

anarchist fortnightly Freedom

Vol. 52 No. 22

16 NOVEMBER 1991

FIFTY PENCE

"Governments create nothing and have nothing to give except what they have first taken away."

Winston Churchill
(Birmingham, 11th November 1903)

LYING: THE ART OF GOVERNMENT

Of course the Government would privatise the Health Service if it felt that it could get away with it — electorally. Tories of conviction — not just anybody who votes Tory because they think that they will be better off under Tory rule — really believe that the yardstick for efficiency is profit and that private enterprise is invariably more efficient (that is, more profitable) than public. And so by that definition of efficiency they are always right, for no private enterprise

would operate if there were no profit to be made at the end of the year.

The Tories have privatised all the profitable public services. They are all making more and more profits and the top men are paying themselves ever larger salaries. There are still a number, not so profitable, which they

have made clear will be up for sale if they are returned at the next elections: the railways, the coal mines, more main post offices, just to mention three in the news. The maintenance of the Royal Parks is also due for some scheme of privatisation. Perhaps even the Royal Family will be privatised. They would certainly be more profitable than they are at present to the taxpayer.

Our argument is that if the Government maintains that private enterprise is invariably more efficient — both as far as service and costs are concerned — then why have they not privatised the Health Service and education?

Surely the answer is that all the soundings of public opinion show that the vast majority want a free service in health and education, and the Government is not sure that they could rely on British apathy to get away with out-and-out privatisation. Nevertheless, they have been introducing privatisation by stealth. The letter columns of the media, as well as one's own acquaintances, provide a damning condemnation of Mr Major's hand-on-heart declaration that 'never, never, never' will we have to pay for treatment so long as he is Prime Minister. As an earnest of his 'good intentions' he has assured us that nobody needing an operation will have to wait more than two years on the NHS and not more than half an hour with the appointments we make with our GP or the hospital. Cynics point out that even before Mr Major's ukases nobody waited more than a year for an operation. But then of course one doesn't know whether the waiting lists were reduced by those who opted to pay and jump the queue, as well as those who died in the meantime. Under Mr Major's new-look NHS more people will opt for private treatment if they can afford it, and more who can't will go on suffering or dying.

(continued on page 2)

The Government's Autumn Statement BUYING VOTES

To nobody's surprise the Chancellor, in his autumn statement, has produced a few billion pounds to prop up the NHS, to add a lick of paint to the public transport system as well as a generous hand-out for law and order, and of course more funds — not to increase 'benefits' for the unemployed but for 'benefits' for the ever-growing number of unemployed. He appears to have fooled nobody — not even the media, the most gullible consumers of government prosperity hand-outs.

Where is the money coming from? well, there's £3 billion from the government's piggy-bank — reserves for just such a situation, said the Chancellor. And there's £8 billion from anticipated sales of the family silver (sales of 25% of British Telecom shares held by the government) plus a bit more borrowing, which by the end of this year will amount to £10 billion. This is nothing compared with the 'experts' estimates of £20 billion for 1992.

Yet the government still maintains that it is intending to cut taxes "when the moment is right" — and everybody is betting that the right moment will be the March Budget as a sweetener for the forthcoming elections.

The opposition, short of calling Lamont and the government a bunch of crooks (which, like calling each other 'liars', is considered not to be parliamentary language), poured

scorn on Lamont's catalogue of his government's 'successes' in beating the recession.

John Smith, the Labour Shadow Chancellor, reminded the House that at the 1990 Autumn Review the then Chancellor (no less than our new Prime Minister, John Major) had declared that the country was "coming back on track". Far from coming back on track, said Mr Smith, "we have experienced a deep and damaging recession" and he listed some of the casualties: 40,000 business failures, 85,000 house repossessions and a 750,000 rise in unemployment.

It's obvious that the government believes in repeating the same lies day after day hoping that, like mass advertising, people's reflexes will be conditioned favourably when the time comes for us to put our crosses so that others can run our lives for us.

But they have tough months ahead (we go to press before the three by-election results). After all, even *The Times* of all the government's allies described the Autumn Review hand-out as:

"A pre-election giveaway on a scale not seen for many years past. Even the Tories sat in embarrassed silence as he told the Commons that the package could in no way so be described."

Political memories are short. We anarchists must never stop reminding people of the duplicity and cynicism of all politicians.

Slave Labour World Wide ...

The prosperous Western world enjoys its prosperity not so much by its own industriousness as by that of millions of the exploited in the third world. The old fashioned colonialism has been replaced by a dollar imperialism. The market economy knows no frontiers. What we don't want in the West is that the cheap labour from the third world should emigrate to the West to earn several times more for the work they were doing in their own country, the product of which was probably being exported to the prosperous Western world.

China, for instance, exports goods made in its labour camps, some of which is handled by Hong Kong businessmen (*The Observer*). Child labour in India involves millions and, according to *The Observer*, "Hyderabad's bride bazaar" is "flourishing".

"The practice may shock Westerners, but in Hyderabad impoverished Indians cannot understand the fuss. 'The money I earn is spent entirely on living, so how am I going to be able to give her the dowry Indian boys ask for?' said Shaikh Badruddin, a rickshaw driver who earns 90p a day to support his eight children. 'A marriage to an Indian would have cost me at least 50,000 rupees [£1,100].'

Hyderabad, with its Muslim majority, is well known as the city that sells girls to the Gulf. Families defend the practice by saying their daughters would not otherwise find husbands.

But many of the girls, who often live with their

'husbands' for a while in India, are left behind when the man returns home, and rumours abound that those who leave India for the Gulf are used as servants, sold on to other men or forced to work as prostitutes.

As many as 10,000 young Indian girls will be married off this year to Arab men old enough to be their grandfathers, according to police estimates."

Much nearer home one learns (*Publico* quoted in *The Guardian*, 18th October 1991) that Portugal, with 200,000, has the highest rate of child labour in the European Community.

According to Alan Whittaker, a spokesman for Anti-Slavery International (a human rights organisation based in London), Portugal's entry into the European Community helped an expansion of the textile and leather industries which make most use of child labour. Portuguese children work without trade union cover and in sectors of the economy which seem to escape any control by the labour inspectorate. Mr Whittaker emphasises that "we are not talking about children who work only at weekends. These are children who are obviously taking the place of an adult, at an age when they should still be going to school. A child's monthly wage in the northern shoe factories is around £30 — the equivalent, on average, to the price of a pair of shoes in London."

The list is unending. For instance, *The*

Independent (15th October) published a detailed account of prostitution in Thailand "where daughters are sent to die". Young girls are sent to the Bangkok sex industry from the north, "some sold by the families into virtual slavery". In addition there is a growing incidence of AIDS. Thailand registered its

first HIV positive case in 1984. Now the country estimates that unless sexual behaviour changes dramatically, up to four million Thais will be HIV positive by the year 2000, and of these, "650,000 will be dead or dying of full-blown AIDS — about one in every 85 Thais".

... and the Slavery of Our Times

The affluent West has its own form of slavery: slavery to the machine, to technology, to money, to possessions, which not only produces a new series of industrial diseases but above all stress, which so often leads to the break up of family relations, absence from work and depression leading to, in some cases, suicide. The Samaritans "blamed the pressure of modern day living for a 7% increase" last year which raised the total to nearly 4,000 (*The Guardian*, 23rd October).

Though the numbers of young men killing themselves continued to rise in 1990, there was also a significant increase in suicides among middle-aged men and among women aged between 35 and 64. One is not given the figures of attempted suicides.

But how explain that in the richest country of the world, "about a million American teenagers attempted suicide and an estimated 276,000 sustained injuries serious enough to require medical treatment", according to a study quoted in *The Guardian* (21st September). We are not told who these million would-be suicides are. We imagine that they are not among the Hispanic kids whose material life, like that of their parents, is difficult and without great prospects. They fight to survive; they don't give up easily. It must be among the better-off youngsters who nevertheless are filled with anxieties about their futures in the status rat-race which gets even more competitive as unemployment increases especially among the white-collar workers.

A feature in *The Independent* (17th September) has a sub-head: "Time is money. Current technology ensures that you are still in touch even if you are out of the office". And of course it is an article all about the latest machines available to the small entrepreneur who is now most vulnerable in the recession, what with the banks reluctant to lend and customers not paying, so that the poor chap must be at it all hours of the day, and that's the wonderful thing about computers. You have them not only in the office but at home in the bathroom and lavatory and with your cordless telephone you can be on-the-ball 24-hours 52 weeks of the year. All these articles don't tell you how long you will last before you are in your coffin or in the madhouse.

The new technology has also produced all kinds of ailments among operators of these wonderful inventions. Kim Darling is 31 and suffers from RSI (Repetition Strain Injury) which developed ten years ago when she worked as a data processing officer for British Telecom. A feature on 'Real Life' in *The Independent on Sunday* (27th October) deals with this woman's problems in great detail. "It has wrecked my life. I just want my arm back," summarises her problem. What concerns us here is what was expected from those like Darling by their employers. We quote Eileen MacDonald's report:

"They were paid according to their speed, which varied from 10,000 to 13,000 key-strokes an hour. (continued on page 3)

LYING: THE ART OF GOVERNMENT

(continued from page 1)

Far from joining the chorus of the Labour Party propagandists who naturally claim the NHS as the great achievement of the post-World War Two Attlee government, *Freedom* way back in January 1948 while recognising that "the increased separation of medical attention from direct remuneration is at least potentially a tremendous advance", added:

"All the same, the scheme ignores the fundamental factor in present-day ill health. Public attention is focused on such questions as the sale of practices and the extension of specialist services, while causes of ill health are simply neglected. For the new comprehensive scheme will still have to try and repair the effects of diseases principally caused or aggravated by poverty; and patients will still be hampered in their ability to benefit from medical attention by their overriding need to go out and earn wages. The chief killing diseases will still be many times more common among the lower income groups than among the higher, and the anxiety which characterises the lives of the great majority of people will still inflict chronic ill health on thousands."*

That fundamental factor has not changed and is openly acknowledged. We have never had a *Health Service*. We still have a *National Ill-Health Service*. Pollution in the countryside from the lavish use of all kinds of pesticides and herbicides on the land to increase yields and profits, and the pollution of our rivers from the slurry lagoons in the pig 'factories'; who knows what ill-effects are suffered by the consumer from all the injections, the implants and the 'scientifically' produced compounds fed to the livestock to increase the producers' profits. Only last week it was decided by the ones who knew best for our health that it is no longer necessary to slaughter hens infected with salmonella. Our praying Minister of Agri-

culture has ruled that salmonella-infected eggs are now okay if they are sold to special centres where they can be pasteurised. They can then be used for mayonnaise, baking, etc. The Government knows that once pasteurised they are quite safe. And the salmonella egg producers are now smiling and making more profits.

