### ANARCHIST YOUTH

(formerly Anarchist Student)

Vol. I No. 3 October 1963

editors:

Adrian Cunningham (Cambridge)

Wynford Hicks (Oxford)

Charles Radcliffe (London)

#### Editorial

"Federation is the organisation of freedom" Proudhon.

ANARCHIST YOUTH. This change recognizes the status quo (since not all our writers or readers are students) and removes from the paper the impression that its main purpose is to address students. We should like ANARCHIST YOUTH to be read by as many young people as possible. Which brings us to the question of organization.

For us anarchism is a philosophy of social change. We are not 'permanent protesters' rejoicing in the existence of exploitation and oppression so that we may enjoy the luxury of rebelling against them; we are revolutionaries and our purpose is to replace the present authoritarian system by a free society. Two conclusions follow from this premise. In the first place, we cannot achieve a free society unless large numbers of people want it also - we are concerned therefore to persuade others to be anarchists. And secondly, since we are interested in society, we are proposing not the abolition of organization, but the introduction of libertarian forms. For these two reasons anarchists should organize themselves: to be effective in reaching the widest audience for their views; and to provide

proof of the possibility of libertarian organization. It is obvious that if you reccommend a course of action your argument is stronger if you adopt it successfully yourself. We fully support the proposal that the anarchist groups in Britain should federate.

Now all anarchists are in favour of 'closer contact' between groups, but some, we understand, envisage a federation as a mere correspondence bureau. Certainly information about other people's activities is essential: we do not think that it is enough. We suggest that through a federation anarchists would be able to co-ordinate their activites, in the same way as the Committee of 100 movement has tried to or anize itself. It has already been suggested that at the next general election anarchists should select a constituency on which to concentrate anti-parliamentary propoganda: how, without a federation, is the constituency to be chosen and activities organized? It has also been proposed that we should mount a campaign against Spanish tourism: is each group to waste time and money printing its own leaflets and posters? The argument for a national federation is substantially the same as that for a local group: only the extreme individualist will

oppose either.

We understand that a conference to there is roughly a three yearly set up a federation is to be held in January, when the views of all groups on the form it should take have been clarified. We hope that the conference will be successful. In the meantime we propose the formation of a federation of anarchist students, not as an alternative to the national federation but as a part of it. Each student group would be part of a local anarchist federation and the student federation - as, for example, in syndicalist theory the railway workers in a particular area would be federated with the railway workers in the country as a whole, and with other workers in the same area. Students

share common problems: they are at college for half the year and turnover - hence a student group is liable to disentegrate; a federation could maintain activity while the strength of particular groups varied. Also, students have certain channels open to them alone. A campaign against cheaprate flights to Spain and South Africa could be carried on inside the National Union of Students. If anarchist students federate, they can begin to act.

We invite all anarchist students who are interested in this proposal to a conference to be held in Oxford in December, date to be arranged. Observers welcome, comments please.

# THE REVELATIONS Diana Shelley

Once upon a time there was a well-known member of the Committee of 100. He was a charming man who lived in a city important enough to boast not only an ancient university but also a less ancient RSG. He had claims to being an original political thinker: when he left the Communist Party it had not been over Hungary or the 20th Congress. His views were much respected in Committee circles, and he achieved brief notoriety in the national press when he admitted to not being the Spies for Peace. He enjoyed being a libertarian, especially in pubs.

This story begins one afternoon in October 1962 when he saw the light. A crowd of two thousand demonstrators surged up Regent Street towards a line of a hundred policemen. Then in a trice, as if the hand of God had intervened, he saw the thin blue line flattened to the ground and the crowd sweep past without injury, without police violence. And he saw the Words and the Words were Nonviolent Pushing and the Words became flesh and went among men and attended Committee meetings. And He told the people of the revelation that He had seen, and the people spat upon Him and reviled Him. . But the State knew what He meant.

