senior managers didn't know about the contracts for gallows! The individuals responsible for accepting the orders were 'severely dealt with' but they still build them at one of their subsidiaries.

When MPs raised the issue the then Foreign Office Minister David Mellor said: "The manufacture of execution equipment in the UK is legal and its export is not subject to any form of control".

It reads like black humour. But it's all true and nauseating. And we dare to call ourselves civilised!

Mobile cash office taken off the road

Lancaster City Council leased a £37,000 collecting 'tank' - a huge blue and white elephant seen wobbling along narrow country lanes to outlying villages in a vain attempt to persuade people to pay the poll tax.

The poor thing never stood a chance in life, being introduced to the public at the same time as the tax itself. Bringing the point of collection into the community merely served to focus hostility. When introduced, it was also said that the van would issue the world's most expensive green plastic bin-bags, costing £385 divided by 52 equals £7.40 each. At great cost, the council graciously provided us all with timetables, enabling protesters to gather at the appointed spot. One such protest at Halton brought out Tory councillor and Deputy Mayor Harry Towers to see what was going on. On reading placards blaming the Conservatives for the tax he told us: "You don't want to go blaming the Tories for that, lad!" But when asked just who was to blame he offered us no further enlightenment...

Another protest attended by four people found that the number of protesters exceeded the number of customers by 100%. On another occasion, residents brought out cups of tea. Police were called (via radio link) every time protesters turned up, but there was only one hostile incident involving protesters when an old gentleman waved his stick. It is also thought that on other occasions stones were thrown, denting the van's otherwise smooth gloss blue sides. It was also graffitied, which necessitated a clean-up or repaint job.

But alas, Leviathan will be no more! Due to reduced grants from central government, the heavily under-utilised Battle-Bus will be scrapped, and its long-suffering crew David and Sue, stood down and dispersed to other duties.

"It just wasn't cost-effective" an anonymous council employee admitted. "Just like a lot of things the council does..." The van received a derisory thirty customers per week, not enough to justify the staff of two, nor its fuel costs. It was an embarrassment to the council. Nobody pointed out the design flaw whereby the diesel-powered vehicle had its own computer system powered by a small petrol-driven generator, thereby breaking a golden rule of vehicle design - never have two different fuels on the same vehicle. In the event, that staff

never had time to ponder the possibility of a fuel mix up, for they had mountains of paperwork to process using the on-board terminal while they waited for the Great British Public to stay away in droves. Latterly, payment has been so bad the van has been used to ferry internal council mail between various lingering outposts of its withering empire. Soon it will make that last journey back to the Chorley coachbuilder where it was spawned, there to be cut up, or perhaps even converted into a mobile Anti-Council Tax Information Centre...

Kevin Klubman

CORRECTIONS

I

Dear Editors, Donald Rooum (25th January) quotes Bakunin's statement 'that liberty without socialism is privilege and injustice, and that socialism without liberty is slavery and brutality', and then gives the source (with thanks to me) as *Liberty and Society, Federalism and Anti-theoreticalism*, c.1864. It should be made clear that the source is Bakunin's 'Reasoned Proposal to the Central Committee of the International League of Peace and Freedom' which was written in 1867 and partly printed in 1868 and was finally published in 1895 in the first volume of the French edition of his works as *Federalism, Socialism and Antitheologism*.

NW

II

A misprint in the editorial comment on 'Strip the Experts' (*Freedom*, 25th January) made us say that "Opinion polls could be very interesting and woeful in a real democracy". For woeful read useful!

Please keep sending in your letters and donations

Libertines, Poseurs and Agent Provocateurs

Dear Comrades, I was delighted to read in Donald Rooum's article of 25th January his drawing attention to the many non-anarchist 'anarchists' who are around, and who for reasons of self-interest, pretension or malice portray themselves as 'anarchists' and, in doing so, do so much damage to the anarchist cause by alienating ordinary workers.