Pollution from car exhausts in the cities is endemic and seriously affects health. What does the Government do to reduce it? Nothing. On the contrary, more roads are planned (toll roads, if possible financed by private enterprise, as was the case with the Dartford Bridge inaugurated by the Queen just recently. Did private enterprise pay the taxpayers who employ Her Majesty a fee for the occasion?)

There can be no real Health Service in a capitalist society so divided by privilege in favour of a minority. It is just nonsense to suggest that everybody has the opportunity in 'this democracy of ours' to 'get to the top'. The real wealth and power is in the hands of a few — the landed aristocracy, the multi-nationals, the banks, the insurance companies and the pension funds. The politicians are mere pawns and performing puppets.

Nothing — not all the fines imposed on ICI and others — will stop them polluting the planet for profit, other than revolution. Yes, we know there will be no revolution tomorrow or the day after, but we also know that to expect the landed aristocracy (and the *nouveau riche* of our time), the multi-nationals, the banks, the insurance companies and the pension funds to give up their privileged situation for the benefit of mankind is like asking for ... well, the impossible. So we anarchists go on advocating the social revolution when enough people realise that they can manage their lives much better than the political salesmen offering their services in return for your quinquennial cross on a piece of paper ... and your freedom!

The Madrid Fiasco

The Americans could not have been expecting very much from the Arab-Israel encounter in Madrid to have described it as a success. As we forecast in *Freedom* ('Madrid a Damp Squib' on 2nd November) the Israelis did not give an inch and the Palestinians had nothing to give. To talk of compromise on both sides, as did Bush in his opening address, is just nonsense. And the Israelis confirmed that by making it clear that they were not giving up the occupied territories which they said had belonged to them no less than 4,000 years ago!

To rub salt in the wounds, on the last day of the Madrid meeting Ariel Sharon the arrogant butcher of the Lebanon, now Minister of Housing, was inaugurating a settlement for Russian Jews of 25 houses bang in the middle of the Golan Heights, with Israeli flags fluttering in the breeze. He made out that he just couldn't understand why the television reporter should suggest that it was perhaps not very diplomatic to launch a settlement on the Golan Heights at this very moment.

But that was not all. For five days, in the area in South Lebanon which the Israelis have militarily occupied for 'security reasons', they have bombed and shelled villages in retaliation for Palestinian guerrilla attacks against their army resulting in five Israeli soldiers being killed.

After all, at Madrid, they couldn't even agree where future meetings would be held. If the Americans insist then the next stage in the talks will take place somewhere else. The arrogance of Shamir and his lieutenants was available to the world to see, thanks to television. We cannot see anything coming out of these talks unless Israel's American

paymaster stops financing them. Then they will soon be in trouble.

Shamir, in his address, presented a picture of poor little Israel surrounded by this large Arab world: four million Israelis against more than a hundred million Arabs, a territory of a few thousand square kilometres surrounded by more than a million. We had the real sob stuff — David and Goliath. The Palestinians were dignified and, having nothing to lose, lived in hope. With Syria the Israelis exchanged insults, with Shamir calling them terrorists and the Syrians waving a picture of the younger Shamir when he was a terrorist fighting the British.

We believe that in the long term Israel will either have to accept 'peace for land' or be driven out of Palestine. Their nuclear missiles will not protect them. If they dared to use them they would rebound in more ways than one. Surely they are aware of the fate of the French *pieds noir* in Algeria. France launched all its military power, involving 150,000 troops and all the most sophisticated armaments — bombing planes, the lot — against a people who never, throughout that period, possessed anything more than machine guns to defend themselves. In the end they won, and the *pieds noir* made their way to southern France (Marseilles, Toulon, etc. — which explains why the National Front with Le Pen is so strong in that area). The important lesson for those arrogant Israelis who think that since Israel was founded 43 years ago (and they have been in the occupied territories for 24 years) nobody will dislodge them, is that the French *pieds noir* were masters in Algeria for eighty years!

*Reprinted in the Freedom Press Centenary volume *World War - Cold War: Selections from War Commentary and Freedom 1939-50*, in the section on 'The Welfare State', pages 342-360 (ISBN 0 900384 48 4, 422 pages, £6.95, post free inland).

The Law is a hole in the elephant's bottom

Do you buy the quality newspapers? I mean the ones that show nudes only as an art form, and present the perverted lives of dead intellectuals for the entertainment of live ones. If you do, you saw recently a list of law graduates that would put to shame the paid-up membership of CND. And what a boring lot they must be. After all, we know the law is an ass ever since some eminent fellow said so. I can vouch for its boring qualities because I never had the patience to study it until the boredom of old age meant that I had nothing to lose. Now I can drop names like Bagehot, Jennings and Dicey. Now there's a bloke, Dicey.

Dicey was Vinerian Professor back in the nineteenth century, whatever that means apart from the fact that a lot of people used to hang on to his every word. He reckoned that the sovereignty of Parliament was unchangeable and eternal — a bit like God, if you follow me. But when the Home Rule for Ireland Bill came up, and it didn't square with his ideas on constitutional law, he decided it was all a load of cobblers, got hold of a gun and joined the resistance.

Now if a Vinerian Professor can spend the best part of his life pontificating about the law and then give it all up as meaningless, you can bet there's not much mileage in it for the likes of you and me.

Did you know there are different kinds of law like Common Law, Private Law, Criminal Law, Martial Law, Constitutional Law, Military Law, Statutes and Royal Prerogative,

as well as Sod's Law? Well, never mind, there's really only two kinds — one for the rich and one for us. When all the talking has been done it's Gun Law that prevails anyway. That's what the armed forces are for. Hitler was just as legal as Thatcher; more so because he got more votes.

Talking about armies, what is that latest batch of law graduates going to do for us? Nothing. They will draw their bloated salaries for keeping the power and wealth firmly in the hands of our law-abiding masters, who cannot but keep within the laws that they made for their convenience. The Rule of Law is a concept which gushes from the mouths of Government Ministers nearly every time they open, but the Crown, public authorities and diplomats and their families can't have their collars felt even if they are foreigners.

My advice to anyone who has nothing better to do than watch 'Neighbours' is to get some books on law — but don't waste your money on them, get them from your library. Wonder what happened to Dicey?

EFC

White Poppies at Gt Cornard Upper School

The Peace Pledge Union's white poppies were in the news at Great Cornard Upper School, according to *The East Anglian Daily Times* (30th October). As Remembrance Day was approaching, pupils at the school were being encouraged to consider the issues of war by being offered white as well as red poppies. Mr Simon Smith, the teacher responsible for initiating the sale of white poppies at the school said:

"I think the whole purpose of remembrance has been distorted during the years since it was first initiated.

The initial sentiment, which was very anti-war, has been turned on its head and the ritual has eulogised the central actions of war.

This is too important an issue not to do something if you feel as uncomfortable as I do about the whole Remembrance Day ceremony. After all, education is about offering people choice — not simply indoctrinating them with one viewpoint."

Mr Smith's initiative had the approval of the head teacher and the board of governors. Needless to say, it was strongly attacked by the local branch of the British Legion whose spokesman, a reverend gentleman, Hugh Wake, seemed less concerned or interested in the whole purpose of the exercise than with the possibility that the Legion might sell fewer red poppies "especially at a time when we are doing our best to raise a lot of money for the appeal". How pathetic can you get!

THE RAVEN - 15 ON HEALTH

96 pages, £2.50 (post free inland)
from FREEDOM PRESS

THE VANUNU TRUST

Freedom had gone to press with the front page on Israel's hostage before the publication in *The Guardian* (26th October) of an advertisement calling for support for the Mordechai Vanunu Trust, the trustees of which are Peter Berenson (founder of Amnesty International), Ken Coates MEP, Bruce Kent, Yael Loban (founder of the Vanunu Defence Committee in Israel), Harold Pinter, Jakob von Uexkull, and Andrew Wilski. They are appealing for funds to carry on their campaign. For details, etc., write to PO Box 1328, London NW6.

The Jerusalem newspaper *Davar* reports that Israel's Supreme Court has rejected

a petition by Mordechai Vanunu to reveal how he was captured and brought to Israel for trial. Vanunu was whisked in and out of the courthouse — the media were refused permission to take photographs. The hearing was in secret. A court secretary told journalists: "The whole subject is a secret. I cannot give you any report". That was Monday 4th November, the day before Mr Maxwell (whom the American investigative journalist Seymour Hersh accuses of being an Israeli agent and of complicity in the abduction of Mordechai Vanunu) was found drowned in the Atlantic. Probably only a coincidence.

