

# anarchist fortnightly Freedom

Vol. 53 No. 16

8 AUGUST 1992

FIFTY PENCE

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

## Ministry of Fun ... and Games Dominates the Media FACE THE REAL SCANDALS!

All kinds of theories have been advanced to explain the media's tenacity in exposing the latest Tory 'sex scandal'. The obvious one is that they don't want legislation to curb their salacious interest in the private lives of people in the public eye which helps to boost their failing circulation. And to the extent that they have succeeded in getting Major

to at least postpone legislation they have won a victory.

In our opinion the Mellor affair is a question of power politics. Both politicians and journalists are in the business not only for the money but also to feel that they have power. After all, who if not the media won the recent general elections for the Tories? And there the government was proposing to curb the power of the media that had by hook and mainly by crookedness won the elections for them.

The Mellor affair is just peanuts compared with the disgusting campaign directed at Neil Kinnock the person. Already Tory headquarters are doing the same job against John Smith. Such campaigns could not be launched with the media.

As we write, the media are giving prominence to Tory back-benchers who are daring to suggest that if PM Major and Chancellor Lamont do nothing to reduce the Bank Interest Rate or wave a magic wand to solve the crisis of the capitalist system, they must be replaced. All hot air, especially as this is the political silly season when the politicians are all

sunning themselves until October on full pay plus expenses.

The real 'scandal' is that the Tories with the connivance of the media persuaded the voting public that the recession was over, that the government would reduce taxes, unemployment ... the lot. And that a wicked Labour government would increase taxation for everybody (instead of the reality which was a too modest increase for the rich and stinking rich) and there were visions of Soviet-type control of everyday life.

We hope we do not have to explain to *Freedom* readers that we are not canvassing for support of the Labour Party, but there is no questions surely that, as *The Sun* proclaimed, the media had won the recent general elections for the Tories.

In June *Freedom* analysed the government's '50 Days of Dynamic Inaction' (13th June). We are now at the 100 days of 'Dynamic Inaction'. Unemployment has increased more thousands, the balance of payments continues on the wrong side, bankruptcies increase, more and

*(continued on page 2)*

## EDITORIAL

The media thrive on 'scandal'. The tabloids would feel starved were they to rely solely on the extra-marital goings-on of politicians and the boring details of the private lives of the royal family.

Anybody in the public eye in this age of television exposure to the gawping millions, whether they kick a football, strike snooker or tennis balls or become willy-nilly part of the goggling families in the various 'soap' series, are fair game for the gutter press, whether they go religious or lead 'scandalous' private lives. No laws to protect the 'privacy' of these 'public' stars can ever be made to work. So long as at least half the adult population of this country buy, or see, the three national Sunday tabloids - *The News of the World*, *Sunday Mirror* and *Sunday People* - and their brothers and sisters in the daily press, there is no way of cleansing this Augean stable other than by a massive boycott by the readers. It is wishful thinking to expect, or to hope, that this will happen in the near future.

As anarchists we are opposed to press censorship on principle. We are also opposed to the idea that the state should finance an alternative press, just as we are also opposed to the idea that the election campaigns of the political parties should be financed on the basis of the number of votes  
*(continued on page 2)*

## Two New Titles from FREEDOM PRESS

### LOVE, SEX & POWER IN LATER LIFE:

a libertarian perspective  
by Tony Gibson

The revolution in sexual mores experienced in Western Europe over the past thirty years has largely bypassed the needs of older people, with the emancipated young often unable to accept that the old, especially parents and grandparents, also have a continuing need for sexual and emotional fulfilment. Tony Gibson, in a well-documented account, sets out to redress the balance.

101 pages ISBN 0 900384 65 4 £3.50

### ANARCHISM AND ANARCHISTS

Essays by George Woodcock

The ten essays on anarchism range from 'The Advent of Anarchism and the Revolution of 1848' to 'The Prospects for Anarchism' written in 1990.

Nine essays on anarchists range from an appreciation of Proudhon and essays on Paul Goodman and Herbert Read to a critical evaluation of Chomsky's anarchism.

This volume is published by Quarry Press, Canada. Freedom Press are the European distributors.

268 pages 23cm x 15cm £9.95

Both volumes are available post-free inland from FREEDOM PRESS

(continued from page 1)

more of Thatcher's 'property-owners' are being repossessed. And now the bosses' union (the CBI) which, with the media at the time of the elections, was promising a rosy future if the Tories were returned, is

EDITORIAL

(continued from page 1)

they received at the previous elections. Let the ICI et alia and the Sheiks of Araby finance the Tories, in whom they have a vested interest, and let some trade unions (not all nowadays - after all, the CBI, the NFU, the doctors and the dentists, the landowners and the lawyers are the most entrenched trade unionists but they all vote Tory) provide 80% of the Labour Party's funds.

Malatesta pointed out many years ago that, as a minority, anarchists must oppose all attempts to muzzle the press, even of our disgusting tabloid newspapers, for the minority press would be the first victims. So if we even remotely hope to influence the lives of our fellows, the alternative press must be on a scale to challenge not only the gutter tabloids but also the 'serious' broadsheets - *The Times*, *Guardian*, *Independent* and *Telegraph* (and their Sunday sisters) - which, with all their qualities which it would be silly to deny, are nevertheless the most serious representatives of the capitalist system, for the simple reason that, in spite of their criticisms, they offer no alternative. They all have the same presentation and features: news, sport, women's page, letters, business and finance, stocks & shares page, and their circulation is a fraction of the tabloids but they flourish on quality advertising.

The alternative press virtually does not exist in this country. Even being charitable, *The New Statesman* (30,000 a week, if that), *The Tribune* (7,000 a week?), *Socialist* (no figures, but failed as a fortnightly, now monthly and hoping that the Labour Party conference will give it the 'kiss of life' - it is a well-produced periodical but still hoping that politicians will solve our socio-economic problems) are anyway a flea-bite to confront the mass media.

Yes, there are the 57 varieties of Trotskyist journals and the *Class War* middle class comrades do their best to emulate the tabloids once every two months. And the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists, and the pacifists and war resisters and various varieties of Greens all produce their journals in their separate compartments, ignoring the very existence of their 'sympathetic' contemporaries. Is there no possibility of a combined effort of the non-parliamentary anti-capitalist libertarian left to perhaps produce a weekly which would reflect all the strands of the non-authoritarian left, leaving it to the readers to decide for themselves the direction to which their ideas will lead them?

FACE THE REAL SCANDALS!

presenting a picture of gloom for the foreseeable future.

Quite rightly the Labour Party spokesman, Robin Cook, accuses the government of misleading the electorate when votes were more important than the truth.

But what could a Labour government have done to deal with the recession? The only relevant proposal was to tax those earning over £30,000 and to up the super-tax from 40% to 50% (the Tories had reduced it from 80% to 40% to help the struggling rich to get a better foothold in the economy). Otherwise nothing very much from the Labour think tank. Yet their post-mortem on their defeat blamed the proposed tax increases! (Incidentally, once more the Tories can thank the media for having completely deformed the tax proposals of the Labour Party to suggest that most people would be worse off instead of the *wealthy minority* only.)

The scandal of our society, as we approach the 21st century, is that we possess all the technology to provide for the needs for all humanity and yet in the

'prosperous' world the G7 nations have 30 million unemployed; there is a poverty 'class' (12 million in Britain, 30 million in the USA, how many in the other 'prosperous' countries?) and how many homeless? And we are only referring to the 'prosperous' minority of the world's people.

Gandhi uttered a great truth when he said: "There is enough in the world to satisfy everyone's needs but not everyone's greed."

As we have repeatedly argued in *Freedom*, capitalism is being consumed by its basic greed. We look forward to its early demise. But in the meantime those of us who believe in mutual aid, co-operatives, production for need as opposed to greed, the abolition of private property and for security of tenure and, as the final success of these objectives, the abolition of capitalism and the money system, MUST join hands, create organisations, be prepared to give up not only material benefits of this corrupt society but also time to further these objectives. Winning votes will change nothing.

... and some are more organic than others!

As from last month this writer, who has for the past 24 years grown vegetables organically - that is without artificial fertilisers and pesticides and herbicides - for sale can no longer use the term *organic* unless approved of by the gurus of the organic movement. As in the tale of the Wizard of Oz where the frightened lion needed a badge to tell the world that he was courageous, one now needs the badge of the Soil Association or of three other organisations to tell the world that you are an organic grower. Obviously you don't join the club for free. They have to employ inspectors to see whether your holding is kosher and you must allow them to descend on you whenever they can get round to doing so. And of course this costs money - for this writer's one hectare, a modest £350 a year: more than the cost of renting a holding twice this size! Now that organic farming (such as it is - and said to consist of 1,100 farmers and growers farming in all 125,000 acres which is 0.2% of the country's agricultural land) has been adopted by the supermarkets (*Safeways*, *Sainsburys et alia*) even the Bible-punching Minister of Agriculture John Gummer is making all kinds of promises, and our friends of the HDRA (Henry Doubleday Research Association) have made it on Channel 4 and now boast Prince Charles as their patron.

So the time has come to label the kosher growers to ensure henceforth that nobody can use the word *organic* who is not a member of this exclusive club.

One is sure that the intentions are honourable

and that since more than 70% of organic produce sold in this country is imported we should ensure that the foreigners observe the letter of the law. So it is a European Community ukase and there will be inspectors to ensure registered organic farmers observe the rules to the letter.

Inspectors are supposed to call on non-organic farmers to see how they treat their animals and whether they are polluting the environment. Apparently there are twelve such inspectors and there are some 180,000 farmers in the UK. What a hope! How more efficient will the organic police force be?

But apart from the numbers, why in a capitalist society assume that the 'inspectors' are incorruptible? Surely not a day passes but that cases of fraud are reported at all levels of society. Who are the biggest fraudsters today if not accountants and solicitors - quite apart from top politicians - and who knows what goes on in the freemasonry mafia?