Some jump on the band-wagon out of some false romantic image or desire to acquire an identity that this society has denied them - many having never read a single book on anarchism, but vaguely knowing it has something to do with 'individual freedom'. However, they do not realise that such freedom is responsible freedom, respecting the rights of others. They use the arguments of anarchism for licence to justify their venting their psychopathy on the rest of society, believing that the more objectionable they behave 'the more anarchist' they are.

These libertines would do the anarchist cause greater disservice if they were to join the other poseurs - such as the Labour Party.

Apart from these, we must consequently be aware of those with more sinister motives, the 'narks' and

agent provocateurs that are amongst us. They are often well versed in anarchist theory, they endeavour to promote the personality cult, centering themselves in the limelight, hoping that by so doing they can engineer splits and disruption or cause groups to act in a way that would be detrimental to the movement.

I believe that our philosophy is the most noble ideal that human beings have ever conceived. A truly human goal. It is a rational humanitarian belief, not to be sullied and despoiled by those who have not the ethical character to live up to it. To be an anarchist takes more than an ability to draw a circle and write a letter 'A' in it. It is shown in the way in which we relate to others. It takes understanding, a passionate love of freedom and humanity and, above all, commitment.

Someone once said the price of freedom is vigilance, true, and that means within the anarchist movement as well as without if ever real freedom is ever to be achieved. This does not mean intolerance, but it does mean that we are not so naive as to believe that calling oneself an anarchist makes one an anarchist.

M.S. Robert

Dear Editors, Harold Barclay's article 'Anarchism and Cities' (*Freedom*, 25th January) raises the question whether we can best understand anarchism as a tendency ante-dating government or as an attempt to get beyond it. He himself favours the 'tendency' view, presenting the non-governmental societies of the Ifugao and the Tonga as anarchic, but what does 'anarchic' mean in this context? Turning to Barclay's valuable book, *People Without Government* (1990), we find: "Leaders among the Ifugao ... have the legitimate right to command contending parties to mediate, on threat of violence" (page 137). Anarchic horticultural

Individualism & Class Struggle

Dear Editors, 'Individualist anarchism is class-struggle anarchism' by Donald Rooum (*Freedom*, 25th January) makes a valiant attempt to paper over interecine strife by claiming that their differences are nothing more than a choice of words, but whereas 'individualist' can mean anything from 'sod you Jack' to altruism, 'class' means nothing to anarchists unless it refers to a state of mind. There is no point in asking the average 'worker' to demonstrate against a particular injustice which affects him personally if he is not opposed to injustice on principle. Judging by the antics of his followers, Marx himself failed to grasp the distinction between 'class' which is an idea and 'class' which is an arbitrary category based upon type of work and remuneration.

It is unfortunate that Donald did not take pacifist anarchism as an example of 'a particular kind' of anarchist, because it is a category which most certainly cannot stand up and be counted when words resolve into actions. A pacifist anarchist cannot defer to any premeditated violence, tactical or not; if it comes to passing the ammunition, a difference in words means a difference in actions - and no truck with Class War even before the event. Pacifist anarchists may be able to understand the frustration of an assassin who kills a tyrant, but they cannot admire him because pacifism is fundamental to our anarchism and freedom. Much of the confusion can be put down to impressive terminology. This should be sorted out. Remember that Kropotkin went over to the other side when it came to the crunch because he failed to properly analyse the ideas he propounded - ideas that are propagated by words.

Ernie Crosswell

The state promotes anarchism

Dear Editors, "Until this year, young people could only learn about anarchism outside of school. Now anarchism is included in the syllabus for A level politics by the London Examinations Board. We learn this from students who have been coming into the Freedom Press Bookshop seeking information" (DR in *Freedom*, 30th November 1991).