Waiting for the Bus

What do you think of the new law to stop husbands raping their wives, Bert? ... Not much, Daisy. Rape is an assertion of power. So long as men want power, they will rape. J.K. Galbraith wrote a book called *Condign, Compensatory and Conditioned Power*. Mind you, he didn't apply it to sex ... What does all that mean, Bert? ... 'Condign' means brute force, 'compensatory' means bribery, threats and rewards, and 'conditioned' means things like education and religion ... I can see that women get raped by force and do it for money, but how can women get raped by education and religion? ... It's done by getting young girls to believe in the superiority of men ... So if there was such a thing as a very powerful woman, she would never be raped? ... You've got it, Daisy ... So that's why Elizabeth Taylor keeps on giving her husbands the heave-ho ... The Church of England has now admitted that it is racist, as well as sexist. There's not much more left for it to confess to ... The Bishop of Oxford wants it to confess that it is mercenary, and stop investing its fortune in anything to do with weapons ... The Bishop's a fine one to talk like that after supporting Desert Storm ... Seems you are right about the AIDS cover-up, Bert. If you work out the figures from the last report, there were 255 AIDS deaths in September, which is a four-fold increase on the previous September ... Yes, and instead of remarking upon it, *The Guardian* headlines the fact that nineteen children died in the last twelve months as compared with only six in the previous twelve months ... Don't tell me the press has had D-Notices on the subject ... You think what you like ... Yugoslavia's in a fine old mess. I suppose Galbraith would say there's a bit of condign politics going on out there ... Poland has got too much democracy according to their General

Election results. A hundred different parties to vote for and only 40% thought it worthwhile enough to go out and vote for any of them. There'll be a bit of condign argy-bargy over there too ... The Polish Bishops have been telling the people to vote for Christian political parties ... I thought the Roman Catholic Church was non-political ... Unless I was dreaming, it said in the paper that a Roman Catholic priest was the Premier of Haiti until he was deposed. I've been wondering why Army and Airforce women are not allowed in the front line ... You do come up with some strange questions, Daisy ... Well, it isn't as if they are not brave enough or skilled enough ... Perhaps women could never be relied upon to drop bombs on cities with kids in them. Just imagine a bomber flown by women aircrew. On the way to Berlin, they would talk to one another about their feelings, not hide them like men would and pretend they weren't scared out of their brains. They would probably talk it over and drop their bombs in the sea rather than on kids ... Fancy all those brothels in Slough being raided by the police. I had no idea they were there. I thought Slough was a decent place ... I expect the authorities were afraid the brothels would attract undesirables to the town ... Like Directors of Public Prosecutions? ... And MPs? ... I thought people would be content to stay indoors and watch the new sex education video ... Perhaps Andrea Dworkin is right about porn, and one thing leading to another ... Talking about porn, I see the Battersea Arts Centre are putting on some Marquis de Sade. The Centre's director says it's a serious theatrical attempt to rehabilitate de Sade into his proper cultural position ... I bet that one's not in the Karma Sutra ... Shut up, Bert, and get the passes ready. Here's the bus ...

EFC

Slavery of our Times

(continued from page 2)

There was a 30-minute break, and two 15-minute tea breaks, but for the rest of the 7¼ hour day the women worked at high pressure. If they fell below 10,000 strokes an hour they were given verbal warnings and feared dismissal."

Ten thousand strokes an hour is nearly three per second. That's not a lot in a second. Do it at that rate for a minute and then for an hour and then for a working day, working week ... a working lifetime. A working hell!

British Telecom has made record profits, and its top bosses record salary increases so obscene that even the government which encourages profit-making is a little bit embarrassed. But that's not all. In spite of its financial success British Telecom is sacking 16,000 staff over the next few years, and presumably those poor slaves of our times will have to learn how to tap 15,000 an hour if they don't want to be given 'verbal warnings' and possible dismissal.

What a world where the machine rules and humans are reduced to mere 'key-strokers' whose arms wear out and, unlike the machines, can't be replaced.



Technology

Ever since the Industrial Revolution, and the emergence of capitalism, there has been a continued tendency to replace relatively expensive and strike-prone human labour with machines. The motivation has been to maintain/increase profitability in the face of cut-throat competition, and to meet artificially high levels of demand stimulated by the most sophisticated advertising techniques. Automated production represents the zenith of capitalist industrial development: it is a large user of plant, a small user of labour and produces very large numbers of relatively cheap items. As such it is a logical accompaniment to consumerism and the degradation of our planet's ecology. The ever higher levels of investment demanded by industrial development has led to increasing numbers of smaller companies going to the wall, the encouraging of monopoly conditions, highly centralised production and rising unemployment. Unemployed workers, ground down by immediate financial problems and anxiety for the future, sadly show few signs of adopting radical measures to transcend their position, whilst those employed seem at best concerned, or at worst merely complacent and accepting of 'progress'.

Setting aside the ongoing problem of apathy and indifference within the population, and assuming that a future libertarian society is possible, one wonders whether high technology has its uses in that context. A truly liberating technology should be consistent with libertarian criteria, so here is a brief evaluation of central concerns:

Needs

Automation can satisfy a large chunk of our material needs, as we have seen, even to excess, but what about *emotional* needs? In my experience, I have found that people dislike working for a boss, but they do relish the emotional fulfilment which comes from working with others, towards an end which they can see is socially useful. Purely leisure pursuits alone seem to me to be somewhat narcissistic and unsocial in comparison, and consequently less satisfying.

I find automation therefore of dubious value, if it 'liberates' perhaps even a large majority of people to a world of leisure. For many, work in capitalist society is a degrading experience, but it seems foolish to seek a 'technical fix' aimed at its abolition, rather than ways to humanise it.

Control

When we consider problems of accountability and community control of automated production, I think we are in the area of greatest difficulty. Decisions made at very large workplaces by a very

small number of people, are hardly likely to be democratic. Furthermore, the non-producers, excluded from the decision making process, will also be totally dependent on the producers for their needs. Notions of *inter-dependence*, equality, power-sharing, etc., have little place in this context, which taken to extremes is potentially totalitarian.

Decentralisation

The very high levels of investment required for automated plants make them quite inapplicable to decentralised production methods. Many modern machine tools can however be used in more 'traditional' factories or small workshops.

Division of labour

All sophisticated technologies require highly skilled specialists if not to operate, certainly to design, build and maintain the equipment which goes with them, and therefore tend towards a rigid rather than a flexible division of labour. Freedom to develop new skills, and move between different workplaces, is thus limited.

Bureaucracy

Widespread computerisation is already replacing armies of clerical workers in industrial as well as state bureaucracies. For a libertarian society, these developments seem to me to be very useful, in that increasing numbers of people could be freed to more creative work within the productive process, rather than being parasitic upon it.

Work satisfaction

Machines have removed much drudgery from work and are thus to be welcomed, but how far should mechanisation extend? Operating a lathe, for example, is exciting and creative, but it makes little sense to develop equipment which is so all-encompassing that the operator is denied work satisfaction and made to feel alienated from his/her produce.

Leisure

Automation and other high technologies can undoubtedly increase the time available for leisure activities. One might imagine the production of far more art and craft works than currently, or just enjoying the chance to daydream for long periods. However, as I have mentioned, the extension of leisure to the point where participation in the production of necessities is denied to large numbers of people, is felt to be detrimental.

Ecology

Ecological sustainability is related to a reduced rate of consumption. It is therefore difficult to link the

ending of consumerism with automation, which must have very high levels of demand/consumption to justify the level of investment required. Crucially, poor quality short-lived consumer trash must be replaced with high quality, long-lived, easily maintained and recyclable *pieces of equipment*.

The continued development of ecologically clean wind, wave and solar power technology is of course essential, whilst those technologies connected with fossil fuels and nuclear energy need to be reduced/ended as soon as possible.

On reflection, I see no use for widespread automation in a libertarian society. Machine tools which remove drudgery are useful, but one must accept the higher levels of technical specialisation required for their production.

With respect to the productive process generally, the line of argument adopted points to the following:

1. Smaller numbers of more durable goods need to be produced.
2. Those currently unemployed need to be re-absorbed into the workforce, together with those people who, although not UB40s would like to work if they had the chance — increasing numbers of women, for instance.

3. Most people would enjoy more leisure, and more flexible work patterns.

4. The most effective community control of production demands maximum participation within it.

To be consistent with the above, it seems to me that we need a form of production which requires less highly specialised skills, and is more labour intensive than currently, *but which entails a shorter working week for all*. The answer could lie with the retention of more 'traditional' factory and small workshop techniques, but strenuous efforts would be needed to achieve high standards of safety, cleanliness and much reduced noise levels. Multi-skilled autonomous work groups, as experimented with at Mondragon, Volvo, Saab and Olivetti, could be used as an alternative to the old production line systems manned by de-skilled operators.

In conclusion, we need to get away from thinking about technology and 'progress' generally, as if they develop through some irresistible historical process which is beyond our control; the capitalists are making their choices, we have to make *ours*. We need to choose technologies which remove drudgery, but which are still appropriate to our needs as highly social beings seeking control of our lives, and harmony with the natural world.

John Griffin

News from Northern Ireland

There are a number of people who think we are in the last stages of the war in Ireland, or more specifically they think we are witnessing the death throes of military activity by the IRA. They think this because of the onset of 1992 and the fact that the border is expected to become irrelevant and because of the decline in the Sinn Fein vote, north and south. These same people also see the recent upsurge in loyalist violence as part of an end game, drawing validity from the collapse of the Brooks Talks and the arrival of new blood into the ranks of the UVF and UFF who will not stand for any pussy-footing around and want to get on with the job of stifling Taigs. People who think we are in the last stages of the war in Ireland think that this last stage will be extremely bloody and vicious and may go on for quite a number of years, given the amount of weaponry held by the Provos, the UVF and UFF and by the British Army. What do you think?

Taxi men are bearing the brunt of the attacks of sectarian killers in Belfast these days. Loyalist killers are phoning up a rank, getting a Catholic driver and killing him. The IRA blew up a taxi in Sandy Row recently in which the driver lost a leg. It turned out afterwards that he was not the intended target. These are direct attacks on a section of workers that highlights the flaws in the futures offered by loyalist and republican military activists. Stiffing workers is what it's all about!

Lots of energy is being expended in Derry these days around the issue of drugs. A major Catholic grammar school expelled and suspended a number of senior pupils because of drugs. The IRA claims to have smashed a major drugs ring. The RUC and a local unionist city councillor claim that the IRA is the major agent dealing in drugs in the town. Amidst these claims and counter claims it's hard to get an idea of what we are really talking about. Does the army have drug dealers who act as soft sources of information? Did the IRA beef up its resources with some hard men from Belfast to squeeze out other drug pushers? Who do you believe and what does it all mean in relation to the use of drugs in Derry? And can we trust any of these various guardians of our lives to

properly deal with the use of drugs in our society? What place will drugs (for Christ's sake will someone tell me what it is we're talking about!) have in our society? No one will want or need to get totally blasted in the free world ... right? Or we'll only want the blissful temporary delights offered by the so-called soft drugs. And no one will make big money out of it ... right? What's that? Another beer? I will surely ... burp!!!