So this story ends one afternoon in October 1963. A crowd of two thousand demonstrators surged up Regent Street towards a line of ten thousand policemen who had been trained in the technique of Nonviolent Pushing. And they pushed. And when the people had been trampled to the ground, they were arrested and He was among them. And at Bow Street He was Nonviolently Pushed down a flight of stairs. He remembered Solidarity's advice, went limp and refused to bleed.

At the Inquest the Coroner found that the death had occurred in the execution of the policeman's normal duties. And Peace News, in the obituary, was forced to admit that He was the first, and they hoped last, martyr to be killed by Nonviolence. R\*I\*P

The issue of violence or nonviolence has arisen once again in the libertarian press but the controversy has, for the most part, proyed dry, sterile and largely irrelevant.

I must declare my partisanship in the controversy - I am for non-violence - but I must also add that I have found these arguments for nonviolence rather unconvincing.

This is largely because many of the advocates of nonviolence have inclined towards a theory of unimaginative, inert, passive nonviolence, rather than creative, active nonviolence. Their nonviolence has been the nonviolence of protest rather than resistance. Offered active nonviolence as at Marham and Porton, many nonviolence advocates have tended to reject it in favour of perimeter pickets, leafleting and so on. This is not to criticise those who chose this form of action. It is as valuable and necessary in its own way as fence climbing or hedge hopping, but it is not even the basis of real, active resistance.

What I would propose for both the nonviolence and anarchist movements is a nonviolence which rules out dogma, which does not conceive of violence purely in physical terms but also in terms of psychological reality. (This does not mean I support the ludicrous theory of nonviolent pushing which is merely a rationalisation of an essentially violent action, one based on the idea of might is right - a dangerous concept for a minority movement!)

We must get away from the rigidity of <u>duragraha</u> and <u>satyagraha</u> (we tend to use a modern combination of the two in practice - varying from extreme to extreme), from the self righteousness of the Gandhians, from the puritanism of the pacifists and the arrogance of the anarchists.

We must decide whether we want to conduct a campaign of massive, de-centralised resistance of whether we want to be a permanent, high minded minority with little or no popular support and a public image of saintly irrelevance.

Having outlined the basis of my argument I want to examine briefly the ideas which I do not accept and which, if acted upon, would, I believe, effectively crush our hopes of success in any struggle, however limited.

The main problem with the language of violence ( which may be, as Freedom never tires of saying, the only language the authorities understand\*) is that the State will, as long as it exists, have a louder voice than the adherents of the 'lunatic left'. As soon as we offer a serious violent challenge to the authorities we will see the heavy hand - briefly before it completely crushes us. Most of the exponents of anarchist violence have stated that they do not visualise us using it now. The idea that violence is the golden future towards which we work, that having achieved this golden future there would be an apocalyptic week, the authoritarian structure collapse and a free society emerge from the rubble is touching in its simplicity; however the intellectual content of the theory is as small as the romantic content is apparently vast. Such a situation would require mass support for libertarianism. Such support would, in any case, spell the death blow for the State. To those who say that the instruments of State coercion would have to be destroyed, as indeed they would, I offer non-violent destruction. I ask readers to refrain from quoting this until they have read further. There exist perfectly acceptable tactics for this destruction, which would need only slight modification. The tactic of the Social General Strike (a purely revolutionary one), so beloved of radical anti-militarists and syndicalists, could serve this purpose, just as could the setting-up of parallel social arrangements, mutual aid communities and the like ("contracting other relationships"etc). It is pointless for violent anarchists to criticise this concept and say that it would require mass support because, for them to do so, means they suppose incorrectly that a violent revolution could be accomplished by a dedicated libertarian elite, without mass support.

<sup>\*</sup> There is some point in speaking a language they do not understand

There are no short cuts but I would maintain that violence, either group or individual, offers us a near certainty of death and destruction, and nonviolence offers us a hope of a reasonable future.