The organic movement was until recently elitist in the sense that its propagandists were mostly well-to-do people financing experimental farms (such as, for instance, Lady Eve Balfour) and writers (such as Edward Hyams or Lawrence D.Hills) and one or two large farmers (such as Sam Mayell or Justin Brooks) and the few wholefood shops, the most important of which was the one in Baker Street, again financed by well-to-do

(continued on page 3)

games & GAMES

Strolling through the recently 'improved' Paddington Recreational Grounds, I paused to watch a dozen black kids skilfully whacking the ball round the football pitch. My silent admiration was broken by the voice of Big Brother on the tannoy: "If you want to play on this ground then pay £22, otherwise get off". So this is what better facilities means, another weapon in the adults' undeclared total war on kids and their spontaneous games.

Thanks to the car, street play is out. The derelict houses, vacant allotments and bomb sites are boarded up or gone. Recreational grounds that cost little to maintain have given way to costly concrete, tarmac, steel and plastic jungles. Childhood that isn't controlled, regimented and coerced by business do-gooding expert or parent is all but extinct. Children and their games have lived and can live in better times and places, as Stephen Cullen informs us in his excellent critique of *Children in Society*.

I took part in my first Olympics in 1947 (not '48) in Dick Ashton's backyard. Seven kids, girls and boys between six and twelve years old, running, jumping and throwing things in

Barcelona '92

a handful of events that might have composed the mythical Olympics. The Ashton's had a big backyard, all grass save for one majestic fig tree, and we older kids planned, argued and made the pits and jump sticks for ages before the big day. Being kids our Olympics were socially superior to those of the adults. We had a handicap system to give the girls and the little ones a chance. I recall, too, co-opting my seventy year old gran to practice with me in secret at the high jump and being told off, both of us, by my Uncle Eric for our stupidity.

But these games were just something special in a continuing whirl of barefoot activities that made up my adult-free paradise in Australia. We played cricket, football and hopscotch in the street; marbles, tag and hide & seek in a vacant allotment; we built cubby-houses in trees and played war, 1914-18 style, in trenches and ditches. If we didn't deliver papers at the crack of dawn we rode with the milkman in his horse and cart. Only the older boys dared to challenge the adult world - pressing front door bells and scarping, or pushing horse-shit in letterboxes or, even more thrilling, blowing up letterboxes with home made explosives. Come to think of it, letterboxes must have been important in those days.

Schooling was just incidental to this - an imposition on the child's real world. I knew when I was in paradise. On numerous exhilarating occasions I recall saying to

(continued on page 3)



## When is Organic not Organic?

(continued from page 2)

'food cranks', the most eminent of whom was, and may still be, the once child prodigy violinist Yehudi Menuhin.

The new organic movement is being run by very able youngish whiz-kids. They have persuaded the supermarkets that there's money in organic produce. It's not limited to vegetables or cereals. Meat is an important item and now the Henry Doubleday set-up even organises 'organic wine tastings' at their rapidly expanding headquarters in the Coventry area, where they have also built a conference hall.

In this writer's opinion, flirting with the supermarkets is the death sentence for small organic growers, and for quality. To cater for the demands made on growers the supermarkets require much larger units, more sophisticated heated greenhouses to supply all the year round produce, which is not only beyond the means of the small quality grower but is wasteful of fuel. For instance, tomato growers in this country can only make production pay over the season by providing early tomatoes, and this can only be done in heated greenhouses, an acre of which consumes some 25,000 gallons of fuel in the season, when there are tomatoes to spare from the Mediterranean countries if one really must eat tomatoes twelve months of the year.

There are now farmers 'going organic' on a few of their hundreds or thousands of factory farmed acres. The inspectors will have to check which are the 'organic' acres in this sea of non-organic acres. And supposing they are growing the same cereals on both, will the inspector be on the spot to make sure that when the cereals are harvested the kosher and non-kosher are kept apart?

In a capitalist society cheating is part of the game. After all, Brussels is moaning about the fact that vast sums are being claimed by EC countries for subsidies on produce that is being ferried from one EC country to another just to collect extra subsidies.

Recently an NFU (Farmers' Union)

spokesman, discussing the proposal for the latest countryside conservation scheme, thought that it would encourage many fraudulent claims in spite of the inspectorate.

Obviously this writer is an advocate (and practitioner) of xxxxxxx (forbidden word) farming and horticulture, but thinks that it has taken a wrong turning. Time will tell. A government report, for what it's worth, declares that "organic food producers in the UK make little or no money despite the growing consumer demand". Like all these statistics they really don't give a true picture of the present situation. According to the report there are now 1,100 organic producers in the UK farming 125,000 acres, an average of 113 acres per farmer/grower. This once more exposes the average. One knows of organic farmers with 500 acres (mainly with livestock) and horticulturists with only five acres or less. The small grower, in this writer's personal experience, does not expect to make a living from five acres if he/she has a family and/or a mortgage. The holding is a part-time enterprise with no illusions as to financial returns but great satisfaction in working on the land and self-sufficiency so far as one's own requirements are concerned.

There are also many disadvantages and we shall return to them on another occasion.

### Raven 17 on USE OF LAND

112 pages £3.00 (post free)  
includes articles which illustrate  
many of the arguments used in  
this article

## games & GAMES

(continued from page 2)

myself 'I'll never forget this moment' - looking close-up into a tuft of buffalo grass, lying full stretch puffing and panting on the ground after a great 'victory' in eluding my pursuers in a game of tag or laughing to the point of hysteria with a bunch of twelve year olds about some trivial anal incident. I can still list the names of all those there. Years later colleagues would comment on my inability to compromise with the injustices of authority and I would agree, mumbling something about knowing better times and places.

In 1956, a modest long jumper, I thought I might make the grown up's games in Melbourne. I blamed my failure on national service. The old men said my legs were too short. In truth I was not good enough. I went all the same as a spectator. In those days spectators were still the biggest source of income for the event. Money, businesses, high-tech and drugs were mostly on the sidelines.

All that remained of games in Barcelona was in the title. Capitalism may be on its knees but this celebration is designed to kid us otherwise. If there is an athlete who isn't making money and trained to incapacity for life, he's a misfit. The spectators contributed less than 5% of the £1 billion that came mostly from television companies and sponsorship. Apart from the cost of organising this occasion and the International Olympic Committee's administration, the rest goes to

organise sport in member countries, i.e. to making more monkeys and conforming adults out of youth - the spontaneous games of kids get bugger all.

The Olympics as a spectacle, and their commercialisation, depend on technology. The television companies erected gear worth £100 million just to provide multi-camera coverage, replays and slow motions of split second events like the high dive or the 100 metre dash for sixteen days. Nothing is permanent, nothing for real - that's capitalism in our time.

The vast system of sponsorship goes beyond making a business of sport and play and millionaires of a few athletes. It spawns an army of parasites - managers, agents, pimps, drug pushers. Even in 'drug-free', 'honest' Britain athletics events are skilfully stage-managed to enable stars to perform beyond their best. Weak efforts to control drug taking are easily circumvented by insiders who can tip off athletes about which event places to avoid because these will be 'random' tested by officials.

If it wasn't for capitalism the games might still be in Dick Ashton's backyard, but, you guessed it, the bloody developers have shoved a block of flats right on top of it.

Denis Pym

Order your book requirements  
from Freedom Press Bookshop  
and help our finances

## Gender and the Ideology

Ernie Crosswell's criticism of George Walford's claim that ideology is more important than gender (*Freedom*, 13th June and 27th June) raises some important questions about ideology and power over others.

'Male' ideology is the dominant ideology but it is important to qualify this by saying it is, as far as I can see, a constructed and learnt belief system. It does not seem to be innate for many people have come to reject 'traditional' male/female values and construct new ways of viewing and living life. It is because it is a learnt ideology that women too can adopt the active-dominant roles usually associated with some men and reduce or abandon their passive-subservient roles to which they are most often restricted. We can see this in the examples of women who become bosses and aggressive businesspeople.

I do not see that there are male/female values as such but values we come to associate with each gender and are in reality those we have learnt according to whether we are male or female. As a rule aggressiveness, not crying when in pain (an innate reaction boys are often taught to override), playing rough, physical games, even fighting, and so on, are modes of behaviour encouraged in boys accentuating the values we call 'male' and suppressing many of those we call 'female'. Similarly girls learn to accentuate their 'female' values and are allowed to cry, play non-violent games, to mimic mother at her chores, and so on, whilst being told off for being tom-boys, thus suppressing male-value associated behaviour.

This socialisation can be changed when the controllers of a society feel it is in their interests to do so. Therefore when Britain was at war with the axis powers women were brought into roles they normally were not allowed or enabled to do. Hard factory and agricultural work, supply and communication work in the armed forces, working on anti-aircraft guns, etc., were roles opened up

to women as the government felt it was in danger of defeat without this level of mobilisation. And in the USSR, which was faced with a higher level of danger, over one million women were in the armed forces in combat roles as fighter pilots, tank crews, machine gunners, etc. In a similar way there are now less restrictions on women getting into the capitalist corporate structure. So we can see that our accepted roles can be altered and women enter the 'domain of men' and vice versa.

What is important in the values delineated as male/female is the acceptance of domination, power and subservience even for the dominant group males. So even for men, supposedly 'dominant', there is a lot of taking orders and being told what to do, being subservient, etc., because we learn to accept and obey authority. Within this wider framework of a power structure there are sub-divisions of gender (patriarchy), of race, of age, and the like. They all entail domination and a lack of freedom and this structure clearly generates unhappiness (one only has to look around us!) but because we have people considered 'below' us we have someone to take our frustrations out on.

The very system that generates the unsatisfactory way we live provides us with belief of subservient people on whom we are more likely to take out our frustrations rather than facing up to the truth. The system is hell and so must be changed. So when things get economically bad the whites who have nothing turn on the blacks and blame them for their misfortune as that is a damned lot easier than understanding capitalism (and monopoly capitalism) is responsible. One of the most constant sub-divisions is gender as this enables men to be worked hard and they will take their frustrations out on 'the wife'. Whilst men battled to get women out of the workplace in the early industrial era and spend a lot of effort trying to keep them there, the

## The Social Market and the Barcelona Formula

The Germans use the expression 'the social market' to describe their economic system. It doesn't mean much over here, but if it was to be given meaning what would that be?