As I write (23rd October) Jeremy Hanley, Minister for Health at Stormont, has just announced that trust status is to be given to the Royal group of hospitals in Belfast. What is amazing about this announcement is that it has been taken in the face of massive opposition not only from staff at the hospital at all levels but also from politicians in all political parties here except the small cringing bunch of Conservatives who inhabit South Down. The whole issue of trust status is being thrashed out in England where the consultative process has been totally insufficient. Over here it has just been ditched quite brazenly by politicians who have absolutely no stake in this place.

Also happening on this day is a major demonstration outside the Dáil in Dublin by people from the north-west of Ireland opposed to the plans by Du Pont to build a big incinerator in Derry. The government in the Republic plan to offer Du Pont money for the project as a way of getting the toxic waste off their political plates by shifting incineration to another jurisdiction. Clever, eh? It will be interesting to watch the response of politicians down south to this expression of people power.

For culture, arts and crack in Derry, we've just had an exhibition called 'Celtic Surveyor', work by Jamie Reid of Sex Pistols fame. It was a fun week of hands-on cultural production by all sorts of people in a splendidly lively and anarchic atmosphere. Two great bands played too. From Wales we had Anhrefn and from Scotland we had Nya Fearties. Catch them if they play near you. And the 'Celtic Surveyor' show may be in Liverpool in November so watch out for that.

Dave Duggan

News from Lancaster

This area has had its first poll tax jailing: Mr James Clayton, an unemployed man from Morecambe, was jailed for fourteen days on Wednesday 16th October. Hardly any mention was made of this fact in the local papers — something which confirms our suspicion that news about the jailings is being completely suppressed in the months running up to the election.

A zephyr in an egg-cup has developed in the local lobotomy party about the jailing. At first it seemed as though a thoroughgoing enquiry was going to be held into reasons why the bureaucrats had not followed the council's (i.e. the Labour leader's) guidelines in prosecuting the non-payers. But that quickly absorbed the energies of the four councillors sympathetic to the anti poll tax and was clearly a clever move to stifle dissent and sweep the whole thing under the carpet. Then it turned out that as the council had never debated the guidelines they had no validity in any case. It was all part of the usual manipulations inherent in the political process.

The public reaction to the jailing has been one of denial, ignorance and apathy. The local anti poll tax group tried to hold a protest at the court but nothing happened. Somewhere between eight and ten thousand liability orders for this year have been issued in four sittings. Less than 1/3% of those summonsed bother to turn up. Out of 41 summonsed for committal, 25 stayed away. We hope to make that ratio higher when our new 'Don't Turn Up' leaflets are printed.

Norris McWhirter came to speak against European Political Union at Lancaster University and was greeted by 75 student protesters. Two men

with a video camera filmed them. Two ex-skinhead mature students stood in front of the camera while the crowd surged forwards and somebody booted McBlacklist. The cameramen ran off, hotly pursued by two anarchists, who followed them to their hiding place in the Beadle's Office. Stories currently flying about claim they were Special Branch or police. My guess is that they were Economic League blacklists on a 'fact' finding trip. Either way, they weren't very professional. Remember 31st March ... *all* cameramen ... etc.

Delegates from Lancaster went to the APT (Anti Poll Tax) conference at Manchester Town Hall on 26th October and heard ex-poll tax prisoners Saroosh Ayandah and Stormin' Norman Laws speak. One delegate described the Labour Party as "as much use as an ash tray on a motorbike" — no doubt there will be further jailings here, which will only serve to confirm his words.

Kevin Klubman

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

The Self-Build Book

by Jon Broome and Brian Richardson
Green Books, 253 pages, £15*

I should, as politicians are supposed to, 'declare an interest' in this book, as I wrote the Foreword. So I hasten to add that cash didn't change hands. It was a labour of love in the truest sense, as I want the book to justify the publishers' faith in their authors in producing a handsome volume full of exciting drawings and intriguing photographs.

Don't assume that it is yet another handbook for the DIY market. It is that, but it has half a dozen other themes. No other manual begins with a chapter on bringing the joy back into building. Both authors built their own homes, one of them twice in a lifetime, first in the 1950s long before other people became interested in environmentally-friendly structures (and just about the time when he began reading *Freedom*).

Both have been much influenced by the late Walter Segal, an architect for whose method of cheap, simple building one section of the book provides an instructional step-by-step guide. They stress that this is "an approach that suggests how to build, rather than a system of building". For them it is an attitude of mind. And in their series of working models they give an account of the Lewisham Self-Build Housing Association, where people from the council's waiting list queued up for the chance to house themselves (described by Brian Richardson in *The Raven* number 6) and other Segal-type projects like the one at the Centre for Alternative Technology at Machynlleth in Wales, and the one at the Glasgow Garden Festival built to show how easy it was and now re-erected in Perthshire.

Their selection of real-life models isn't confined to the method they prefer personally. It includes, for example, the absorbing experience of a Dutch group at Maaspoort, and the Lightmoor initiative sponsored by the Town & Country Planning Association at Telford, as well as the Netherspring Housing Co-operative at Sheffield designed with the particular aim of using solar energy.

I take as my starting point for this essay the argument which I have recently heard advanced by 'Green' anarchist comrades that 'Anarchism can't work in cities'.

A major component of this argument is that anarchism can't work in cities due to the lack of social control implied in anarchism, and that anarchism would supposedly require a change in human nature in order to work. The evidence advanced in favour of this viewpoint seems based on a version of Social Darwinism. It is advanced that as competition is a strong component of humans and human society, the co-operation needed between humans in order to survive in an urban community can only be achieved through the agencies of the state. Therefore to 'abolish' the state we need to abolish the city/town as a method of organising human life, communities and production.

This, however, ignores the sociological viewpoint that 'co-operation' is inherent in the very fact of being human. It is an observable fact that we can't develop from infant to adult without the active help of humans, freely given by the adults, mainly women, concerned. Total isolation from society at an early age results in lack of normal development. In this sense a 'human' being outside of the co-operation of human society does not exist. It is not so much a choice between competition or co-operation that we face, more that being human and within human society are interchangeable. Human behaviour is almost 100% learnt. It is not based on instinct.¹ In learning to be human, we learn to co-operate.

Many anarchists would respond that anarchism does not imply a change in human nature since their anarchism includes the idea that no-one is good enough to be another's master. It is arguable whether human nature can be changed at all anyway, and human are capable of running their own lives now, imperfections, follies and all, we don't need to wait for human perfection before arguing the case for anarchism. The question to be addressed is how to develop sustainable societies capable of coping not only with the demands of the environment, but also with the pertaining level of human selfishness and anti-social behaviour. This applies to anarchist societies as much as any. Many previous stateless societies have developed very complex and involved methods

1. *Sociology: Themes and Perspectives*, M. Haralambos, page 2, paperback, UTP.

Bringing some joy into housing

Now anarchist housing advocates like Richardson and me are quite well-known in the official housing world and whenever we draw upon the experiences of self-build groups, or of housing co-ops who simply employed building contractors, are continually being told by housing committee members, academics, socialists and anarchists, "It's all very nice, but you're just generalising from the experience of sophisticated middle-class drop-outs". Say that in Lewisham, or down at the Great Eastern Self-Build Housing Association in the area we have now learned to call Docklands, or at the Girescope Co-op in Hull, and you will get an appropriate response.

Broome and Richardson provide an account of the Zenzele Self-Build Housing Association, formed by twelve unemployed young people from the St Paul's district of Bristol, aged around 20, mostly black, and unskilled. How disadvantaged do you have to be to get taken seriously?

But they are appallingly right about the endless obstacles put in the way of anyone or any group having the nerve to attempt to house themselves. To quote from my Foreword:

"How devastating to learn that the difficulties facing self-builders are not to do with the acquisition of building skills, or the endless hard work. For the authors tell us that in fact 'these planning stages are the most difficult part of self-build: by comparison, the actual building is straightforward'."

And to quote too from the Afterword contributed by John Seymour:

"Let us consider the case of a farmer who has an acre of ordinary agricultural land in England that he wishes to sell. Without planning permission it might be worth a thousand pounds. If he manages to persuade — or to bribe — some Lord Luck in the person of a *planning officer* to squiggle his name on a piece of paper, that thousand-pound field

immediately goes up in value *two hundred times*. For if he cuts the acre up into eight plots each plot will be worth £25,000, wherever it is. So the young couple, desperate to build their own house in their own country, have to fork out that amount before they even buy a bag of cement or a concrete block, and they have to pay that money for a piece of land actually worth only £125."

The grotesque situation Seymour describes has to be taken as just one of the hurdles that face people who dare to want to build for themselves, and the authors work their way through the issues of access to land and to finance, design and the battery of permissions. Unusually, and true to their philosophy, they include a clear and helpful chapter on materials and conservation. You and I are as bewildered as anyone else when it comes to considering the least environmentally harmful and most reclaimable building materials. The authors give us a table on how to choose the 'greenest' insulation, and scatter the whole book with helpful tips. It's a practical book.

Broome and Richardson are *not* peddling self-help as a universal solution, but they want to see small groups promoting it in every district. They conclude, with the authority of experience, that:

"If it should be thought that self-build is an inefficient way to produce houses compared with the geared-up efforts of the building industry, yes, we admit that in terms of the amount of effort that goes into it, it may be. But the point is that so much of that work comes from a formerly untapped resource, the skill and energy of the general population. And to be obsessed with efficiency would be to leave out of the account a more important factor: that the people who have committed themselves to the effort of housing themselves will have gained so much more. When the community engages in self-build, it builds itself"

I see their book as another plank in the anarchist platform on housing which declares that *the first principle is dweller*

control. This was beautifully enunciated years ago by another anarchist architect, John Turner, in a passage I have quoted in at least four books about housing. So I'll bring in instead a thought of his from his essay on *Housing as a Verb* of 1972:

"On the one hand we have supra-local agencies which plan for and provide for people's housing needs, with the result that the people so planned for and provided for turn into consumers or passive beneficiaries. On the other hand, if housing is treated as a verbal entity, as a means to human ends, as an activity rather than as a manufactured and packaged product, decision-making powers must, of necessity, remain in the hands of the users themselves."