The advocates of tactical or limited violence also reject logic for woolly emotionalism. They have said, for example, that the violence offered by us during the Cuba crisis demonstrations in October, 1962, during the Whitehall 'anarchist' demonstration on Easter Monday, 1963, and during Greek Week in July, 1963, was nothing compared to the ultimate violence threatened by the modern military State. But it is no good telling the 'average citizen' that the violence of demonstrators is nothing compared to the violence of the State and its agencies. He will react with a healthy "You what ?" He will not see the relationship in these terms, not because he is a pig-headed selfish oaf but because it has not been thus illustrated for him. It is up to us, if we do want to go anywhere, to point the relationship in such a way that he is more, not less, likely to see the issue as one of State and social coercion and violence against peaceful but determined individuals. Nonviolence, a combination of stubborness and imaginative empathy for those one resists, can alter conceptions while violence merely strengthens prejudices and justifies violence by our opponents. Violence strengthens the prejudices not only of those on whom it is used but also on those who see it. Nonviolence is as much a psychological as a physical weapon

Further, to talk limited or tactical violence is to talk the language of the State and the cuttorit as . I don't see much difference between a man who wants to obliterate his fellows for the sake of the proletariat and one who wants to do it for the sake of national supremacy or Party Prestige. Nonviolence accepts the fundamental worth of human beings, their reasonableness and their sense, while violence is both an acceptance of the limited power of the advocates' persuasion and an acceptance of the rights of the cunning and strong over the weak and confused.

I want now to return to the theory and practice of nonviolence. It my contention that the theory is equally applicable by the tactically nonviolent as the 'principled' nonviolent. It is a theory of action and change and, if it be accepted at all, it may as well be accepted whole-heartedly (if only, in the case of the tactically nonviolent, for as long as they wish to use it). I rather think that if it is used imaginatively a permanent, revolutionary method will be discovered. There are difficulties. Consider the variety of 'effective' violent tactics, compared to the limited number of nonviolent ones. However if we use nonviolence we will soon find ourselves evolving new methods, based on experience - success and failure. Our ideas, our policies, our commitments will grow out of our past quite naturally. We shall have miserable failures. We won't win immediate sympathy. It is likely that we shall all be blown high, wide and handsome by one of the nuclear liberators first. But at least this way offers us a hope.

What I propose is not, as I have already pointed out, the nonviolence of protest but the nonviolence of resistance. Today the distinction may be only theoretical but today we can practise tactics which could, tomorrow, lead to real, effective resistance - another advantage over violence. The sort of proposals made in Beyond Counting Arses and by Scots Against War are worth every serious war resister's careful examination. They advocate an aggressive use of nonviolence involving genuine obstruction, genuine disruption of the machinery of the Warfare State, and as much subversion as any of us can manage. This does not rule out effective non-eliteist contact with those whose ideas we oppose, but rather strengthens this side of our campaign. It also broadens the anti-war movement into vitally important channels, viewed only hesitantly and relucatntly so far - into the field of industrial direct action, into the field of education, into the field of disobedience in print, into the field of belligerently illegal broadcasting, into the field of incitement to disaffection of the armed forces and the police. How these

would be effectively carried out is not as yet clear but the <u>Spies For Peace</u> document was a superb example of disobedience in print which provided an enormous impetus to the peace movement and was an example of how decentralist, nonviolent action can hoodwink the authorities.\*

This raises the question of Openness or Secrecy, a question central to nonviolent action and theory. I have insufficient space to deal with it at any length here but we hope a serious and detailed consideration of this issue will be undertaken at a later date in ANARCHIST YOUTH.