Ever since anarchism began the presence of the 'movement' has demonstrated the availability of information about it. Whatever the state and its supporters may have wanted to do, they have not in fact kept anarchism hidden. For generations not only the bookshops but also the free libraries have offered information on the subject, and now the state even goes to the extent of starting to teach it to the young. May we hope for an end to the claim - always unjustified and rapidly becoming absurd - that anarchism remains a minority movement because people cannot get to know about it?

George Walford

YOUNG OR OLD?

societies in Africa "keep cavalry and deploy them as devices for domination" (page 57). "African anarchic polities are invariably characterised by the presence of slavery and sometimes of debased pariah castes" (page 570). Does the anarchist movement aspire to a society which will include command, threats of violence, cavalry, domination, slavery, and sometimes a debased pariah caste? It does not appear so from the literature.

Barclay takes 'anarchy' to mean simply absence of government, and in doing so he departs from the sense in which the anarchist movement now mainly uses the term. This appears in his article, when he values sameness and homogeneity above "the usual anarchist propensity for variety and emphasis on individuality". 'Anarchy' has developed a richness of meaning beyond its etymological root. It now indicates, for most of those who associate themselves with it, a society free not only from government but also from other externally imposed restraints upon free expression of individuality, and this condition does not appear among non-governmental peoples; those who study them generally agree that the community itself imposes control upon each person. George Woodcock, Marshall Sahlins and Elman R. Service have all stressed this feature, and Barclay himself speaks of Tonga society as integrated and ordered by "a fine mesh of counter-balancing obligations" (page 69).

Government grew out of the first, non-governmental, human communities - unless we blame it on God there was nowhere else it could have come from -

showing that they tended towards it. If the absence of government, by itself, qualifies a community as anarchic then it follows that anarchic communities produced the state.

Anarchism now means, for most of its adherents, an aspiration towards doing away with external restraints upon personal freedom (especially but not exclusively those imposed by government) and, pending this ultimate achievement, a continuing effort to restrain them and limit their effects. No such aspiration is reported as displayed by the Ifugao, the Tonga, or other peoples living without government today, and we have no good reason to assume its presence in the early communities. Anarchism as we know it becomes most readily comprehensible, and our thinking best agrees with the evidence, when we accept it as a recent development. With Godwin, Proudhon and a few others as forerunners it largely took shape in the course of Bakunin's struggles with Marx. It was in the councils of the First International, and other nineteenth century revolutionary movements, rather than among the foragers and horticulturalists, that there was developed the distinctly anarchist concept of freedom.

This suggests a brighter future for anarchism than that indicated by the contrary view. We do not have ten thousand years of solid evidence to show that the state can crush and overwhelm the movement; as a recent introduction anarchism has still to show its full capabilities.

George Walford

News from Angel Alley

Sorry to go on about subscription renewals but since at least three-quarters of our subscription list is up for renewal in December, we wait with bated breath for your response to our green reminders. To those readers who haven't yet done so, a pink and final reminder will be sent with the next issue.

We realise that a number of our readers have financial difficulties and if they can't afford even the claimant's rate and they do want to go on receiving *Freedom*, then we suggest that they send us the postage (24 x 18p) - say £4, and we will go on sending *Freedom* in 1992.

But we hope that those of our readers who are, relatively speaking, 'in the money' will help us to cope with those who aren't by sending donations to our funds.

One generous reader this month writes from Sheffield: "Why not ask supporters/readers to set up direct debits to your account* to ensure a regular additional source of income. A hundred people at £1 a month is not a sum to be sneezed at." And he adds "keep up the magnificent work".

And while we are preening ourselves (we don't often do it, do we?) another friend sending his renewal well in advance ends with a 'thank you': "for another consistently stimulating and thought-provoking year in print. Warmest wishes to the editors and all those 'behind the scenes' who help keep the light burning during these dark times."

For 1992 we have an ambitious publishing programme. We are hoping to complete the Centenary

*Our account number is Girobank 58 294 6905.

volumes and at least another three in our Anarchist Discussion series.