A useful insight came out of a recent conference called by *London 2000*. One of the speakers was Joan (a man's name) Busquets, Professor of Architecture in the University of Barcelona. As between Columbus, Seville and the Games, that city is very much with us this year. Since what makes us tick is the social market, there is some point in taking a closer look at it. Spain is the success story of 1992.

Barcelona, the city of Picasso and Gaudi, is very much into art and architecture, just as Shakespeare's London was very much into theatre. The city belongs to its people in a sense that, unhappily, we do not have - yet. In Barcelona architecture and town planning are everyone's business and it is all on the human scale. The only high-rise buildings I noticed on a recent visit there were the unfinished Gaudi cathedral and the two pencil-like towers specially built for the Olympic Games, one a VIP hotel and the other for all the offices necessary for running the administration.

The story goes back a long way. The Romans founded Barcelona and gave it the grid street pattern it retains to the present day. It is a port without any natural harbour, no river, no estuary, no helpful neutral water breaks: just lengthy piers built out from the beach. Everything is man-made, perhaps that is part of its secret, design is imperative.

Crossing the city and diagonally crossing the

grid, much like Fifth Avenue in New York, is The Ramblas over a mile long. This has two one-way traffic roads flanking a central pedestrian isle wide enough to encompass a broad pavement, trees, cafés, booths of all kinds, along which all Barcelona promenades all day and for most of the night as well. The motor car is decisively marginalised, but not excluded - a very ingenious formula. Beyond the end of The Ramblas is a vast residential area of apartments built on the grid pattern of the nineteenth century. It is called The Eixample. None of the corner buildings end in right angles - they have all been lopped off.

When Barcelona has something to celebrate, like a great exhibition or the Games, they don't put up temporary buildings and pull them down after the event, they re-design the city to match the occasion and everything is permanent. They also work on the principle that a city needs regeneration every 25 years anyway - and get on with it. The present Games have totally transformed the North Shore and the whole complex had been built over a new underground road of motorway proportions. It is all for keeps.

Barcelona did not lie down under Franco, but it had to be satisfied with small victories. After 1945 Barcelona froze, the middle classes started to move out much as they have done in the USA. The rot had to be stopped. The very depression called for new vision - the kind inspired by Gaudi who could not stand straight lines and flat surfaces, and

(continued on page 4)

## of Power

capitalists always managed to fill their pockets. As long as they have workers what do they care? Most of us are still dominated but continue to dominate others as we learn, implicitly and explicitly, that this is how it is.

This socialisation process puts a barrier between the values ascribed to males/females causing us to accentuate and suppress them to achieve the 'desired' result. But the barrier can be crossed either way and women can become soldiers in combat, terrorist bombers, assassins, directors of reckless companies and generally engage in oppressing their workforce as much as their male counterparts. The issue is power and authority as I feel is borne out by the Milgraws experiment in the 1970s. The experiment involved people delivering what they thought were real electric shocks to someone whenever he failed to answer questions correctly. The victim was in fact a scientist and merely pretended to be hurt by the punishment of 'electric shocks'. Whilst asking the questions in the presence of a white-coated scientist people went a lot further in upping the voltage with each failed question than when alone. The 'victim', in another room but with a microphone, would pretend to be in agony, say he couldn't go on and eventually the voltage would be so high that he would pretend to pass out after a rather realistic scream.

Despite their moral concerns, Milgraws found people could be persuaded by the authority figure to continue even after the 'victim' had gone silent and the voltage was, as far as they were concerned, increased with each question to incredibly dangerous levels.

What the experiment showed was that our conditioning to authority enables the latter to get us to do that which goes against our morality. (One can easily see how a few dedicated Nazis got others to join in their murderous ways as, after all, they were 'just

orders'.) But also of great importance is the fact that women in the experiment obeyed to the same degree and almost in the same numbers as the men. They too could be made to believe that delivering shocks to a crying man was all right.

The values of both genders accept domination and authority even if one group is seen as 'naturally' below the other in the hierarchy. For this reason women can join the controllers and exploiters and fuck up as many lives as men. If the system is wrong then it won't matter if our oppressor is male or female, black or white, young or old, etc., for to be in the system they must accept its values and the way it operates.

We must therefore be aware that the structure itself is unjust and that this creates the injustices to women, to children, to men, to black people, etc. If there is just concentration on the gender issue we will only end up enabling women to have access to the system which perpetuates wrongs and the environmental disaster we all face. Therefore the oppression of women must be linked to the struggle against all forms of authority and exploitation. No one on the libertarian left can justify, to my mind, seeking the liberation of women that will then enable them to also engage in the power system, to take on 'traditional male' power roles and exploit others. It must be part of the wider issue of getting rid of the very system itself.

We can try by stopping the clear division of values into female and male and start to accept those that are good and reject those that are bad. This means thinking about what we believe and not blindly accepting modes of behaviour just because we are a male or female. All values to do with ruling or being ruled must be rejected, so the values of males to dominate and those of women to be subservient to men must be discarded. Only then can we all become equals and hopefully stop the exploitation that is endangering this planet. Power over *anyone* is wrong regardless of their gender, race, colour, etc.

I. Borrows

## Pacifism is *not* realism!

In his article supporting pacifism (*Freedom*, 27th June) Stephen Cullen made several points that I feel I must criticise. He uses the issue of Northern Ireland to illustrate the futility of anti-government struggles as obviously the IRA cannot win a military victory, and on this few could seriously disagree. But clearly the IRA themselves are aware of this and it is not the type of war they are waging. In fact they have resorted to urban warfare against the British military and terrorism against the civilian population exactly because they do not have the forces and weapons to win militarily. It is unrealistic to think they ever could achieve this, which is why they have opted for the war of attrition, the killing of civilians, in order to force a political settlement on the British government. Terrorism is about keeping a cause alive and wearing down an enemy to the point they just can't be bothered any more. So one cannot view Northern Ireland and 'The Troubles' as proof fighting does not succeed in purely military terms as that isn't what's going on. You could take the line that such violence is immoral, as I would with some IRA actions, but Stephen tried to justify the futility of war purely in practical terms.

The issue of Northern Ireland aside, I would say that violence is necessary and will have to be used if we wish to change some situations. I agree that one cannot resort to it as an automatic knee-jerk reaction to any problem or difference of opinion, but some situations are beyond change for the better if we let those who resort to violence as a means of rule and power have their way. Peaceful methods must always be tried, but even Gandhi accepted the need for violence in some situations. And how long would he have lasted in East Timor or El Salvador or occupied Palestine where peaceful methods are tried but where the peaceful are continually beaten, tortured and shot.

An example which gives me a reason for believing in the need to react sometimes with

violence is a story told by a Jesuit priest about El Salvador. (Anyone who is aware of the recent history of that tortured country knows that state terrorism against the populace was the norm and random brutality a daily occurrence.) A peasant woman, sister and three children all sat at a table. They had all been decapitated and the head of each placed in front of them on a table with their hands placed on top of the heads as if stroking them. The hands of the eighteen month old baby mustn't have stayed in place on their own and so had been nailed in place. In the centre of the table was a plastic bowl full of blood.

How could peaceful methods be used to confront such barbarity? The right-wing state reacted to the peaceful organisation of peasants and unions with extreme violence, so how could they continue with such non-violent means without being obliterated? When all you demand is some land and an end to exploitation but are met with torture and death-squads, then to continue peacefully may be in line with one's personal moral convictions but I could not stand by and allow such hideous brutality to take place unchallenged. The killing of each sadist who engages in such oppression goes some way to changing things for the better, and to show the right-wing that they can't kill people just so that they can be rich and have power over others.

IB

Books reviewed in *Freedom* can be ordered from

**Freedom Press  
Bookshop**  
84b Whitechapel High  
Street, London E1 7QX

## The Social Market and the Barcelona Formula

(continued from page 3)

Barcelona today is dotted with his strange masterpieces.

The university, the professions, the town council, amenity and community groups, all politicians, most of Barcelona began a great debate in 1968 about the future of their city. Franco's demise in 1975 opened the doors.

Professor Busquets pointed out that every city with more than half a million in population had a mobility problem which means that the transport solution needs to be built into the design right from the start. Density means special provision for pedestrians and cyclists. And the key to success?

"The power is in the city council. The energy and initiative is in the local community. And if you put the initiative and power together, you can encourage the developer to make almost whatever you want."

So that is what the social market is!

The city is rebuilt *privately* according to rules and plans decided *publicly*. The city council is unquestionably in charge. It promotes the vast debate with every sector in the city and finally draws up the plan of development. It then puts the whole thing out to tender and the contracting developers do the job *as planned for them*. This means that a contractor agreeing to build 300 houses will also build a school. The public-private interest is integrated at the outset. There are no Canary Wharfs.

Professor Busquets added that the city council acquired "the confidence, a certain moral power, which I think is the most important, the key issue". And he never mentioned Madrid or the central government!

## Power and Corruption

**The Powerholders**

by David Kipnis

University of Chicago Press, 1976, second edition 1981

**Technology and Power**

by David Kipnis

Springer-Verlag, 1990

"Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." So said Lord Acton, and most anarchists would agree. Any hierarchical system provides positions of power which are sought by the worst sort of people, namely the ambitious, unscrupulous and ruthless. Furthermore, even if by some chance sensitive and honest individuals obtain positions of power, they can quickly become corrupted. This is the experience with governments, corporations, churches, political parties and

other institutions. One has to be careful about making automatic transfers between cultures, but lessons are another matter. Clearly Barcelona has powers to act that our cities (mostly financed by Whitehall) can only dream of. The social market cannot work in Britain until local authorities regain such powers as will make it possible. That is the first step. And with Barcelona plastered over our screens for weeks, this is not a bad time to raise the issue. People can see that it works.

And that it comes from Barcelona is, for anarchists, poetic justice. Bakunin, you should have lived to see this day! Some of the 1936-39 people have done just that.

Peter Cadogan

other institutions.

But why does power corrupt? For the answer, it is worth consulting the excellent work by David Kipnis, a professor of psychology at Temple University. He has carried out numerous experiments showing just how power corrupts.

For a person to be autonomous is widely considered to be a good thing. It is a feature of being fully human. When a person exercises power over others, the powerholder gains the impression that the others do not control their own behaviour or, in other words, they are not autonomous. Hence, they are seen as less worthy. In short, a person who successfully exercises power over others is more likely to believe that they are less deserving of respect. They thus become good prospects to be exploited.