Self-build is one form of dweller-control, and so is owner-occupation — and it's just silly to compare the householder's tenth of an acre with the Duke of Westminster's 100 acres in Mayfair and 200 acres of Belgravia — and so too is the housing co-operative. It fell to me to point out to the good and the great in the housing world that some of the most enterprising and successful housing co-ops in London have grown out of the squatters' movement (see *The Raven* number 3). Incidentally, the Home Secretary Kenneth Baker, having been told that at least 50,000 properties were occupied by squatters, issued on 15th October a discussion document proposing that squatting should become a criminal, rather than a civil, offence. He's playing to the ignorant Tory gallery of course. Most of the derelict or empty houses or flats occupied by squatters belong to local authorities.

But this brings us to yet another housing dilemma. In pursuit of their aim of breaking up the power and influence of local authorities, the Conservative governments of the past twelve years not only brought in the 'right-to-buy' legislation, but forbade the local authorities from spending more than 15% of the proceeds on providing more housing. Tenants who couldn't or wouldn't exercise this option are faced by endless rent increases with the excuse that if they 'genuinely' can't pay they must be eligible for the means-tested Housing Benefit. Indignity after indignity is thrust upon tenants. For

Anarchism and

of social control. Examples of such societies include the plateau Tonga tribe of Zambia and the Ifugao tribe of the Philippines as cited by Harold Barclay in his *People Without Government: an anthropology of anarchism*.² The state as an episode in human history is very recent, being 10,000 years old at most; humankind got along quite well without state sanctioned means of social control for the previous hundreds of millennia. Anarchism does not imply a breakdown of society; humans can work out their own solutions to social discord according to their needs and circumstances, and would do so whether living in urban or rural societies and whatever their political organisation.

The assertion that anarchism is impossible in cities also blandly ignores the need to define what is meant by a city. Some cities in Ancient Greece would hardly qualify as small towns today. Both Colin Ward and Murray Bookchin have cited the Ancient Greek concept of the city in support of their arguments for decentralised, human scale, anarchist/green/ecological communities, and they are right to do so. Aristotle in his work *The Politics*³ gave a definition of the ideal city as he saw it. His ideas related both to the geographical location, size and population of a city.

"In order to give decision on matters of justice and for the purpose of distributing offices ... it is necessary that the citizens should know each other and know what kind of people they are."⁴

This implies contact on a face to face basis and therefore limits the possible population of such cities to a figure, for argument's sake, within the range of 2,000-5,000. The question of population and size is important if a city/community is to be self sustaining. If people are to be

2. *People Without Government: an anthropology of anarchism*, Harold Barclay, page 60 and page 68, paperback, Kahn & Averill.

3. *The Politics*, Aristotle, Penguin Classic Series, 1977.

4. *Ibid*, page 266.

able to travel on a daily basis out to allotments and market gardens in order to grow their food in the manner envisaged by Kropotkin, the 'city' needs to be close to its surrounding fields. Kropotkin's book *The Conquest of Bread* was an attempt to address the problem of feeding a city in times of revolution, and in his book *Fields, Factories and Workshops Tomorrow* Kropotkin came to the conclusion based on nineteenth century levels of knowledge that Britain could feed up to ninety million people. He based this on a study of intensive methods of agriculture as practised by market gardeners in Lombardy, Flanders, and the Channel Islands.⁵ He has been accused of over optimism, but even if this figure is an overestimate it should be possible using intensive market gardening/allotment cultivation and redistribution of the land among the people to feed the present population even if there is a breakdown in international trade. We will all have to work at it though. We need to work out a modern rule of thumb equivalent to Cobbett's four acres and a cow per family as part of our calculation of the size of a community, the amount of land needed to support it, and how much / what kind of production — be it craft, agricultural, small scale industrial — there should be.

The Greek concept of the 'city' grew out of the discussion of the relative merits and demerits of urban and rural life, and the practical lived experience of thousands of Greek citizens. This discussion has continued down the ages in works too numerous to mention. Thomas More, Marx, William Morris, Patrick Geddes, Kropotkin, Orwell, Colin Ward, Murray Bookchin, etc., are a few who have contributed. We need to develop an anarchist theory within this context, not to establish definitive blueprints but to sketch out what is possible given libertarian organisation,

5. *Fields, Factories and Workshops Tomorrow*, Peter Kropotkin, edited by Colin Ward, page 61, paperback, Freedom Press, 1985.

The 'Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought' are new editions of old writings, mainly intended for students but also appealing to general readers. The first titles include several liberal classics — by Locke, Montesquieu, Paine, Constant, Bentham and Mill — and one libertarian classic — Bakunin's *Statism and Anarchy*. While most of the other items are simply new versions of

example, on 29th October the National Consumer Council published a report stating that councils in England have raised rents by almost twice the government's guidelines and that some less well-off tenants are being used to subsidise services like refuse collection, road maintenance and lighting, which they are already paying for through taxation. This is not in fact a new situation. It is described in a book of mine published six years ago (*When We Build Again: Let's Have Housing that Works*).

I know that there are anarchists who advocate a massive local authority house-building programme in the face of the current desperate situation. All the socialist housing pundits I know say the same thing. Well, do please read the last two pages of my Freedom Press book *Talking Houses* about the kind of government housing policy we are likely to see if we get a Labour government next year. We anarchists, precisely because we are anarchists, ought to be among those who look further. Remember that the bizarre situation of land prices that John Seymour describes (and it may be worse even than he suggests) is not simply the result of the greed of land-owners. It arises from the comprehensive planning legislation introduced by the post-war Labour government. The great virtue of the Broome and Richardson book is not so much its instructions about self-build, but the fact that it raises fundamental anarchist issues about the pleasure we ought to feel in getting a roof over our heads, just because we are in control.

Colin Ward

*When ordering by post from Freedom Press, whether inland or abroad, please add £2.50 postage — it's a heavy book.

Statism and Anarchy

Statism and Anarchy

by Michael Bakunin, edited and translated by Marshall S. Shatz

Cambridge University Press, £27.50 (hardback) and £9.95 (paperback)

familiar works, this one is not only a rare anarchist contribution to an academic series but a valuable publication in its own right, since although it is well known it has never been properly available in English before.

Gosudarstvennost i anarkhiya was Bakunin's most sustained single work — a full-length book, intended as the introduction to a major theoretical exposition of anarchism, written in Russian in Switzerland in 1873, published anonymously there that year by his young Russian colleagues (calling themselves the Social-Revolutionary Party), smuggled into Russia, and circulated there in the growing revolutionary movement. It was later reprinted several times in Russia, and also included in some of the standard collections of Bakunin's works in various languages; but there has of course been no such collection in English, and apart from extracts in anthologies the only previous English version was a defective and expensive translation published by the Revisionist Press in the United States in 1976.

Marshall Shatz is an American academic — a professor of history at Massachusetts University — who has specialised in the Russian revolutionary movement. Twenty years ago he produced one of several American anthologies of anarchism — a paperback rather absurdly called *The Essential Works of Anarchism* (1971) — and now he has produced this edition of what might well be considered an essential work of anarchism. He has used as his basis the standard scholarly edition of Bakunin's book — *Étatisme et anarchie*, Volume 3 of the Archives Bakounine, a large 500-page tome produced by the International Institute of Social History and published in the Netherlands in 1967, which contains the original Russian text and a French translation

by Marcel Body, with some other relevant writings and a scholarly introduction and notes by Arthur Lehning. Shatz's edition contains a 220-page (American) English translation of Bakunin's text (including the two appendixes), a 30-page introduction, a list of 'Principal Events in Bakunin's Life', a bibliographical note, a note on the translation, 17 pages of endnotes, and an index.

The result is a certainly a valuable addition to libertarian literature in English, but two problems must be considered.

The most important problem is Bakunin's original book itself, starting with the question of its title. A minor point is that *Gosudarstvennost* is really *Statehood* rather than *Statism*, but the latter has become generally accepted; *Anarkhiya* is *Anarchy*, though it is sometimes rendered as *Anarchism* in order to balance *Statism*. Accepting the conventional English wording, however, the title-page reads: *Statism and Anarchy: Introduction: Part I*; and the opening page of the text reads: *Statism and Anarchy: The Struggle of the Two Parties in the International Workers' Association: Foreword*. This all seems very confusing, but in fact the introduction or foreword is all that Bakunin ever wrote, and a more serious question is whether the book really deserves a place in a series of classic texts in the history of political thought, or is merely a transient piece of political journalism.

The great bulk of the text is a rambling and rhetorical polemic about imperial and national and political developments in nineteenth-century Europe, mainly concerned to draw not only revolutionary and libertarian but also nationalist and even racialist conclusions — bad upper and middle classes and bad Germans being contrasted with good lower classes and good Slavs and Latins in the

critical situation following the Franco-Prussian War and Communist movement of the early 1870s. About 90 per cent of this material has little but historical interest, consisting of derivative narrative, unreliable speculation, emotional exhortation, and sometimes sheer nonsense. But the other ten per cent of the material gives the book its classic status.

As part of his project Bakunin was concerned to attack Marx, the leader of the other party in the International and his main antagonist in the European revolutionary movement, as a bad bourgeois German (and a Jew), in terms which reflect the attacks made by Marx (and his colleagues) on Bakunin (and his colleagues). Much of this material must have seemed pretty tedious then, and most of it seems quite pointless now — especially the laboured attempt to identify Marx with Bismarck. But in the course of his attack Bakunin scored some strong points which got stronger as time passed — his warnings in general about "popular government" and "proletarian dictatorship", and in particular about the authoritarian tendencies of Marxist policy and practice in the nineteenth century, turned out to be all too prophetic of the catastrophic developments in Marxist parties and regimes in the twentieth century.

Bakunin also included occasional passages proclaiming the message of the anarchist "social revolution", and foreshadowing what the main book itself would have been about if it had ever been written. In particular, his first appendix was an influential text of both anarchism and populism, attacking the patriarchalist, conformist, monarchist and religious traditions in Russia, and advising the Russian revolutionaries to abandon orthodox politics, "go to the people", and prepare for a mass insurrection — which many of them did, at great cost to themselves and little benefit to the people.