For the next issue of *The Raven* number 17 on 'The Use of Land' we are still inviting suggestions and contributions. John Pilgrim is working on a *Raven* on sociology. We also feel that a *Raven* on nationality, religion and fundamentalism would be a valuable addition. We would also welcome comments from readers who have ideas for a *Raven* on feminism and anarchism which would include a number of articles on anarchist women.

Last but not least, a warm thank you to all who have contributed to our funds this month.

DONATIONS

17th - 29th January 1992

Freedom Fortnightly Fighting Fund

Bolton DP £2, London SW15 JPMcG £2, Bristol AFC £10, Wrexham JK £2, Pontypridd GC £5, London SW6 PGT £5, Hadleigh AH £5, New York CG £12, Wolverhampton JL £2, London N19 RV £5, San Francisco LM £5, Teignmouth MD £10, Sheffield ID £10, Oslo RBM £10.

Total = £85.00
1992 total to date = £272.55

Freedom Press Overheads Fund

Wrexham JK £2, Pontypridd GC £2, Burnley MH £2, London E11 WJM £2, Wolverhampton JL £2, Teignmouth MD £10, Dossenheim RS £6, Sheffield ID £1.50, Goteburg JL £3.

Total = £30.50
1992 total to date = £126.00

Raven Deficit Fund

Bristol AFC £5, London N19 RV £2, San Francisco LM £5, Teignmouth MD £6, Sheffield ID £5.

Total = £23.00
1992 total to date = £147.00

MEETINGS

Greenpeace (London) Public Meetings

On the last Thursday of every month London Greenpeace has a public meeting where a speaker starts off the discussion and then everyone who wants to can have their say. These public meetings are at the Peace Pledge Union, 6 Endsleigh Street, London WC1 (near Euston tube). They start at 8pm and go on until just before 10pm. The first six meetings for 1992 are already planned and they are:

- **Thursday 27th February** – The forthcoming General Election. We're not voting and we hope you won't either. Towards a national anti-voting strategy. The vote changes nothing.
- **Thursday 26th March** – Defend (and extend) our green spaces (i.e. no new roads, factories, and so on), with John Beesley from Otdogs.
- **Thursday 30th April** – Women and Anarchism.
- **Thursday 28th May** – Saving the planet, a response from the Earth Summit.
- **Thursday 25th June** – The world is dominated (and it and its people are being ruined) by the rich governments represented by the IMF and G7. How do we resist them?

For further information contact London Greenpeace at 5 Caledonian Road, London N1, tel: 071-837 7557.

FREEDOM fortnightly

ISSN 0016 0504

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

Printed by Aldgate Press, London E1

Anarchist Forum

Fridays at about 8.00pm at the Mary Ward Centre, 42 Queen Square (via Cosmo Street off Southampton Row), London WC1.

1992 SEASON OF MEETINGS

- 7th February - General discussion
- 14th February - 'Structural Thinking' (speaker Silvia Bercu)
- 21st February - 'Co-editing *Freedom* in the 1960s' (speaker John Rety)
- 28th February - General discussion
- 7th March - 'Pragmatic Anarchism: Libertarian Practice in the Real World' (speaker Andrew Lainton)
- 14th March - General discussion
- 20th March - Discussion on the future of the Anarchist Forum
- 17th April - General discussion
- 24th April - 'Conversation: An Anarchist Metaphor' (speaker Tim Francis)
- 1st May - General discussion
- 4th May - May Day Picnic. Any suggestions for the venue?
- 8th May - 'Anarchism: Ancestor Worship or Blueprint' (speaker Peter Neville) [transferred from January]

Four exhibitions

Sources of Humanity

at

The Small Hall, Conway Hall,
Red Lion Square, London WC1
(nearest tube Holborn)

- 14th to 20th February: Emily Johns, Joan James, Irene Runayker
- 21st to 27th February: Ursula Bayer, Belinda Hale
- 28th February to 5th March: Maureen Sinclair, Valerie Wright, Sandra Wright
- 6th to 12th March: Linda Landers, Rosemary Phelpps, Wendy Meaden

Viewing times: Mondays 9-11am & 5.30-7pm, Tuesday-Friday 9am-2pm & 5.30-7pm plus other times changing daily and weekends. For these phone 081-347 9452

Anarchist Communist Federation Calendar 1992

Unless otherwise mentioned, all meetings will be held at the Marchmont Community Centre, Marchmont Street, London WC1, beginning at 8.30pm.