For example, Kipnis organised experiments in which a 'boss' oversees the work of 'subordinates' in a simulated situation. The experiment is contrived so that all subordinates do the same work. But the subordinate who is thought to be self-motivated is rated much more highly - for exactly the same work - than the subordinate who is thought to have done the work only under instruction. As well as laboratory studies, Kipnis examines the effects of power on the powerholder through studies of couples, managers and protagonists in Shakespeare's dramas. The results are always the same.

In *Technology and Power* Kipnis follows through the implications of such evidence in a number of areas involving technology,

including medical technology, workplace technology and the technology of repression. For example, technologies for surveillance or torture serve to control others: that is the obvious effect. But in addition, the psychology of the powerholder is changed when the technology promotes the reality or impression that others lack autonomy. Those subject to the technology are treated as less worthy, and any prospects for equality are ruled out.

Kipnis rightly points out that few studies have looked at the effects of power on the powerholder. He has done an admirable job of redressing this imbalance.

As a result of his investigations, Kipnis is quite pessimistic about solving the problems of power and the technology that reinforces it, precisely because the usual prescriptions ignore the effects of power on the powerholder. It seems, though, that Kipnis is unaware of anarchism and the long-standing anarchist critique of all forms of hierarchy.

However, this gap need not detract from the value of Kipnis's studies for anarchists. Besides the points mentioned above, he deals with tactics of influence, use of rewards, inhibition of the exercise of power, motivations for power and other corruptions of power. This work bears close study by all who want to understand better the psychological dynamics of power.

Brian Martin

Order your book requirements from Freedom Press Bookshop and help our finances

# The Lesser of the Two Holocausts?

Past events can be presented historically or hysterically. In the blue corner we have those who assure us that Jesus is as much a historical figure as Julius Caesar, and in the red corner we have those who insist that not one Jew was gassed alive in Auschwitz. A question that nobody seems to want to ask, however, is why these particular questions are so important. Whether the answers be yes or no, the fact remains that a set of rules called the Sermon on the Mount appeared in our literature, and millions of Jews died a horrible death in concentration camps.

World War Two, the stage for the holocaust atrocities, also caused deaths from a variety of other horrible methods, including incineration in Dresden, irradiation in Hiroshima, and starvation and disease in many theatres. What is it that was so specially barbaric about German concentration camps? It cannot be the concentration camps as such because thousands of Boer men, women and children perished from hunger and disease in British camps at the turn of the last century. Is it the genocidal nature of those deaths? Hardly, because most Britons can still sing with gusto 'Land of Hope and Glory' in the wake of the wiping out of Aborigines, Maoris, American Indians and African tribes during the formation of the British Empire. And if it is the numbers, that is no problem surely when member states of the United Nations have the means to up the six million to a record score in the Guinness Book of Massacres.

Supposing we were given a choice, what method would we choose out of gassing,

torture followed by shooting, or death by starvation and disease? The young inmates of Feltham Remand Centre choose hanging, but their choice is rather limited, though they do have the option of staying alive if they can put up with isolation and maybe bullying.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki can be explained away as having shortened a war that would have resulted in even more deaths, had it gone on for much longer, but such an argument could hardly be put by the Nazis to excuse their treatment of the Jews. The former were planned massacres, but they lacked the systematic cold-blooded nature of the 'final solution'. The genocidal extermination of the Australian Aborigines was carried largely in 'hot blood' – at least they had spears and the chance to run away if they wished.

Perhaps one of the main reasons why revulsion at the holocaust lives on, and British imperial genocide does not, is the fact that the Jews form a powerful influence in so many countries, particularly the USA – unlike the poor Aborigines who had their pride taken away from them along with their land.

Another thing that has to be borne in mind is that the Jews, having no country of their own and therefore no government, could not declare war or have war declared upon them. The slaughter of Jews was, by the standards of the Geneva Convention, illegal. If you have a government that can declare war on your behalf, you can kill as many people as you like. In this sense, killing Jews was like hitting below the belt, which is certainly not cricket. Having no government behind them (a

situation that all but anarchists dislike) it is not surprising that Russian Jews have been emigrating to Israel despite the possibility that they are jumping out of a frying pan into a fire.

When all is said and done, the holocaust was no more evil than many of the other massacres that have occurred, and are still occurring, at the instigation of governments all over the globe. Those unfortunate Jews were just another example of the way governments behave when stretched to the limit, and people who insist that they belong to a race specially chosen by God, are very foolish to do so if they have no government to back them up.

The existence of national governments, all armed to the teeth, inevitably leads to war where the latest methods of killing will, if necessary, be used. If we want governments, we must be prepared to accept death by any means, including gas. A war crimes trial could await any government that loses a war because it is too squeamish to use its most lethal weapons or resort to the most extreme tactics. If the allies had lost the war by refusing to bomb Dresden, 'Bomber' Harris could have been found guilty of other outrages in a German court. War is barbaric. And if, as our church leaders tell us, it is morally justified to take that course which is the lesser of two evils, one holocaust can be acceptable if the only alternative is deemed to be another bigger holocaust. War is the inevitable consequence of the idea of nations and Hitler, Saddam and Stalin differ from Bush, Major and Rabin only in degrees of desperation.

EC

## FREEDOM PRESS new titles

- *Strip the Experts* by Brian Martin, 70 pages, £1.95
- *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
- *A Structured Anarchism: an overview of libertarian theory and practice* by John Griffin, 37 pages, £1.00
- *The State is Your Enemy: selections from Freedom 1965-86*, 270 pages, £5.00
- *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)

**THE RAVEN – 18  
ANTHROPOLOGY,  
ANARCHISM &  
AFRICA**

96 pages £3.00 (post free)  
from FREEDOM PRESS

# Pastoral Care and the Curriculum

(continued from last issue)

It had always been something of a puzzle that the wealthier classes so easily agreed with the proposals to create a system of education for all, since that would impose an enormous burden on both rates and taxes. But a close reading of the correspondence columns of *The Times* during the months leading to the Education Act of 1870 reveals that employers had noticed that those of their employees who had been to Dame Schools and Church Schools were much more amenable and 'well disciplined' than those who had not. Since only a well disciplined workforce could run the factories that were growing at a fast rate, with the three-shift system introduced to keep the engines running for 24-hours a day in the interests of maximum profits, employers saw schooling for all as a way to ensure disciplined workers even before they entered the factory and without expense to themselves.

The original curriculum for state schools was 'the three Rs' so narrowly interpreted that children spent, literally, hours at a time practising business letters and working out the cost of bills; learning the principal products and the ports of countries all over the world – all backed up by the threat and the liberal use of the cane – in preparation for life as clerks in business. It was the teachers' unions who fought over many decades to have that narrow curriculum made human with music, art, literature and games, against the narrow-minded businessmen who so often dominated county and local committees.

My central point is really that it does not matter a damn what 'subjects' you teach in school so long as it is concerned with real life in such a way that the pupils see its relevance and are emotionally involved. The most important thing that happens in Summerhill is the weekly 'meeting' where anything of interest to the pupils is raised by them and argued about until some resolution is found. Such meetings are far more important than lessons in English because their use of English is vital to get their points across to the meeting. The incentive to speak well and clearly springs from the child's need rather than from the teacher's demand.

But, and this is central to the argument, once the child realises that he is being taken seriously by the school, that his desires and interests are valued as important by his teachers, then there occurs a kind of release. He is able to speak with more confidence in expressing his views about whatever is of concern to him, and he knows that the teachers will listen to his point of view and either act on it or argue with him in a

democratic way. The result is that the child is also more open to the views of his teachers.

Let me finish by describing an experiment that, in my view, was even more startling and revolutionary than Homer Lane's *Little Commonwealth*, important as that was in changing the course of education in this country.

About twenty years ago in the early '70s, Alec Clegg, then Education Officer for the West Riding (before it became South Yorkshire) and Royston Lambert, then head of Dartington School, started a scheme for a group of boys in their last year at Conisbrough School. The scheme was practical, making toys for infant schools, refurbishing old office desks, repairing metal trolleys for a local steel works and so on. The boys were paid for the work they did and, after paying any necessary bills, could spend the money as they chose.

Dick and Pat Kitto from Dartington, Neill, a teacher from Northcliffe School from where the boys came, and Ken from the research Team at Dartington, together ran the scheme. All decisions were made by the staff and boys together, each having one vote. The staff planned a wide range of activities, including rock-climbing, visits to exhibitions, visits to Dartington, work with handicapped children, inviting well-known speakers to talk on current issues, and so on.

At first the boys regarded the exercise as just another gimmick by school, but when they were asked to decorate the rooms in The Terrace, were shown how to set about the task by a well-known local decorator and builder, were congratulated by him when they had finished and paid at the adult rate, they began to view the scheme more favourably.

I interviewed the first group of boys after they had completed the ten months of the scheme. I was surprised at their enthusiasm, their intelligence, their obvious ability to express themselves, at their confidence in themselves and their clear determination to improve their own ability to speak and write. They had become interested in local and national affairs to an extent that I would not have thought possible in the time since I had last met them. When I had first seen them at the start of the course, knowing that they had been chosen because they were held by their school to have no hopes of passing even GCE and had a record of truancy and of trouble with the police, they had lived up to their teachers' expectations. Now they were intelligent young men who had acquired a realistic assessment of their own capabilities and were keen to improve them. And this had happened in a period of ten months. So impressed was I in the change that I obtained leave to study the experiment.

The more I studied what was happening the more I became

convinced that old theories of intelligence were no longer tenable, and that motivation would have to play a much greater part than hitherto in any new theory. Even the boys' own parents could not believe what was happening. I began to realise that the key to the change was the democratic nature of the scheme; the fact that the boys' views and wishes were taken seriously by the staff. These boys had developed new interests and new skills. After they left the scheme some started work on their own account, some entered the local and traditional fields of coal and steel, but were taking an active part in their unions and in educating themselves both about the industry and their union.