The arguments in favour of openness are fairly obvious to the initiates of nonviolence but they may be unfamiliar to anarchists reared in the Bakuninist tradition. The points I shall make are not complete, either in themselves or as a statement of the desirability or effectiveness of open action. I hope readers will read further on this subject; Peace News printed a reasonably valuable article by Gene Sharp on it at a wildly inappropriate time ( when Pat Pottle was on the run before the Old Bailey trial of the Six) and more recently that National Committee of 100 produced a clear and well-argued case for openness in publication . Both these are well worth consulting and there is certainly no shortage of literature on the theme. The basic arguments are roughly as follows. The authorities act secretly and we must behave openly in contrast. If we behave conspiratorially we do not get our ideas across effectively. Information and action carry more weight if people are visibly prepared to be responsible for the dissemination and organisation. Secrecy makes internal communication difficult and the advantages gained by taking the authorities 'on the hop' are invariably lost by diminished support. Internal secrecy has a corrosive effect on internal trust and internal trust is a prerequisite for effective action. People who can be seen to be behaving openly, at great risk, tend to achieve more sympathy from the reutral citizen.

<sup>\*</sup> Danger - Official Secret 1/- from 13, Goodwin Street, London N 4 + P.N. December 29 1961. See also letter from Tony Smythe January 12 1962 

± Statement of conference of July 8/9, 1963 (available from Goodwin St,N4)

The other side of the argument also bears consideration and presents greater difficulties than most total openness advocates seem prepared to admit. Should the Spies for Peace, for example, have been open with the authorities and, if so, at what stage? If they had been would Danger! Official Secret have survived to give a purpose to the annual Easter beanfeast at Aldermaston and to present a very serious challenge to the equanimity of the State? If they had appended a list of, say, 100 names would the authorities have dutifully arrested them all, or just picked out the 'chief conspirators'? Collective responsibility has become rather a sick joke since December, 1961.

It is because I believe that both sides of the argument are important and that only practice will really indicate which is the best stand to take, that I have simply presented two arguments. I cannot see that either will be unconditionally right for all occasions though my personal prejudice is towards openness. However what frightens me more than anything else is the appalling lack of sympathy shown by some people to those who act secretly; to Pat Pottle, for example, when he was on the run. Would this happen again? Would people threaten to hand over another escapee to the authorities, simply because his moral code is different from their's? The peace movement has often been bedevilled by opportunism, and equally often by a misguided refusal to mind one's own business or to allow others to contravene one's own moral code. I hope the future will see more tolerance. No principle is so important that we should cut a genuine comrade's throat, solemnly and systematically and inspired by the highest moral principles, simply because he disagrees on one point.

It has been said of the advocates of nonviolence and the nonviolent actionists that they are attacking the State at its strongest points - the police and armed forces - where only violence could provide any real resistance. I believe this view, and its supposed corollary to be profoundly mistaken. We are attacking the State at the points of its greatest power ( mass destruction etc., ) but this is also one of its

points of weakness. The links in the State's armour hore are human links, and human links are as likely to act like humans as they are to act like links. The State has good reason to be frightened of the Committee of 100's Forces Campaign which could be a very dangerous threat to the War Machine.

Quite obviously a violent campaign at this point would be ruthlessly supressed. But although we have no hills to retreat into, we have all the contradictions of the mass centralised society to play upon. In this situation violence is not only unnecessary but idiotic. Because nonviolent techniques do not leave a trail of mutilated bodies and dynamited ammunition dumps behind them they are more difficult for the authorities to trace and deal with effectively. Because nonviolence is concerned with human beings it deals with subversion rather than destruction and because it creates its own, essentially libertarian, forms of organisation and communication it contains within itself the seeds of new social organisms. Nonviolent guerrilla groups can operate effectively without the authorities bringing in the tanks or even realising the least need to do so. They can also expand and be trained without difficulty or the risk of truly effective supressi n. The most a violent libertarian army could manage would be self-defence. In our society it would be inherently incapable of establishing new forms of social and industrial organisation. The most probable result of its existence would be death and destruction: for itself, for members of the army opposing it, and, worst of all, for innocent, unconcerned individuals. Equally a mutiny in the forces is better than a violent rebellion. Soldiers merely cease to obey their officers, cease to serve in firing squads, withdraw their cooperation rather than establish a new army to deal with the old. An officer without authority is a man.