- **6th February** - Public meeting: Philippine worker speaking on the current situation in the Philippines
- **13th February** - Public debate: 'Freedom – how do we get it?', with the Islington branch of the Socialist Party. Held at the Highbury Roundhouse Community Centre, 71 Ronalds Road (off Holloway Road), N5, at 8pm (nearest tubes: Highbury & Islington or Holloway Road)

If further details are required, please write to: ACF (London), c/o 84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX.

Pornography and Censorship

Wednesday 12th February
at 7.30pm

Conway Hall (small hall),
Red Lion Square, London WC1
(nearest tube Holborn)

Speakers:

- **Linzi Drew** (former editor of *Penthouse*)
- **Della Grace** (photographer, *Love Bites*)
- **Tuppy Owens** (publisher of *The Sex Maniacs Diary*)
- **Lindi St Claire** (Corrective Party)

All welcome, waged £5, unwaged and low waged £1.

Organised by Feminists Against Censorship, BM Box 207, London WC1N 3XX

FREEDOM AND THE RAVEN SUBSCRIPTION RATES

	inland	abroad surface	outside Europe airmail	Europe airmail
<i>Freedom</i> (24 issues) half price for 12 issue				
Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	14.00	18.00	27.00	23.00
Institutions	22.00	25.00	33.00	33.00

The Raven (4 issues)

Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	11.00	12.00	16.00	14.00
Institutions	13.00	15.00	20.00	20.00

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

Claimants	18.00	-	-	-
Regular	23.00	28.00	40.00	37.00

Bundle subs for *Freedom* (12 issues)

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail
2 copies x 12	12.00	13.00	20.00
5 copies x 12	25.00	27.00	42.00
10 copies x 12	48.00	54.00	82.00

Other bundle sizes on application

Giro account number 58 294 6905
All prices in £ sterling

FREEDOM CONTACTS

Sectional Editors

Science, Technology, Environment: Andrew Hedgecock, 9 Hood Street, Sherwood, Nottingham NG5 4DH

Industrial: Tom Carlile, 7 Court Close, Brampton Way, Portishead, Bristol

Land Notes: V. Richards, c/o Freedom Press, 84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX

Regional Correspondents

Cardiff: Eddie May, c/o History Department, UWCC, PO Box 909, Cardiff CF1 3XU

Brighton: Johnny Yen, Cogs U/g Pigeonholes, University of Sussex, School of Cognitive and Computing Sciences, Falmer, Brighton, East Sussex BN1 9QN

Northern Ireland: Dave Duggan, 27 Northland Avenue, Derry BT48 7JW

North Wales: Joe Kelly, Penmon Cottage, Ffordd-y-Bont, Treuddyn, Clwyd CH7 4LS

Norfolk: John Myhill, Church Farm, Hethel, Norwich NR14 1HD

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 make my sub to *Freedom* into a joint sub for *Freedom* and *The Raven* starting with number 16 of *The Raven*
- I am not yet a subscriber, please enter my sub to *Freedom* for issues
- I would like the following back numbers of *The Raven* at £2.50 per copy post free (numbers 1 to 15 are available)
- I enclose a donation to Freedom Fortnightly Fighting / Freedom Press Overheads / Raven Deficit Fund (delete as applicable)

I enclose £..... payment

Name.....

Address.....

.....Postcode.....