In the course of studying the scheme and talking with both the boys and the staff I began to realise that, like Summerhill and Dartington from which Dick, Pat and Ken had come, confidence in themselves had grown from the democratic interaction between boys and staff. As one boy put it: "At school you couldn't talk to teachers". Others realised that they had more confidence in themselves and were therefore more prepared to try new activities. All spoke of school as a place where they had experienced constant boredom and frustration.

I began to realise that technical education should be done on the job where young entrants can see its relevance. School should be a place of joy in discovering the wonderful place that this world is and the wonderful things we can all do to make it better. Games, art, constructive activities to help people close at hand; music – actively learning to play and combine with others – taking part in real and suitable work with adults who care about the full education of the young. Above all, talk and argument to develop their intelligence and their sensitivities. I know this can be done because I have seen it happen.

School is fine for the bright lads and lasses who come from middle class families and see a well-paid future for themselves. For the rest it is a place where, through fear or ridicule, they are trained to toe the line and not to ask questions; good fodder for a future of button-pushing or pushing things across the trolley at the check-out, or undertaking dangerous, dirty and low-paid work such as mining, without complaint. Alec Clegg and Royston Lambert deliberately structured the scheme at The Terrace so that it could be easily incorporated without great cost into ordinary schools. I have written to MPs and others who have professed interest in raising the quality of education. Have I had a reply from any of them? Have I hell!

Michael Duane

## The Raven number 18 Discovering Anarchism?

The Raven anarchist quarterly no. 18: 'Anthropology, Anarchism and Africa' Freedom Press, 96 pages, £3.00 (post-free anywhere)

This issue of *The Raven*, devoted to anthropology, manages to cover both the exotic and the everyday. It attempts to blend, as John Pilgrim says in his introduction, the relevance of anthropology to anarchism with an ethnographic account of music in Milton Keynes, and a kind of travelogue by Angus Calder in Africa.

I suppose I ought to start with Harold Barclay's description of his discipline and his explanation of how anthropologists do anthropology. There are of course the ethical problems. The objection that anthropology has been used as a tool to justify the imperialist domination of their subject peoples by Britain and France in the nineteenth century, and more recently the United States, has been put by Edward Said in his book *Orientalism*. Mr Said even felt obliged to suggest: "Perhaps the most important task of all would be to undertake studies in contemporary alternatives to Orientalism, to ask how one can study other cultures and peoples from a libertarian, or a non-repressive and non-manipulative, perspective. But then one would have to rethink the whole complex problem of knowledge and power."

This is the 'west' and the 'rest' dichotomy. The notion, one might say the collective delusion, partly purveyed by disciplines like anthropology, that the occidental is somehow superior to the Oriental. Harold Barclay shows he is well aware of this problem, claiming that the funds for research continue to come from governments and corporations.

### Anthropological bias

An anthropologist may not slavishly serve the state, but there may be other forms of built-in bias.

An example of this kind of thinking is given in Jerome R. Mintz's *The Anarchists of Casas Viejas* when he shows that the attitude of intellectuals to anarchists and peasants is often to represent them as retarded creatures of social evolution. Mr Mintz in a footnote says:

"In his discussion of the distortions of anarchist activities by historians, Noam Chomsky warns that intellectuals may adopt the attitudes of their class in describing popular movements and the presumed need for elitist supervision ('Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship' in *American Power and the New Mandarins*). Writing forty-odd years earlier, Diaz del Moral ascribed to the campesinos racial and cultural stereotypes that were the common saws of his class. The sole cause of the waves of rural unrest, Diaz del Moral asserted, could be found in the psychology of the campesinos. He believed that the Andalusian field workers had inherited a Moorish tendency towards ecstasy and millenarianism that accounted for their attraction to anarchist teachings... Spanish anarchists have been classified as racially inferior Moorish fatalists on the one hand and as mystics and ineffectual utopians on the other. Brennan found that the 'deeper layers of Spanish political thought and feelings are Oriental'. More recently, Carr reaffirmed Diaz del Moral's picture of the cycle of anarchist activity as 'the sudden relapse into Moorish fatalism, apathy and brute indifference'."

While he accepts that anthropology "has too frequently been dependent upon and manipulated by governments and other powerful institutions", Harold Barclay claims that as a discipline it is "open-minded and free from orthodox conventions". Sociology suffers from similar dangers in that funding for research is often aimed at benefiting business, management, administration or the needs of the market. Clearly Mr Barclay wants to acquit his colleagues of any conscious collaboration with the aims of the state and big business.

Would a branch of fascist anthropology spring up if fascist governments returned to Europe? There was no shortage of German scientists willing to swallow 'racial science' under Hitler. A more subtle snag has been identified by Michael Moerman in his paper 'Accomplishing Ethnicity': "Were it not so generally shared, professionally entrenched and scientifically justified, the naïveté of

anthropology would be amusing... Anthropologists imagine that it would not be a fish who discovers water, yet believe that the credibility of a cultural analysis varies with the length and intimacy of fieldwork. Anthropologists point out that everyone's viewpoint is rooted in his social position, yet suppose that their own observations are unmotivated and their motives invisible."

What it seems to me Harold Barclay does is look for traits and social characteristics in cultures which he is able to identify as 'anarchistic', or having an 'absence of government'. In an abstract way he has two social models in mind: one 'authoritarian' the other 'anarchic', and is able to tot-up the features of any culture and decide how close it comes to either of his two ideal models. In the end Mr Barclay decides what behaviour is 'authoritarian' and what is 'anarchic', not the

natives he is studying. This approach is not uncommon among social scientists; indeed in 1969, the anthropologist Fredrick Barth complained of social anthropologists avoiding problems by using a "highly abstracted concept of 'society'" which allowed them to treat "a world of separate peoples, each with their own culture and each organised in a society which can legitimately be isolated for description as an island in itself". In Harold Barclay's case, being able to dissect the world into 'savage' and 'civilised' or 'anarchic' and 'authoritarian' he is able to make some sweeping statements. He feels able to say, for example: "'Civilisation' clearly correlates with true warfare, slavery, social classes and castes, human sacrifice, state and government bureaucracy" or that "rigid and restrictive child rearing practices coupled with corporal punishment are

invariably found in authoritarian societies".

The temptation is to develop shortcuts by posing abstract models of society; by forming lists of social behaviour, traits and characteristics; by analysing cultures as 'islands to themselves'; by ignoring that, as Barth says, "cultural differences can persist despite inter-ethnic contact and interdependence". The temptation of the social scientist is to impose his own conceptions where either he doesn't understand what the native is doing or where there are apparent gaps in the native's conception. Mr Barclay refers to the lack of a concept of freedom in many ethnographic reports on native cultures. He says of freedom: "Perhaps it is a difficult term to get at since many people throughout the world seem to lack a conscious or verbalised conceptualisation of it. Freedom seems to be a term which has been most discussed in European circles since the eighteenth century."

It would make sense to look at how natives use their own conceptions, and seek to study

(continued on page 7)

## WILL AMERICA RULE THE WORLD?

[This prophetic piece was written by Marie Louise Berneri in *War Commentary*, December 1939. Yankee imperialism has not changed in the intervening fifty years: Eds]

Mr Roosevelt seems to have stepped into the shoes of the Almighty. From all sides come flattering greetings and most urgent requests. These requests do not reach him from rulers of the world only but also from the pens of pacifists and socialists. In *Peace News*, for instance, it has been suggested that it is up to Roosevelt to call a conference to end the war, and the editor of *Forward*, having apparently lost hope since the end of September of hearing King George VI announce over the radio that peace had been made with Germany, suggested, on October 28th, "an International Peace Conference to be called immediately to be held in the USA, under the presidency of President Roosevelt..."

A naive observer may well ask himself what are the qualifications of the President of the United States to justify such universal confidence. Roosevelt's moving appeals which have reached Europe during the last few years have been strangely contradicted by his eagerness to turn the war to profit as soon as it was declared. Thanks to this great pacifist, Wall Street is rubbing its hands at the prospect of French and English orders, and the importance given, during the debate on the Neutrality Act to the cash and carry provision leaves no doubt as to the disinterested sympathies of the US for the two democracies!

*The Star* of Kansas City puts it in a nutshell: "Plain common-sense and national interests require this country to throw open all its resources to the nations who come to buy American goods of whatever sort". Furthermore, it has been "estimated by a Government economist that between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000 of America's unemployed will obtain jobs by January if war brings large foreign orders and stimulates more intensive investment of private capital". The economic situation in American can hardly be called bright at the present time. She needs new markets

for her products; the New Deal has not met with the success hoped for and the war may just bring the prosperity to increase Roosevelt's popularity.

The United States are ruled by capitalist interests (probably to a greater extent than any other country) and these interests seem to identify themselves with American imperialist interests. In fact, one can justly ask whether, from an imperialist point of view, the United States have not a great deal to gain by a war which will weaken their three great rivals: Germany, Britain and France. No matter where the United States have attempted to establish their domination, whether in Asia or the Americas, they have always clashed with British or German interests.

In China, British interests are more extensive than American interests. Whereas Britain owns the banks, railways and mines, America, who arrived on the scene later, had the monopoly in aviation and only a few investments in the mines and railways. Even in these, they clash with German interests.

In Latin America the conflict between European powers and the US is no less noticeable. It was manifest recently in regard to the nationalisation of the Mexican petroleum companies, the outcome of which has been a victory for American interests. As the *Bulletin of the Archives of Geneva*, dated 7th June, points out: "From now onward, the United States is the indisputable master of all the domains of Mexico. The last British stronghold (in Latin America) has been demolished to its foundations. The United States have employed the only means of driving the English from Mexico without firing a single shot."

It is also suggested in the *Bulletin* that it was with the aid of Cardenas that the English were finally driven out of Mexico. This was accomplished without difficulty. While the English were rejoicing in the

possession of 60% of the petrol in Mexico as opposed to the 40% controlled by the American companies, Cardenas expropriated it all. But, while the expropriation aroused a storm of indignation in London, it was greeted calmly in Washington. What would that suggest? According to the *Bulletin*, an understanding was reached between Washington and Mexico by which all the petrol would be American "thus demolishing the last British stronghold in this hemisphere".

And a recent report which appeared in *The Daily Telegraph* (26th November 1939) states that the Mexican petrol has been sold to an "independent American firm".