I h ve been able to develop my ideas only sketchily and they need to be examined closely and critically, along with other ideas intimately connected, such as the psychological relevance of nonviolence (see Gregg - Power of Nonviolence). It is the oeace movement that leads the resistance to governmental idiocy at the moment but I hope the future will see more and more anarchists involved and giving the peace movement some of their aggressive and original qualities. I hope they, in turn, will learn

to respect and use nonviolence and realise that people do get hurt, whatever the resistance, but are more likely to if they are violent. I hope anarchists can bring themselves enough up to date for the new generation of young radicals, brought into politics by the DAC and the Committee of 100, to join them in the parallel struggles for specifically anarchist ends. The real lesson to be learnt by anarchists and pacifists is that they are, respectively, pacifists and anarchists - or neither.

### GERMANY: EMERGENCY LAWS & COMPULSORY NATIONAL SERVICE FOR CIVILIANS

The Emergency Laws, likely to be passed by the German Parliament early in November, are extremely complex. They will operate if the Govt. declares an 'external' or 'internal' emergency. An 'external' emergency can be declared if the Govt. claims to have knowledge of threatened attack, even if there is no obvious international tension. Parliamentary elections are cancelled: the Govt. can retain office indefinitely. If an 'internal' emergency is declared, e.g. a major strike, the Govt. can override all the citizen's constitutional rights.

Civilian Service Law Gives Govt. control of males (18-65) & females (18-55) for emergency service. In peace compulsory training will be 200 hours or 28 days in the first year; afterwards 100 hours or 14 days per year. Noncompliance punishable with 2 yrs imprisonment and fines up to 10,000 DM. Protective Building Law All builders must construct air-raid shelters in houses, hotels, schools, factories, hospitals. Cost to be borne by builders but recoverable later from tenants or purchasers. Self-Defence Law All citizens over 16 to undergo annual air-raid training of at least 10 hours. Families to have 14 days' supplies for every member and materials for protection from nuclear, bacteriological & chemical war. Residence Regulation Law Govt. can at any time (even in peace) declare that inhabitants of given places shall not leave without official permission & can order compulsory evacuation of whole regions. Vehicle Registration Law Even in peace all motor vehicle owners can be forced to go with vehicles to a prescribed place to assist in provisioning and movement of local fighting forces. Fines for infringement 20,000 DM. Foodstuffs Security Law Plans for control of all available foodstuffs and preparations for rationing system.

The Emergency Constitution has to be passed by a two-thirds majority, the other eight laws by a simple majority. The laws aim at complete militarisation of the population and are strongly reminiscent of the so-called authorisation laws of the Hitler era. Most German people are ignorant of the text and purposes of the laws; they may only wake up when it is too late. The consequences of these laws would be far reaching and could be disastrous in any future Berlin crisis. The German peace movements have asked for our support in arousing an awareness of, and opposition to, these laws. We must act quickly.

<sup>\*</sup> The remaining two laws, not listed above, deal with economic control and military status for border guards.

# FREEDOM UNDER LAW

"It is well known that Mr. Henry Brooke believes that demonstrations are not in the 'National Interest'. However it has not been widely recognised that peaceful demonstrators are liable to be sent to prison for eighteen months.

"This has now been explained by a Home Office spokesman. 'We prefer demonstrations to be violent,' he said. 'In this way we can arrest anyone in sight. The sentence passed on Mr. Clark is intended to deter peaceful demonstrators who we are not supposed to arrest.' "

PRIVATE EYE.

George Clark's trial seems to be yet one more example of what a hostile Chairman can do with the weight of evidence; after hearing his summing-up, the jury retired and brought in a verdict of guilty. They placed more weight on the evidence of the two police witnesses than on that of the thirteen witnesses for the defence, in spite of the fact, ignored in the summing-up, that serious doubt was thrown on the reliability of one of them. All this is commonplace to us. The atrocious sentence that followed the verdict only shows that, provided the public eye is not on a particular case, the executive have nothing to fear from the independence of the judiciary. It should be obvious to all of us that we must now try to draw public attention to the unfair trial and unfair sentence, both to help George Clark in any way possible, and also because action against injustice brings understanding of and sympathy for our ideas in a way few other concerns of ours can.