It is good to have all this material properly available in English at last, but it must be said that the best parts have already appeared several times, and that a much clearer impression of Bakunin's contribution to

(continued on page 7)

Cities

decentralisation of communities and production and the use of appropriate technology of the kind pioneered at the Centre for Alternative Technology in Mid Wales. Stating that anarchist cities are impossible as such is to misunderstand the meaning of the word 'city' and to miss the chance to create human scaled communities.⁶

Some Green anarchists postulate that cities and industrial production imply the growth of a 'hierarchy of specialisation' but there is nothing intrinsic in the operation of decentralised, appropriately sized communities which would lead to the growth of such a hierarchy. In a society where all contributions are equally valued all members would have equal 'status'.⁷ In any event the simpler methods of production, the appropriate technology in use and the fostering of "transparency of operation"⁸ would hopefully lead more to 'generalisation' of skills than to specialisation and the growth of privileged castes of workers. All would market garden, build, repair, do mechanics, print or whatever.

One major point that the 'anarchism is impossible in cities' approach does not address is that some people — a not inconsiderable number, one supposes — actually enjoy living in cities and would presumably go to some lengths and effort to continue to do so. Ask confirmed Londoners why they like their city and you will get many different answers: they know their area, they love their friends, they see it more as a collection of villages than as a great mass, the Great Wen.

6. Thomas More *Utopia*, Karl Marx *Grundrisse*, William Morris *News From Nowhere*, Ebenezer Howard *Tomorrow: a peaceful path to real reform and Garden Cities of Tomorrow*, Peter Kropotkin *The Conquest of Bread and Fields, Factories and Workshops*, Colin Ward *Anarchy in Action, Welcome Thinner City and Housing, an Anarchist Approach*, Murray Bookchin *Post Scarcity Anarchism*.

7. See *Who Will Do the Dirty Work?*, Tony Gibson (1952) reprinted in *Why Work?*, Freedom Press, 1983.

8. See Colin Ward *Anarchy in Action* page 106.

Anarchist communities might strive to maintain the benefits of urban civilisation but in the context of a decentralised, human scaled, rural/urban mix. Surely such a society is now possible given our present knowledge and understanding of the world in a whole range of areas including planning, sociology, modern communications, education, horticulture, ecology, among others.

Transport within and between cities need not be the great problem which Green anarchists often anticipate. Even if we got rid of the car, what is wrong with the humble bicycle? For transport between towns there is already the rail network — an extended rail network could be run in a directly democratic way by the communities and workers involved. There is in addition the canal network where tons of goods can be pulled around the country, albeit slowly, by the power of one horse or small motor. Even some international transport could be available: powered dirigibles, wind powered ships could make low energy long distance transport of people and goods available.

Energy use within human scaled 'cities' need not be impossible to meet. A great deal of energy would be saved using suitably designed housing with efficient insulation, passive solar heating, solar panels, heat recovery systems. Electricity for domestic use can be generated from a variety of renewable sources widely available around the globe: wind, sun, wave, hydro, geo-thermal, and some limited use of fossil fuels should allow life to continue with the necessities and allow for power for small scale productive activities.

When we look at the issue of anarchism and cities I believe we should not imagine we have a monopoly of the 'truth' or all the 'solutions' to future problems as yet unseen. To quote Malatesta, we are only one strand of opinion within society. We do not have the right to be some Green anarchist Pol Pot forcing people to change their lifestyles against their will. For me anarchism implies a multiplicity of social forms, economic production/exchange methods and lifestyles with the sole provision that these are not damaging to other people or to the planet.

Whether we like it or not there are great conglomerations and urban areas already in existence. Our best hope is to foster

the greening of these cities as advocated by various writers,⁹ by means of more allotments, city farms, more parks, more gardens, better housing, less traffic — these are part of the gradualist approach and, this side of an unlikely revolution, they are worth working for, even while keeping the aim of small human scale sized cities very much in mind.

Green anarchists raise the question of allocation of resources as yet another objection to anarchist cities. This can be a problem for any society, not merely those based on cities. Famine has a long history in rural as well as urban society. Assuming we can devise communities with enough land to support them, and enough members able and willing to work the land, resources in terms of food should not be a problem. There are other resources than food to consider: scarce raw materials and also labour as a resource are important in any productive process or service, but what is wrong with open discussion and decision making? Planning is not necessarily bad so long as it is open, decisions are made by those affected, and all have a 'say'. When considering the allocation of resources it does not have to be a straight choice between the capitalist version of the 'free' market and corporatist state capitalism. Discussion of the allocation of resources in communes, collectives, councils or whatever 'forms' the new society adopts, would not equal government. It is co-operation surely and to be welcomed, we may even decide to use 'market mechanisms'¹⁰ — this is a long and respected element in anarchist thought.

If ever we get the chance to build them, the anarchist cities of the future can be self sufficient in food, energy efficient, they can produce goods from sustainable sources of raw materials (you can farm trees, cotton, rubber), they will be non-polluting, centres of craft production, in harmony socially and ecologically. They can be the answer to the problems of destructive/consumption driven capitalism. Green anarchism does not mean we have to return to purely hunter-gatherer or even agricultural societies.

Jonathan Simcock

9. See Colin Ward's *Welcome Thinner City* chapter 12 'Green Cities'.

10. See Proudhon's idea for a Peoples' Bank which he attempted to establish in France in 1848.

Statism and Anarchy

(continued from page 6)

anarchist thought is provided by some of the old anthologies, which give the basic essentials of his ideas without all the repetitive and rebarbative incidentals.

The other problem is Shatz's editorial treatment, which is strangely subdued. His translation is complete and conscientious, though rather clumsy, so the full text is made properly available to English-speaking readers; he has made a few minor alterations or corrections and also added a few explanatory footnotes, which are generally (though not invariably) helpful. His introduction is a summary account of Bakunin's whole life, with relatively little space to discuss this particular work or its later influence and lasting importance. His biographical and bibliographical notes are useful but far from complete. His endnotes, which mainly derive from Lehning, are necessary and helpful, but many of Bakunin's obscure allusions remain unexplained.

One significant item has been excluded from this edition, as it was from the *Archives Bakounine* — Karl Marx's own comments on Bakunin's book, which were written in 1874-1875, first published in 1926 in Russian and later in other languages. These amount to a virtual dialogue between the two great antagonists — of the kind imagined by Maurice Cranston in one of his brilliant radio dialogues in 1962 (published in *Anarchy* 22)

— and are fascinating and highly revealing about both Marxist socialism and Bakuninist anarchism. They are briefly discussed by Shatz (as they were by Lehning), but their absence from this edition is regrettable (as it was from Lehning's). Extracts from Marx's comments have been included in several English-language selections and collections of Marx's works — most conveniently in the Pelican Marx Library volume on *The First International and After* (1974) — and the first complete English translation was at last published in 1989, in Volume 24 of the Anglo-Russian edition of the *Collected Works* of Marx and Engels, so they are now accessible; but this edition of Bakunin's book would surely have been an ideal place for at least substantial extracts from Marx's contemporary criticism — especially now that "actually existing socialism" is collapsing all around us.

Shatz doesn't himself offer much criticism of *Statism and Anarchy*, except to condemn the nationalistic and racialistic passages, which he points out were typical of that milieu at that time; he might have mentioned that Marx was just as bad as Bakunin in this respect. Yet there is plenty more to say against as well as for this book. Bakunin was no doubt right to oppose the German, Austrian, Russian and Turkish Empires, and he did so at great cost to himself, spending many years in exile, poverty and prison for his pains; similarly he

was no doubt right to encourage the revolutionary movements in many countries of Europe, and for his efforts he was honoured in his lifetime and has been remembered ever since. But his crude distinctions between nations and peoples and races and classes and parties have now dated beyond rescue and are simply embarrassing, and indeed his crude arguments in general — recalling the worst editorials in revolutionary periodicals from his days to ours — make most of this book very hard going more than a century after it was written. Even the occasional references to anarchism in it are superficial and simplistic by comparison with the treatment in some of his earlier writings. We may regret that he didn't write the book he wanted to write, but we should remember that in 1873 he was an ailing and aging man — contemporary photographs show him looking much older than his sixty years — full of private as well as public anxieties, and it seems that his intellectual as well as his physical powers were failing.

Shatz usefully comments on some of Bakunin's arguments, but sometimes fails to follow them up. Thus his distrust of intellectuals in power was adopted by many anarchists, and was later developed by Jan Wacław Machajski into the argument that revolutionary socialism was indeed the ideology of intellectuals rather than workers. His warning about Marxist leaders becoming a new class was echoed by anarchists during the Russian Revolution, long before Milovan Djilas popularised the term. His prejudices against Germans and in favour of Slavs and Latins also became traditional in Russia and

elsewhere, and were developed by Kropotkin and others into a justification of support for the Allies in the two World Wars. And his contempt for liberalism also became traditional, and sometimes betrayed anarchists into supporting the replacement of bourgeois democracy by much more sinister regimes. The legacy of Bakunin is altogether more ambivalent than Shatz indicates.

So, as so often, this edition of a libertarian text which has been referred to more than it has been read deserves a mixed welcome — positive, because it is always good to have the actual works of the founders of the anarchist ideology rather than studies of or extracts from them; negative, because this particular work and this particular edition are both rather unsatisfactory.

The closing paragraph of Shatz's introduction deserves a concluding comment. He says that "anarchism's foremost contribution to modern political thought" has been "its critical voice", that "its defining feature is negation of the state and of political relationships", that it "has served the useful and provocative purpose of challenging the very validity of politics, the legitimacy of the political sphere of human life", that it asks, "is man by nature made to live in a polis?", and that it has therefore "served as the conscience of political thought". I reject this negative view of anarchism. Surely its defining feature is the affirmation of the individual in society and of political relationships based on autonomy, reciprocity and solidarity; surely we answer Aristotle's question positively, though insisting that the polis is for *all* its inhabitants; and surely we see anarchism not as the conscience but as the consciousness of political thought, not a sentimental protest against the way things are but a serious proposal about the way things could and should be.

NW

Food for Thought ... and Action

Recent additions to Freedom Press Bookshop stock.