In South America too, the dreams of American hegemony have been badly jarred by German propaganda in recent years, and no doubt the US would welcome the removal of such a dangerous rival.

Is it too much to suggest that the United States have the opportunity of gradually ousting Britain, even in the Dominion markets, due to the increasing difficulties created by the war on production and transport from the metropolis?

Let it not be said that the above is pure Machiavellism and that American opinion, and perhaps Roosevelt himself, do not experience a genuine sympathy for the democracies. The opinions of the masses (or rather, what the press makes them believe) has nothing in common with the combined capitalist and imperialist interests which determine the policy of the country. But it must be recognised that these interests have everything to gain by a European war. And if it is as yet too early to forecast accurately the results of this war, one can however state that the United States by promising help to the democracies, and Russia by promising to help Germany, are ready to reap the fruits of their cunning political manoeuvres.

This article is one of 51 by Marie Louise Berneri in the volume *Neither East Nor West* with 16 anti-war cartoons by John Olday 1943-1944, 192 pages, ISBN 0 900384 42 5, £4.50 (post free inland) from Freedom Press.

With the collapse of Soviet communism many Marxists, it seems, are undergoing an identity crisis. Marxist intellectuals like Robin Blackburn are beginning to take seriously the anarchist critique of Marx and the Bolsheviks, while at the same time searching around for some theory – other than anarchism – that might affirm their continuing radicalism. Abandoning Marxism, such intellectuals often end up embracing some form of social democracy dubbed 'market socialism'. Blackburn now seems to take his inspiration from the liberal economist Friedrich von Hayek, one of the gurus of Thatcherism. This bewilderment 'after the fall' has led many Marxists to abandon their allegiance to dear old Lenin, and to suggest that there may perhaps be some organic link between his revolutionary politics and Stalinism. They thus join hands with the liberals and conservative critics of the October revolution in Russia. Anarchists, of course, have long been critical of Bolshevism. They have seen this as a betrayal of the revolution, but unlike

## The Bolshevik Tradition

liberal scholars they have always affirmed the revolution itself. Thus Marxists or ex-Marxists are now obsessed with the question: 'Did Lenin lead to Stalin?' This is the title of a recent article in the theoretical journal of the Socialist Workers Party (*International Socialism* 55) by Robert Service, a biographer of Lenin. He comes to the conclusion that Lenin's conception of politics was almost identical to that of Stalin: both believed in dictatorship and the one-party state, both used terror tactics when the party's power was threatened, and both stressed the subjugation of the soviets and the worker's organisations to the will of the party. Service concludes: "There really was something violent and authoritarian both about Bolshevism from its inception after the turn of the century and about the October revolution from its earliest days" (1992, page 81). Another critic is Samuel Farber, author of the

recent book *Before Stalinism: the Rise and Fall of Soviet Democracy* (1990). He tries to draw a distinction between what he calls "mainstream Bolshevism" (Lenin) and his own brand of Marxism – "democratic revolutionary socialism". His basic argument is that Lenin's authoritarian and dictatorial strategies – which suppressed the free and authentic political life of Russia by 1920 – cannot be explained simply by the exigencies of the civil war, but were intrinsic to Lenin's own politics. The latter he feels belongs to the Jacobin tradition, which favours centralisation for its own sake, and is not inclined to support civil liberties, minority rights or real popular sovereignty. Likewise Blackburn seen Lenin, in his suppression of Kronstadt and of the remnants of pluralism that were expressed in the soviets, as having 'set the stage' for Stalinism (1991, page 189).

To anyone who has read Gregori Maximoff or Voline none of this is new.

But defenders of the Bolshevik tradition are still around, in the guise of the Socialist Workers Party. They recently held their summer school to rally support and to defend their version of Marxism, to defend 'democratic centralism', the theory of the vanguard party and the workers' state. This implies, of course, a compulsive need to rubbish anarchism. This is in line with the best traditions of Bolshevism. Did not Lenin suggest that his methods were calculated to evoke hatred, aversion and contempt towards those he disagreed with, that he was concerned not "to correct the mistake of the opponent but to destroy him, to wipe his organisation off the face of the earth"? Thus at their recent conference the Socialist Workers Party were mustered "in defence of October", to uphold the Bolshevik regime and its terror, to suggest Makhno was a bandit, and the tragedy of Kronstadt an "anarchist myth". One woman at the meeting on Kronstadt valiantly tried to put the anarchist case, to defend the Kronstadt workers, and to draw attention to Bakunin's perceptive insights into the inherent dangers of a centralised vanguard party who see themselves as leading and representing working people. She was derided by Pat Stack, who went on to issue a diatribe against Bakunin describing him as a charlatan and as someone who wanted to destroy 'society'. This indicates the low level of understanding that such Marxists have of anarchism. They ritually incant Marx's words that "the emancipation of the working class is the act of the working class", while at the same time arguing that a disciplined 'party' is necessary to direct, control and lead the working class. Rural proletarians and peasants they dismiss, along with the anarchists, as petty bourgeois reactionaries.

Brian Morris

## Discovering Anarchism?

(continued from page 6)

the social rules and how people apply themselves to these rules.

As developed by Harold Barclay, the claim that: "The viability of anarchy, or the absence of government, is demonstrated by its widespread occurrence amongst a variety of cultures..." will comfort some anarchists who need some reassurance.

### Musical anarchists

Colin Ward is one of those anarchists who seek to show anarchism, or something close to it, is just around the corner. All that is required is a few adjustments here and there to the present system, a few modifications in human behaviour, arrived at quite painlessly, and we will usher in something like a libertarian society.

This idea of respectable anarchism has been around for a long time. At the time of the Spanish Civil War there were some, as Malcolm Muggeridge pointed out in his book *The Thirties*, who claimed that "though anarchism was ordinarily believed to aim at the destruction of all authority, as worked out by the Catalonian anarchists it was productive of something scarcely distinguishable from Welwyn Garden City".

Mr Ward, who has made respectable anarchism into a fine art since the 1960s, writes here of 'Anarchy in Milton Keynes'. His approach is to uncover the seen, but unnoticed features of anarchism in everyday life, and then to encourage their development. This is street corner anarchism, if you like.

He has based this approach on a quote from Martin Buber's book *Paths in Utopia* in which the German anarchist Gustav Landauer is reputed to have said: "The state is not something which can be destroyed by a revolution, but is a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of human behaviour; we destroy it by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently."

In this attempt to reveal for us an oasis of anarchism in our midst Mr Ward has turned to Ruth Finnegan's study of Milton Keynes entitled *The Hidden Musicians: music-making in an English town*. It is claimed that this ethnographical account shows that beyond the hierarchical 'top-down model' of culture with its musical specialists and its mass presentation at professional concerts, there is an undergrowth of local musical endeavour which runs by a different set of rules. Not the boss's rules, but rules, as Finnegan says, based on collective "decision

making, communication, choice between alternative methods of achieving objectives, delegation of responsibilities and, above all, co-operation in the attaining of more or less agreed ends..." These are the maxims, argues Finnegan, for running local amateur music.

Colin Ward compares this method for running a local organisation of community music with Martin Buber's social principle of what happens when people "link themselves in pursuit of a common need or interest" and Kropotkin's idea of this kind of voluntary co-operation as a social structure. This is not a description of a rigid regime, but as Kropotkin said, an organisation reflecting a harmony which "would result from an ever-changing adjustment and readjustment of equilibrium between the multitude of forces and influences" and, above all, "would represent an interwoven network, composed of an infinite variety of groups and federations of all sizes ... temporary or more or less permanent – for all possible purposes".

Mr Ward asks, wouldn't it be nice if we organised our work, our education, our health services or our transport along the lines they organise the music scene in Milton Keynes.

The rest of this *Raven* is given over to a journal of Angus Calder's trip round East and Central Africa to research the state of poetry there, and a further development on the theme of sociobiology by Peter Gibson.

Brian Bamford

### References

Robin Blackburn, editor, 1991, *After the Fall*, London, Verso.

Tony Cliff, 1980, *Rosa Luxemburg*, London, Bookmarks.

Samuel Farber, 1990, *Before Stalinism: the Rise and Fall of Soviet Democracy*, London, Polity Press.

Victor Serge, 1967, *Memoirs of a Revolutionary 1901-1941*, Oxford University Press.

Robert Service, 1992, 'Did Lenin Lead to Stalin?' in *International Socialism* 55, pages 77-84.

Mary-Alice Waters, editor, 1970, *Rosa Luxemburg Speaks*, New York, Pathfinder Press.

(to be continued)

## Anarchist Summer Picnic

Supporters of the London Anarchist Forum welcome comrades and friends to our Summer Picnic held at 2pm on Monday 31st August 1992 (August Bank Holiday).

The Picnic will be held in the Orleans Gardens recreation area on the north bank of the River Thames to the west of Marble Hill House, a fine white Palladian mansion, in Twickenham, Middlesex.

Those coming by public transport can either go to Richmond Station (District Line, North London Line or Network South East from Waterloo) thence by bus travelling to Twickenham or St Margarets, or to St Margarets Station or Twickenham Station thence by Richmond buses. Alight at Marble Hill House.

Walkers from Richmond Station go left along The Quadrant / George Street / Hill Street then right over Richmond Bridge and either turn left on the tow path along the Thames for about a mile or go along Richmond Road for the same distance past Marble Hill House thence left up Orleans Road. Those from St Margarets Station go down Crown Road to Richmond Road and turn right. From Twickenham Station turn left down London Road, left along York Street and Richmond Road. Both turn up Orleans Road.

For car users approaches can be made via the M25 and M3/A316 Great Chertsey Road turning right for St Margarets thence along St

## More Letters

Margarets Road, past St Margarets Station, turn right down Crown Road and left along Richmond Road. From the North Circular turn right down Crown Road and left along Richmond Road. From the North Circular turn right before Kew Bridge and use the A315, A310, A3004 to St Margarets. From the South Circular use the A305, right along the B353 and left along the A316 and left to St Margarets (avoiding Richmond town centre). Marble Hill Park has a small car park on its left facing which may quickly fill up on a Bank Holiday Monday, otherwise street parking.