It is also worthwhile to step back a little from the immediate injustice, and consider the trends in police policy which it indicates, and the pending cases of similar import over which we must take action now.

Incitement means urging someone to do something - whether he does it or not is irrelevant, whether he hears it, or even understands it, are equally so. Incitement is a crime in common law only if you are inciting someone to do something illegal. The present cases concern inciting people to obstruct the highway. This is basically a technical matter: the only thing you are in fact allowed to do as of right on the

highway is pass and repass reasonably. Standing still is technically an obstruction, though it is probable that someone would actually have to be obstructed before a prosecution would be brought: though one prosecution succeeded in the complete absence of any real obstruction whatsoever. Obstruction, in the legal sense, is an offence which occurs by the million in London every day. During the rush-hour, almost everyone is obstructing almost everyone else in the free exercise of their common law right of free passage of the highway. Crowds at Royal weddings, or outside courts, or round building or demolition sites, are committing it, as are pedestrians (other than on crossings) who slow down traffic by crossing roads, and motorists who by their presence on the road bring pedestrians to a halt on the kerb. Obstruction is a perfect example of a change of legal meaning concealing a total absurdity. Using the word in its ordinary sense, it is reasonable to the average citizen that it should be punishable - in its very different legal sense it has become useful for a purpose totally removed from that one might imagine from its name. Under the pressure of the environment, the offence has adapted itself to a new function after an initial period of dormancy.

It is, technically, so widespread that in the vast majority of cases the police do not prosecute. Accordingly the general public does not realise the extent of the offence, and is unaware of its reliance on the discretion of the police. If every instance of the offence were prosecuted, the courts would come to a standstill and the law be brought into contempt; and the law would be changed in a moment. As it is, the law is invidiously enforced against a minority, who can do little to protest because the name makes the law sound reasonable.

People are not often arrested for common law obstruction on demonstrations, because there is usually something more convenient to charge them with; disregarding the Commissioner's Regulations, for example.

Common law obstruction is used to ground incitement charges.

This started with people who shouted 'sit down': urging people to sit is, on the face of it, clearly inciting an obstruction. The fact that it is done to avoid violence, and the fact that the police are usually causing a far greater obstruction in the area with cordons and horses, are both equally irrelevant. But now, with George Clark's case, urging people to move together in the same direction is held to be incitement to obstruction. 'Members of the public' are alleged to have been obstructed by 'demonstrators' (some sort of second class citizen) walking along the pavement. Part of the evidence in Terry Chandler's committal on the same charge was that he shouted 'follow me' before and during the demonstration.

This innovation is a serious incursion into the freedom to demonstrate. It appears that it is illegal to call a group of people together to go somewhere on foot in a town. It also appears that the law will only be applied if the Commissioner of Police, or the Home Secretary, disapproves of the political implications; in this case, Royalty was involved. It was not applied, for example, to the march to Wormwood Scrubs on September 15th: superfluously, this was protected by Commissioner's Regulations forbidding any march other than the one organised by the Committee of 100. Or was it superfluous? There is a danger that the police may be edging their way towards the position where demonstrations which are not the subject of protective Commissioners' Regulations are automatically illegal because they cause obstruction.

Essentially, what we are asserting is this: our freedom to cause people inconvenience by demonstrating. Police co-operate in processions, royal weddings, teachers' lobbies, etc: they divert traffic or hold it up, close streets, and set up special signs and traffic-lights. This is a nuisance to them, and considerable obstruction is caused in spite of their efforts. Democracy means tolerating this kind of inconvenience. Otherwise, freedom of speech merely means that you can say what you like so long as not too many people take any notice. The Home Secretary and the Commissioner of Police are quietly eroding our freedom by slowly and delicately extending the scope of their common law powers. They are trying to ensure that any demonstration they choose can be made illegal, and ultimately, though this is more speculative, that any demonstration not protected by specific Commissioners' Regulations is ipso facto illegal. This means, in effect, that anyone at the front of the demonstration, and anyone raising his voice during it, and anyone the police recognise from previous demonstrations, is likely to go down for incitement, like George Clark.