Children in Society:— a libertarian critique* by Stephen Cullen, Freedom Press Anarchist Discussion Series. The first copies of this important new title have just arrived in the shop and should prove a valuable contribution to the ongoing debate about children and their role in society. Amid the continuing controversy over child abuse, it is a highly topical book which will be of special interest both to parents and to those who work with children. But it should be read by *everyone*, considering that we all began life as children. Well, all except Norman Tebbit, that is — he was probably dumped on earth by aliens in a passing spaceship when they emptied their toilet, and anyway, he can't read. Good complementary reading might be *The Child in the Country* (Yale, £12.95) and *The Child in the City* (Bedford Square Press, £7.95), both by Colin Ward and available from us, plus postage. *Children in Society* will be reviewed soon in these pages. 43 pages, £1.20.

Anarchy in the USSR: a new beginning edited by Philip Ruff, ASP. A timely look, given the collapse of State Communism in Eastern Europe, which looks at the newly emerging Russian anarchist movement. "Seventy years after the death of Kropotkin, the massacre of the Kronstadt Commune and the rout of Makhno, the Party which outlawed anarchism in Russia has itself become a banned organisation. But anarchy in the USSR has made a new beginning. Might anarchism now fill the ideological vacuum left by the collapse of Marxism?" Much as one dislikes stating the obvious, one is tempted to say that one answer has something to do with flying pigs, but we all hope that the real answer is 'Yes!' (For a wider perspective on this subject, see *The Raven* number 13* on Anarchists in Eastern Europe, Freedom Press, 96 pages, £2.50.) In this collection of writings, many of which have appeared elsewhere, "the new Russian anarchists speak for themselves about their ideas and of how anarchy may bring a new order, based on freedom, to the chaos of the USSR". You bet! 80 pages, £3.00.

Lib Ed: a magazine for the liberation of learning*, number 17/18. The latest issue

contains articles on children and war, small schools, Ivan Illich's de-schooling thesis and the anarchist tradition, artists in schools, and much more. 36 pages, £2.00.

The Ecology of Freedom: the emergence and dissolution of hierarchy* by Murray Bookchin, revised edition, Black Rose Books. The definitive work by Bookchin has now been reissued in a revised edition. A serious, important work already in demand again despite the increase in price. 385 pages, £11.50.

Workers Solidarity, number 23, magazine of the Workers Solidarity Movement, Dublin. A worthy publication and, with one exception, well produced. I refer to an article on the back page asking whether human nature is an obstacle to anarchism, which ends in mid-sentence: "We have the power to change the world. The ruling class know this and try to (continued over page)!" Alas, over the page is the front cover, but you could have fun completing the sentence — and the article — and perhaps sending your version to the editors? Well, perhaps not. But seriously, there are good pieces in this issue, such as how Lenin led to Stalin, third world starvation and capitalism, a critique of the 'Peace Train' movement, unemployment, and more, with some good cartoons. 20 pages, 75p.

Sacco and Vanzetti: the anarchist background by Paul Avrich, Princeton University Press. Rather than focusing on the robbery and murder at the shoe factory near Boston, the infamous trial and the worldwide protests that it occasioned, in this new and valuable perspective Avrich tells the absorbing stories of the lives of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, both Italian immigrants and anarchists. Based on a range of new material, this book treats a dramatic and hitherto neglected aspect of the *cause célèbre* that began in 1920. 265 pages with photographs, hardback only, £17.75.

KM

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

Anarchist Yearbook 1992

Anarchist Yearbook 1992
Phoenix Press, £1.50*

The second of this annual series is, as we might expect, an improvement on the first. The comprehensive lists of periodicals and publishers are more comprehensive than they were, with fewer "no information received" notices. More space is given over to articles, but they are articles relevant to the *Yearbook's* aim of describing the contemporary British anarchist movement. It is not making the mistake of becoming in part an annual magazine.

A most interesting article is 'The State of Anarchy', reprinted from the Economic League's monthly *Analysis*. The editor of the *Yearbook* requests that some anarchist magazine publishes a full list of the errors in this piece, but there are not all that many. The bosses' spy organisation is not defrauding its customers.

There is a useful survey of the year's wars and other government activities from Year Minus One Press of Hastings, and a reprint of the *Solidarity* manifesto of 1967.

The text of a talk on 'Anarchism Today' by "a member of one of the national anarchist groups" is stopped at the point where the speaker starts to compare national groups, because "the *Yearbook* wishes to promote class struggle anarchism in general, and not one group rather than the others". Freedom Press, however, is flattered by being the only group slagged off in the published part of the talk. It is said that we "seem oblivious to the fact that under the Tories, life has become more restricted, the poor have become poorer, and the state has grown in its powers". Evidently the speaker has not read *Freedom* for a long time.

Phoenix Press gave us sight of the text before publication, and space for a short rejoinder. The bit we are most pleased with is our reply

to the charge — true as a fact but ridiculous as an accusation — that some of us are "of the older generation". The old ones among us, we say, "choose age in preference to dying young, which is the only alternative".

Incidentally, *Freedom* is a paper of 'class struggle anarchism', this being the current term for what used to be called 'communist anarchism'. We have reservations about the term 'class struggle' itself, because of its association with Marxist mythology, but nobody who reads *Freedom* regularly will doubt that we embrace the ideas intended by the term. Like the *Yearbook*, we try "to go beyond the existing class struggle anarchism and find common ground with other forms of anarchism", but our opinions are not diluted.

The article on 'Green Anarchism', signed by Paul Gravett of London Greenpeace, says that our contemporary *Green Anarchist* refused to support the 1984-85 miners strike because the miners were part of the industrial system. *Green Anarchist* has sent us cuttings which show this statement to be false. Unfortunately, the *Yearbook* omitted to give *Green Anarchist* the opportunity to reply which it gave to *Freedom*.

Next year we hope there will be no need for anyone to have the opportunity to reply, because the *Yearbook*, in furtherance of its aim of bringing the 'anarchist movement together, will refrain from publishing articles by anarchists which slag other anarchists off. We should be fighting the enemy not each other.

In time, we hope, the *Yearbook* will be a standard reference work and a focus of the movement. It is well researched and a splendid idea, and deserves to succeed.

DR

* From Freedom Press Bookshop, inland post free, please add 40p contribution towards postage when ordering from abroad.

Anarchists and the NHS

Dear Editors,
I would like to respond to Donald Room (Freedom, 19th October) and his article on the National Health Service. The NHS does create problems for the anarchist.

I must first disagree with the statement: "The NHS increases individual opportunities by providing every individual with access to medical services". In truth the quality and quantity of resources offered to individuals is riddled with inequalities. Both the Black Report (1982) and the Health Divide (1987) have shown that in reality the NHS has done little to improve the health status of what are called the 'lower' social classes, since its inception.

There is also very real evidence of the NHS serving the cause of sexism and racism, both against patients and workers. NHS orientation to 'acute services' also increasingly leaves out elderly citizens from care. As an example of this, some feminist research into Electro Convulsive Therapy (Electro Shock, ECT) showed that you are more likely to receive ECT if you are a woman, working class or black.

An analysis of the NHS reveals a service controlled by professions for professions. Formerly the most powerful being the medical profession, but including the nursing profession (interesting interactions of power between these two professions, one 'male' against the other 'female') and

increasingly with the advent of NHS 'reforms' by professional managers with totally capitalist orientation.

We have seen the NHS leading the vanguard in the medicalisation (that is de-politicisation) of health and ill health, its philosophy often covertly 'victim blaming'. The NHS has served the white, male middle class, already articulate from privileged education.

However, I do defend the NHS. Another paradox. The NHS should meet the needs of individuals as they define their needs. Worker and user control rather than oligarchy management; primary preventative medicine rather than expensive, technology-based treatment. Empowerment for healthy living rather than passive patients. Creative and liberating rather than oppressive.

I am both an anarchist and a nurse. I am in many ways part of this paradox. I am frequently filled with self-doubt that I am able to be both anarchist and nurse within the NHS. The struggle is to empower both the people I care for and myself and co-workers.

Richard K. Hodgson

P. Townsend and N. Davidson, *Inequalities in Health: The Black Report*, Penguin Books.

M. Whitehead, *The Health Divide*, Health Education Authority.

Dear Editors,
Having read Dave Duggan's column and exchanged letters with him, I hope I shall always take what he has to say seriously. I assume that we are both attempting to get at the truth of the matter — a difficult exercise in a land notorious for having two truths — one Catholic and one Protestant.

I confess, however, to being baffled by his inference that there is no distinction to be made between the condition of the streets of Northern Ireland and the rest of the United Kingdom! When was he last in Belfast? I can only speak from the evidence of my own eyes. In Belfast the ugliest armoured cars in the world patrol the roads. Troops in battle dress with rifles at the ready walk the streets. Every police station is a fortress surrounded by a high security fence provided with searchlights and closed circuit television surveillance. Outside Belfast there are regular road blocks manned by armed RUC bulging with flak-jackets. There are areas the police refuse to go into without army back up. Until a few weeks ago the roads of South Armagh were no-go for the army and police; and patrols had to go in by helicopter Vietnam-style.

The last time I saw a gun on the streets of England was when I was carrying one myself going home on leave during World War Two. I know that there are armed police. If they have to take on gun-crazy psychos, paramilitaries or armed robbers what do you expect? Batons! 'Normal' is exactly what the

Northern Ireland

situation is *not* in Northern Ireland — to make it so is the challenge.

Is it not about time we had a proper libertarian policy on Northern Ireland? Surely the starting point is to separate the issue of peace from that of a constitutional settlement such as Peter Brooke is vainly seeking. *There can be no settlement so long as there is a war on.* Making peace comes first — that is all I am saying. If Dave has a better first step, what is it? He declares his support for non-violence. How can that mean other than the removal of all armed men from the streets and their replacement by an unarmed RUC supported by both communities?

Then about leadership. Why are we frightened to death by that word? The anarchist press is continually on about Bakunin, Kropotkin and Malatesta — were they not leaders? And other great libertarians like Tolstoy, Gandhi, Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela — were/are they not leaders? What we want is more of them. They are an indispensable catalyst. The election of Mary Robinson as President of the Republic is acknowledged on all sides to constitute a turning point in Irish history. Northern Ireland has any number of promising Mary Robinsons awaiting their moments. Dave calls for "insight, imagination and vision" and they can only come from individuals working in

authentic group contexts. It is the non-authoritarian context that makes the difference.

Of course the amendment of Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Constitution (under which the South claims jurisdiction over the North) will have to be part of a package. But I am sure that Dave is perfectly well aware that the Unionists make a meal out of those Articles and the sooner they are taken away the better.