There are numerous pubs with good quality beers en route and some cafés, but remember it is a Bank Holiday. Try and bring food and drink for sharing and a bag for your litter.

Peter Neville for  
London Anarchist Forum

## 'Small Capitalists' Good?

Dear Editors,  
A reply to John Papworth (*Freedom*, 27th June 1992). John says "Adam Smith was quite right when he urged that

competition among lots of small capitalists, plus freedom of consumer choice, was enough to prevent exploitation and abuse". Anyone who wants to see if this is true need only read Dickens, Zola, Tressell and their contemporaries to find out what life was really like for millions of working class people at the height of small capitalism: widespread poverty, illness, poor diet, bad housing, shoddy goods, starvation, unemployment, deplorable working conditions.

John obviously doesn't understand the nature of capitalism; to survive a company needs continually to expand or it will be absorbed (merger, take-over by another) therefore it is inevitable that monopolies reappear. The only way to prevent this would be for a body or organisation to be set up to regulate them; they would soon consolidate their power through the ability to interfere with the economic system, hence the re-emergence of the state.

Capitalism doesn't produce the goods, people do.

Jason of Deptford

## Editors' 'contentious remarks'?

Dear Editors,  
The 11th July edition of *Freedom* contained an editorial article 'Reflections on the Capitalist Racket' which ended with the following, emphasised, piece of innuendo: "... whether our pacifist comrades like it or not, the capitalist system will only ever be defeated by direct action ..." What does he mean (I say 'he' confidently)? Does direct action necessarily have to be premeditated violent action? Where is the evidence that such violence ever got rid of a capitalist system? Is conscientious objection, leading to imprisonment or perhaps death by firing squad, not direct action?

Surely the place for such contentious remarks is on the viewpoints pages, not in editorials. Churning out editorials is a selfless task, but that is no excuse for using editorial power to slip in dodgy personal viewpoints.

Ernie Crosswell

[This editorial writer and Ernie Crosswell have been crossing swords for at least forty years – we will never agree until 'death do us part'! Most of his contributions are published without editorial comment. On this occasion he has exceeded the limits of our non-violent tolerance. So long as the present editors produce *Freedom*, and take responsibility for its publication year in, year out, what he considers as "contentious remarks" which should be included on the viewpoints pages are in fact the editorial viewpoint, for better or for worse!

We agree that "churning out editorials is a selfless task". Would that there were more editorial writers to share the burden! But to declare that the views Crosswell objects to are "dodgy personal viewpoints" just because he dislikes them provokes this writer to ask Crosswell how he defines his viewpoint. This writer opposed World War Two on revolutionary grounds and ended up in prison for his "dodgy personal viewpoints". Our good friend Crosswell on his own admission was one of HM millions of conscripts, which perhaps explains why he is not such a fundamentalist pacifist. Eds]

Keep sending those letters!

# Non-Violent Change?

Dear Editors,  
I think that I should reply to Neil Birrell's letter (*Freedom*, 11th July) concerning my arguments for non-violent change. Although Neil makes some show of answering my original article, he really attacks some of the more stylistic elements of the piece (which, nonetheless are pertinent to the argument) and then goes on to list some of his arguments in favour of violence.

Neil accuses me of setting up a straw man in order that I may knock it down, the example he gives being my accusation that too many people on the left believe, subconsciously or consciously, in "the myth of the barricade, the heroic militiaman/woman, head bandaged (not guts spread all over the place), flag in the corner of his/her mouth ..." (from my original article). He claims that there aren't many pro-violence 'revolutionaries' that are like that. Well, to a degree we can't resolve that argument, but interestingly enough the day that I read Neil's letter I saw a book in my local second-hand bookshop entitled *Che Guevara and the Cuban Revolution*. This is a thick collection of Guevara's speeches profusely illustrated with photographs of the man. And, yes, you've guessed it, it was full of the sort of images that I'd originally mentioned, even down to one

of Che with two neat little bandages and a cigarillo in the corner of his mouth, automatic rifle in hand. Frankly, the photographs in that book of Che and Castro reminded me of nothing more than the various action shots of Mussolini that we all take so much delight in guffawing at. There were pictures of Che in combat trousers, stripped to the waist working with the peasants, Che target shooting, Che in military conference with other officers, Che in combat gear playing golf (!), in fact doing everything Mussolini liked to be photographed doing - he was an ex-soldier and revolutionary socialist too. I assume the editors of the book felt that they were giving their left-wing readers what they want.

Neil continues by saying that he "loathe[s] the very idea of violence". One might answer "I've heard that before". In fact, I have heard that before, and the last person I heard saying it was a Royal Air Force officer. But then, as Neil points out, some good anarchists have, like RAF bomber command in the last war, been able to see the necessity of violence - Kropotkin being one. However, I'm not prepared to listen to Kropotkin on this one - after all, he supported the Great War.

Neil also attacks me for my proposed strategy, rightly divining that I don't think the achievement of a full-blown anarchist society is possible. He's right, I don't, but I do think we can encourage through education and our own personal examples more people to adopt an anarchistic way of life. If you really want to change things you have to change individuals. Anyone who thinks that a 'revolution' is possible whereby everything is changed overnight is either a fool or a fanatic - and they are both dangerous.

As far as violence as an act of revenge goes, then I'm afraid that I don't agree with that either, as I implied in my original piece when I said that such violence doesn't lead to a better society. I must also object to Neil's use of the chilling word 'execution'. That smacks

of all the horrors of statist murder, cold-blooded terror. Would Neil like to press a 9mm pistol against someone's head and then pull the trigger? That's 'execution' for you.

The strategy of terrorism that says you can provoke a state into being extremely brutal and repressive and thereby turn the people against it is far less than "limited by its potential" as Neil states. Such a strategy pushed Colombia from being a bourgeois democracy to a military dictatorship, and set off a chain reaction throughout South America in the 1970s, and in the old West Germany the spoilt bourgeois terrorists of the RAF found that far from turning against the state most Germans wanted to see even greater powers given to the security forces. Great strategy!

A point on tanks. I doubt if the British Army would ever feel the need to use tanks in a civil situation - they're too able for that, but that doesn't mean that tanks can't be used. Recently the old Soviet regime used them in the Baltic states, the Chinese used them to finish the pro-democracy demonstrators, and the Algerians are using them just as the French did thirty years ago. Tanks inspire fear, they are useful against lightly armed protesters.

Neil also seems to see some sense in the tactics of the IRA, Che Guevara (the man who made love in combat gear) and Mao. Well, I don't think the IRA will 'win', and the nationalists in Northern Ireland might as well have found that the nationalist struggle in the Baltic was a better model, rather than that developed by the proto-clerico-fascist Patrick Pearse. The Cuban revolutionaries won, but as I argued in my article they still haven't taken off their combat gear and Cuba is a highly militarised society, not an anarchist paradise. And remember that the Cuban revolutionaries won against a poorly equipped tin-pot army. As for Mao, he finished his fighting by conducting a full-scale war with regular troops, and look where that 'revolution' ended up - more 'executions' than any other revolution or reaction in history,

and that includes the Nazis.

Neil says that I exaggerate when I say that the modern state cannot be defeated by political violence. Do I? Can he give me one single example where violence has defeated a modern, westernised state and ushered in an anarchist society?

Then Neil turns to the examples of the Viet-Cong and the French resistance. The Viet-Cong certainly used guerrilla tactics (though there's not much in the way of dense jungle in Britain) but they were also backed by aircraft, heavy artillery (remember Dien Bien Phu, the French artillery was outraged by its opponents' guns), mortars and tanks - where's the Neil going to get his from? As for the French resistance, and, indeed, all the resistance groups throughout western Europe, I'm afraid that their usefulness has been greatly exaggerated. Certainly heroic acts were performed (as they were by the Germans and those who collaborated with them) but how useful were these groups really? And what were the effects of their violence? Firstly, their usefulness was always very limited. Alone they could never have defeated the Germans, that took the might of the armies of the USSR, USA, Britain and the Empire, and a lot of others, not a few thousand badly-armed resisters. In fact, most countries in the west had to be pushed into resisting, by Britain's Special Operations Executive. They were acting on Churchill's exhortation to "Set Europe Ablaze!" God, what a disgusting thing to say! And many times the only result of the SOE's meddling was the suffering of the innocent and no change in the final outcome of the war. Take Denmark, for example, the SOE had to create the violence there and, predictably enough, the Germans went over to top in their response - just as the SOE knew it would. And when the SOE engineered the assassination of the SS boss Heydrich in Czechoslovakia they didn't change a thing (there were plenty of SS bosses about), only they knew that the SS would 'execute' plenty in reply. Lidice was the SS's answer, that was the result of the SOE's action. Innocent men

and women murdered, kids orphaned. Would the men who carried out the Heydrich killing (and lost their lives too) have thought it had been worth it if they had known? Perhaps their SOE bosses thought it was - after all, it was a propaganda victory.

I've gone on at great length about this because I feel that violence must be seen for what it is - an evil. I don't think it works, violence simply breeds more violence, and it isn't usually the armed men (and it is usually men) that suffer, but the weak, the old, the women and the children - look at Sarajevo. Violence cannot be the way if we want to build a new, more humane, more equal, loving society. If you want your revolution you can start it today - with yourself. My wife and I began our personal 'revolution' a few years ago, partly through reading *Freedom* (I'd sent away for a copy after reading about it in *The Daily Telegraph* - which is proof that propagandist/educative efforts do sometimes work). We must resolve to start our revolutions now, not wait for some 'revolution' in the distant future when it will happen in a few bloody weeks, and until then you can forget about the way you live your life. I thought that Neil's letter was a fair response to my article, but when he writes "I feel that violence, unfortunately, will be necessary to achieve ..." I am reminded of all the government spokesmen of all the wars and 'police actions' I can remember.

Stephen Cullen

## Non-Violent Change?

Dear *Freedom*,  
I think Derrick A. Pike misunderstands the essential point of my recent piece regarding 'means' and 'ends'. Peaceful 'means' of protest, action and publishing anarchist ideas are preferable to 'means' employing force. However, where 'force' is being used to stifle free expression of our view, then violence can be justified, if it can restore the conditions where 'peaceful' criticism is once more possible.

Not all anarchists are 'pacifists', like Derrick A. Pike, and do not regard 'violence' in self-defence as being in the same category as the violence which is perpetuated by oppressive forces on behalf of governments, capitalists, etc. In certain circumstances it is a regrettable necessity.

JS

## Non-Violent Change?

Dear Editors,  
I, like Derrick Pike, find it equally difficult to understand why so many anarchists still believe in the possibility of the violent destruction of the state. A study of history shows that violence did play a big part in replacing one tyrant with another, but in the main it always left the system intact and hardly changed the conditions of the majority of people. For example, feudalism was not introduced into this country by William the Norman, but was already well on the way when he landed here. Although the common people had to do the fighting, the battle was always between tyrants contending for power and control over the daily lives of people. I am a pacifist but willingly concede that pacifists cannot possibly be certain how they would behave in every conceivable situation. Certainly I believe in direct action, but it is absurd to talk about military action in modern times. Gustav Landauer, who was murdered in 1919, wrote as follows: "The state is not something which can be destroyed by a revolution, but is a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of behaviour. We destroy it by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently". Anarchists may benefit by reading Derrick Pike's book on *Anarcho-Pacifism* and also Landauer's books, *For Socialism* and *Call to Revolution*.

Neil Fisher

## Christianity and Anarchism

Dear Editors,  
As it was my article in *Freedom* of 16th May that appears to have started the present debate on Christianity and Anarchism I hope I may be allowed a few words to clarify the debate. Firstly all discussion is good and I value those letters against me as well as those for. However, we may be a cross purposes.

Most of those writing against Christianity seem to be attacking religious fundamentalism, in which case those writing for would probably join with them. Fundamentalism based on literal and often incorrect translation and interpretation is in itself a form of materialism. The fundamentalists are concerned with historical fact and authority as are most materialists. The real debate is between those who believe in a spiritual nature and a spiritual path and those who believe that men and women are mental and physical animals only. For me, as a Christian, it is a chosen spiritual path not dependent on historical evidence. There can be no evidence outside myself after all. It will surprise materialists that many sincere Christians would not change their beliefs even if it was proved that Jesus never existed. After all, we know for a fact that Lao Tse did not write the *Tao Te Ching*. So what? It is still there. We have no idea who wrote the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads* or even the *Bhagavad Gita*. It makes no difference to those that follow that path.

JA in *Freedom* of 25th July states: "Anarchism is a positive life affirming philosophy which possesses ethics based on mutual respect and generalised

benevolence". But not to Christians or Jews I presume, JA? Tony Gibson in the same issue writes with many learned references from present-day writers who doubt the historical fact of Jesus. So? There is no reason why those who believe in either spirituality or materialism cannot respect each others views if they share a common purpose. A Christian, Jew, Buddhist or Hindu can certainly be an anarchist as he or she can accept no worldly authority which contradicts their own conscience. That should be the same with atheists and humanists.

The religious contributors to *Freedom* have not attacked the beliefs of the materialists and atheists, merely asked that the same tolerance could be expected from them. Right now the world is changing fast and revolution will be thrust upon us. That revolution will be from the bottom up, replacing authority not destroying it.

There is an enormous division and split about to occur in the Roman Catholic Church, as an example. With the resignation of Leonardo Boff, who must be followed by many other Liberationists, there will be many millions of people choosing the side of Boff. That is, no authority except that of God and duty to one's community. And before I hear the objections, the Liberationists mean no authority - no priest, no bishop, no church. That sounds like anarchism to me. Even if you don't believe in God, why condemn?

If anarchism is a life affirming philosophy then let's get on with it.

Working with and for the people is what it's all about "with mutual respect and generalised benevolence". How many so-called anarchists really subscribe to that view? Complaints about government and authority only show acceptance of authority. Riots and demos are not really helping the hungry or homeless. The basis of anarchism is that we do not need government. Ignoring it is the true revolution and working for each other. "States pass, the people remain."

Mike Quentin-Hicks

## Riots

Dear *Freedom*,  
You probably all know about the rioting in Burnley on the Stoops Estate on the 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd and 23rd July.

The council spent £10 million on improvements to the area, but painting the houses does nothing to give the youngsters living there dignity and a sense of purpose. It will be remembered that Burnley has one of the worst records for jailing people for not paying the poll tax. It has also got one of the highest suicide rates.

During the Burnley riot, an empty house on Florence Avenue was set alight, but it is believed that the war between Indian and Pakistani youths in the Whalley Range area of Blackburn (on the 22nd onwards) was more ferocious.

There may have been a drugs factor in the Blackburn riot, as on the Brackenhall Estate in Huddersfield (22nd). John Smith is reported to have said that the Tory policies "threaten the fabric of

society". It is already too late. Neither party offers us any solutions. While the urban wasteland burns, the only analysis being offered is that of David Mellor's bonking activities. With priorities like this, it is no wonder that despair and frustration turns to violence.

Kevin

## Gibraltar's Migrant Workers: correction

Dear Editors,  
An error crept into my review of the report on migrant workers in Gibraltar (*Freedom*, 25th July). My comment on the Gibraltar wage system which in the 1960s discriminated on the basis of nationality ought to have read: "At that time, before General Franco closed the frontier and withdrew the Spanish labour, which had been entering Gibraltar to work each day, there were three different rates of pay based on nationality and officially fixed and upheld by the British and Gibraltar governments. Income thus depended on whether you were British, Gibraltar or Spanish - a caste system in pay such as only a British bureaucrat could dream up."

Mack the Knife

More Letters on page 7

## DONATIONS

20th - 25th July 1992

**Freedom Fortnightly Fighting Fund**  
Ambleside JSD £5, Glasgow FEG £2.

Total = £7.00  
1992 total to date = £870.80

**Freedom Press Overheads Fund**  
Buckfastleigh AMcG £1.90, Castle Douglas MA £2.50.

Total = £4.40  
1992 total to date = £505.05

**Raven Deficit Fund**  
Glasgow JC £8.

Total = £8.00  
1992 total to date = £424.60



## MEETINGS

### Anarchist Forum

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

#### 1992/1993 MEETINGS

**25th September** - Donald Room will introduce his new book: *Anarchism: An Introduction*

**2nd October** - General discussion

**9th October** - 'Anarchism and the Limits of Reform' (speaker Dave Dane)

**16th October** - General discussion

**23rd October** - 'Women in Society' (speaker: Mary Quintana)

**30th October** - General discussion

**6th November** - 'Work' (speaker George Walford)

**13th November** - General discussion

**20th November** - 'A Retiring Person' (speaker Peter Neville)

**27th November** - 'Prison in an Anarchist Society' (speaker Peter Lumsden)

**4th December** - General discussion

**11th December** - 'Exploiting the State' (speaker Andrew Lainton)

**8th January** - 'An Anarchist Daily' (speaker John Rety)

**15th January** - General discussion

**22nd January** - 'Whiteway And On' (speaker Michael Murray)

**29th January** - General discussion

**5th February** - 'Anarchism and Feminism' (speaker Lisa Bendall)

Meeting slots still available until 26th March 1993 and from 23rd April to 9th July 1993

We are now booking speakers and topics for the 1992-93 season. This is from 25th

## FREEDOM fortnightly

ISSN 0016 0504

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

Printed by Aldgate Press, London E1

September to 11th December 1992, then from 8th January to 26th March and 23rd April to 9th July 1993. If anyone would like to give a talk or lead a discussion, please make contact giving names, proposed subjects and a few alternative dates. These can either be speaker-led meetings or general discussions. Overseas and out-of-town speakers are particularly welcome. Friday is the only night available for the meetings as the centre is booked up for classes on other nights.

Anyone interested should contact Dave Dane or Peter Neville at the meetings, or Peter Neville at 4 Copper Beeches, Witham Road, Isleworth, Middlesex TW7 4AW (Tel: 081-847 0203).

## RED RAMBLES

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

- **Sunday 6th September: Bonsall** - meet at Market Cross at 10.30am, a circular walk to the Heights of Abraham. Length: two miles.
- **Sunday 4th October: Brassington** - meet at village hall at 1pm, a circular walk via Harborough Rocks. Length: four miles.
- **Sunday 8th November** - meet at High Peak Junction car park at 1.30pm for three mile walk via canal and woods.

Telephone 0773-827513

**Freedom Press Bookshop**  
84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX

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

## The Raven Anarchist Quarterly

number 18 on  
'ANTHROPOLOGY,  
ANARCHISM & AFRICA'  
- out now -

Back issues still available:

- 17 - Use of Land
- 16 - Education (2)
- 15 - Health
- 14 - Voting
- 13 - Anarchists in Eastern Europe
- 12 - Communication
- 11 - Class
- 10 - Libertarian Education / Kropotkin on Technical Education
- 9 - Architecture / Feminism / Sociobiology / Bakunin and Nationalism
- 8 - Revolution: France / Russia / Mexico / Italy / Spain / the Wilhelms-haven Revolt
- 7 - Alternative Bureaucracy / Emma Goldman / Sade / William Blake
- 6 - Tradition and Revolution / Architecture for All / Carlo Cafiero
- 5 - Canadian Indians / Modern Architecture / Spies for Peace
- 4 - Computers and Anarchism / Rudolf Rocker / Sexual freedom for young
- 3 - Social Ecology / Berkman's Russian Diary / Surrealism (part 2)
- 2 - Surrealism (part 1) / Vinoba Bhave / Walden School
- 1 - Communication and Organisation / Guy Aldred / History of Freedom Press

£3.00 each (post-free anywhere)  
from  
**FREEDOM PRESS**

## FREEDOM AND THE RAVEN SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail	abroad airmail
<b>The Raven (4 issues)</b>				
Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	11.00	12.00	16.00	14.00
Institutions	13.00	15.00	20.00	20.00

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail	abroad airmail
<b>Joint sub (24 x Freedom &amp; 4 x The Raven)</b>				
Claimants	18.00	-	-	-
Regular	23.00	28.00	40.00	37.00

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail	abroad airmail
<b>Bundle subs for Freedom (12 issues)</b>				
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, Black Cat Press, PO Box 5, Derry BT48 6PD

**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 18 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 17 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.....