The really exciting thing is that people power, politics with a small 'p', empowerment, metapolitics, is at last emerging in both parts of Ireland. I have been on the National Committee of New Consensus (GB) since it began last year and I can assure Dave that we bash *all* paramilitaries (non-violently, of course!) not just the Provos.

There have been a series of significant new developments. In Yokohama in September Amnesty International changed its policy to include the paramilitaries. END has just conjoined Yugoslavia, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Fortnight (Belfast) is working on a proposal for an independent commission on the troubles, and Troops Out are no longer getting it all their own way. They are challenged by New Consensus, The Peace Train, FAIT and Stop in a lobby that grows daily in strength and confidence. Will Dave and readers of *Freedom* join in?

Peter Cadogan

Romanticism

Dear Editors,
In reply to Ernie Crosswell's article on romanticism and to Eileen's letter.

Regarding art, surely imaginative creation is a fundamental part of human life. In *The Soul of Man Under Socialism* Oscar Wilde said of art: "... what it seeks to disturb is monotony of type, slavery of custom, tyranny of habit, and the reduction of man to the level of a machine". And where would we be without the surrealists?

I cannot comprehend the idea that a woman's primary purpose is to procreate. Surely the primary purpose of life (for men and women) is to be happy and enjoy life — this is the only one you have. If a child brings happiness then great, but no-one should have to do anything they don't want. To tell women they should have children is an example

of the authoritarianism we are all fighting against.

Having said that, I realise that Ernie is a comrade and we are on the same side.

John Sellars

Oh no, it's the revenge of the killer vowel

"Have you ever wanted to get your own back on computers? Are you angry about the large amount of personal information stored on computers?"

Well, BACKBYTES discovered what seems to be a foolproof method of throwing a decent-sized spanner in the works. Change your name to a single letter. Computers hate it. They won't accept it.

This was the discovery of Korean-American Stephen O. Now O is a fairly common family surname in Korea but it caused 23 year old O enormous problems in the US. O found that computer systems wouldn't accept that his surname had just one letter.

After struggling with the difficulties of not being able to obtain credit and constant hassles with US government agencies, O threw in the towel and had his name changed to Oh. But that may not be good enough. He was turned down for a car loan because the computer system at the financing agency only accepts surnames which are at least three letters long.

In the UK, changing surnames to a single vowel could prove to be the most effective weapon for dedicated poll tax or council tax saboteurs." (taken from *Computing* magazine, 31st October 1991)

Has anyone in Britain had a similar experience, I wonder?

C. Korycinski

A Structured Anarchism

Dear Editors,
D. Dane (letters, 2nd November) feels that the argument for the abolition of money has not been thought through. Well, think through the argument for retaining money.

I presume we mean money in the sense of exchange tokens, of negligible intrinsic value. Such a system cannot be viable if everyone is allowed to manufacture money. The money factories must be under communal control, including economic control to regulate the amount of money in circulation. And of course people must be prevented from satisfying their need for money by setting up secret money factories.

Put another way, if you have

anarchist money you need an anarchist central bank and an anarchist police force. This is not what D. Dane intends, but it is where his argument leads.

Of course society will not become free overnight. There must be a transition process. But if we try to map out the transition process in advance, the next stage in the process becomes an objective in itself. Tyrannies in the Soviet Union and China were not produced by people who wanted tyranny. They were produced by social idealists working to a plan.

Shortly after Tom Paine published *Rights of Man* 200 years ago, a cartoon appeared in the print shops depicting the ship of state being steered between the two perils of arbitrary government and democracy. Democracy is not regarded as a peril these days. Society has become less religious,

less patriotic, less respectful of the upper class, more tolerant, more egalitarian, and more individualistic. Change has occurred in the direction Paine would have wished, but the actual course of change could not have been predicted.

"What do ... anarchists do about those who want to keep some sort of money?" The same as we do about those who want to keep any other oppressive institution: try to change their minds. The way to encourage transition towards our goal is to aim for the goal. Social change follows changes of opinion, and changes of opinion are brought about by people who argue for what they want, not by people who modify their aims for fear of appearing too extreme. Change is never quick enough for extremists, but you don't speed things up by slowing yourself down.

Donald Room

FREEDOM PRESS new titles

- **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)

Freedom Press Bookshop
84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX
Open
Monday to Friday
10am-6pm
Saturday 10.30am-5pm

News from Angel Alley

With this issue of *Freedom* we are sending out green reminders to readers whose subscriptions expire(d) in October and November. We have stopped sending the papers to readers whose subscriptions expired in August and who have not renewed, and this will be the last issue we send to those whose subscriptions expired in September and have not been renewed. So consult your address label, and if the number above your name is 5218 or 5217 you are the next victims of the axe! Sorry to lose you but we just can't finance you as well as giving our time to produce *Freedom* every fortnight.

On 2nd November Freedom Press had stalls at the Lib Ed Conference in Leicester and the London Greenpeace Fayre in London. Neither stall had vast sales, but our publications were introduced

to many potential sympathisers, which is after all the point of a propaganda stall (and we did cover our costs). The Bookshop was open as usual, so we were in three places.

London Greenpeace is an anarchist / anti-militarist / vegetarian / environmentalist group founded in London about the time the (now) international Greenpeace organisation was founded in Vancouver. The coincidence of names is mere coincidence. There is no linkage of the organisations.

For the past four years, London Greenpeace has organised a Saturday 'Fayre' (for the first two years it was called the 'Anti-MacDonalds Fayre') at Conway Hall, one or two weeks after the Anarchist Bookfair. Freedom Press is not the only group to have stalls at both events. The London Greenpeace Fayre attracts a wider audience.

During the past year, Freedom Press has taken part in similar events at Bradford, Cardiff, Hadleigh and Brighton. Let us know where else we might be welcome.

About a hundred adults and probably as many children

attended the Fast Forward for Freedom conference in Leicester, which all agreed was a great success and where our Freedom Press bookseller was given an excellent Indian meal.

DONATIONS

22nd October - 4th November

Freedom Fortnightly Fighting Fund
Wolverhampton JL £1, Beckenham DP £20.

Total = £21.00
1991 total to date = £824.94

Freedom Press Overheads Fund
Wolverhampton JL £1, Beckenham DP £20, London N5 £1.50, Dublin WSM £2.30.

Total = £24.80
1991 total to date = £717.52

Raven Deficit Fund
Beckenham DP £20.

Total = £20.00
1991 total to date = £523.00

MEETINGS

Anarchist Communist Federation

Thinking About Anarchism

Discussions at the Marchmont Centre, Marchmont Street, London WC1, fortnightly on Thursdays at 8.30pm.

- 7th November - What constitutes the working class in contemporary society
- 21st November - Is there any revolutionary potential in the middle class
- 5th December - The individual anarchist, at work and daily life
- 19th December - Effective revolutionary strategy

Five further discussions will continue this series in the new year - watch this space for further details. We hope to see you soon!

GREENFEST 91

A day for the environment with anarchist bookstalls, speakers, films, food & music

Saturday 16th November

from 10am to 4pm

Hillhead Library, Byres Road, Glasgow

Admission free

FREEDOM fortnightly

ISSN 0016 0504

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

Printed by Aldgate Press, London E1

Midlands Anarchist Forum

Tuesday 19th November at 8pm

General Discussion

In The Snug, The Queens Head, Chesterfield Road, Belper, Derbyshire. Enquiries: 0773 827513

Anarchist Forum

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

1991-92 SEASON OF MEETINGS

15th November - 'The Importance of Small Groups' (speaker Peter Cadogan)

22nd November - General discussion

29th November - To be announced (speaker Julay Arici)

6th December 1991 - 'The Clandestine Press in Europe during the Nazi Occupation - from (its origin in) Belgium in the First World War to (its use in) Poland during the days of the illegal Solidarity' (speaker Martyn Lowe)

13th December - General discussion

10th January - 'The Role of Prison in an Anarchist Society - the prison as a sanctuary' (speaker Peter Lumsden)

17th January - General discussion

24th January - 'Anarchism: Genesis, the Prophets, the Law, Ritual, Progression, Magic, the Light' (speaker Peter Neville)

We are still booking speakers or topics for 1992. The dates free are from 31st January to 20th March and 17th April to 10th July 1992.

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, but not too early in the morning please).

If anyone is interested in a weekend conference on anarchism, in London or elsewhere, in 1992 now is the time to think of the arrangements. But let us not be idealistic. No one is going to subsidise participants. Revolution costs.

The Raven Anarchist Quarterly

number 15 on Health out now

Back issues still available:

- 14 - Voting / Kropotkin's 'Revolutionary Government'
- 13 - Anarchists in Eastern Europe: East - a freedom workshop / Nestor Makhno /
- 12 - Communication: George Barrett's Objections to Anarchism
- 11 - Class: Camillo Berneri on Worker Worship / Class Struggle in the 1990s / Durham Coalfield before 1914
- 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 the Young
- 3 - Social Ecology / Berkman's Russian Diary / Surrealism (part 2)
- 2 - Surrealism in England (part 1) / Vinoba Bhave / Walden School
- 1 - Communication and Organisation / Guy Aldred / History of Freedom Press

price £2.50 each from Freedom Press

FREEDOM AND THE RAVEN SUBSCRIPTION RATES

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

	inland	abroad	outside Europe	Europe airmail
The Raven (4 issues)				
Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	11.00	12.00	16.00	14.00
Institutions	13.00	15.00	20.00	20.00

The Raven (4 issues)

	inland	abroad	outside Europe	Europe airmail
Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	11.00	12.00	16.00	14.00
Institutions	13.00	15.00	20.00	20.00

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

	inland	abroad	outside Europe	Europe airmail
Claimants	18.00	-	-	-
Regular	23.00	28.00	40.00	37.00

Bundle subs for Freedom (12 issues)

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

Other bundle sizes on application

Giro account number 58 294 6905

All prices in £ sterling

FREEDOM CONTACTS

Sectional Editors

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

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

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

Regional Correspondents

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

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

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

North Wales: Joe Kelly, Penmon Cottage, Ffordd-y-Bont, Trenddyn, 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 15 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 14 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.....