So much for incitement: there is also conspiracy. Peter Moule and Terry Chandler are faced with this charge as well as charges of incitement. Conspiracy means agreeing, and it is contrary to common law if what you agree to do is illegal, or if it falls under a number of other specific heads, such as corrupting public morals. Peter Moule and Terry Chandler are charged with conspiracy to cause a public nuisance by obstructing the free passage of the highway by processions and demonstrations. It is likely that it will be considered irrelevant that they did not intend to cause either a nuisance or an obstruction, and equally irrelevant that the royal procession during the same period caused a good deal more obstruction than the demonstrations; and, fundamentally, irrelevant that the demonstrations would in fact have caused no obstruction at all if they had not been interfered with by the police. It will, if the indictment is allowed to stand, have been made illegal to

organise a demonstration if the Home Secretary or the Police Commissioner do not want there to be one.

This can easily be applied to demonstrations which, as planned, would cause no obstruction. The Commissioner issues Regulations 'to prevent obstruction', places cordons in front of the procession, halting it in the road, orders mounted police to ride into the crowd, charges with incitement anyone who tries to keep the demonstration non-violent by calling for a sit-down (police horses cannot break up and terrorise a seated demonstration), charges anyone sitting and anyone else he chooses with disregarding the Commissioner's Regulations, for good measure frames-up a few for possessing offensive weapons; and rests secure in the knowledge that his gallant police will command public sympathy for having to perform such an obnoxious task. In addition he charges any organisers in sight with conspiracy, particularly if, like Peter Moule and Terry Chandler, they are helpful enough to go on their own initiative to Scotland Yard and explain beforehand what demonstrations are planned.

The absurdity of this area of the law is clear if you consider a prosecution as follows. You prosecute for incitement and conspiracy to cause a public nuisance by obstructing the free passage of the highway all businesses which are nearer to Oxford Circus Underground Station than any other station. The ground of the charge is that they agree to release on to the streets all their employees at much the same time, and urge their employees to leave at that time: the result is a public nuisance. Your prosecution would not stand up for one moment. And yet the only difference between this hypothetical case and the prosecutions of George Clark, Michael Ridley, Frank Adler (both incitement), Peter Moule and Terry Chandler, is that the motive is different: in one case business, in the other politics. And if we once allow the motives for an action to make the difference between crime and no crime, then we have begun to lose our freedom of speech.

To sum up: demonstrations the police don't like are illegal; anyone taking part can be done for obstruction or disregarding the Commissioner's Regulations; anyone opening his mouth during such a demonstration can be done for incitement; anyone organising one can be done for conspiracy; and public disquiet can be stilled by using horses to provoke a few individuals to violence, and by planting bricks on a few more.

It wouldn't help to change the law: other laws would adapt under the pressure of the environment to serve the same purpose. We must change the environment by so arousing public opinion that the authorities no longer think they can get away with it. We must demonstrate until the law is seen to be the farce it is, and until the oppression that is Henry Brocke can be restrained.

19 4 3.

To do this, the demonstrations we organise will have to be non-violent. Whatever our position in the non-violence/violence controversy, we just cannot afford to give the authorities that much help. Those who feel the need to use violence against the police can do so whenever they see a constable on the beat. Indulging this sort of urge during a demonstration has served the authorities purpose very well in the past, and is largely responsible for the desperate situation in which we now find ourselves. If we cannot now show that we have learnt from past experience, and cannot break this stranglehold upon our freedom, then the prospect for the future is rather grim.

Nicholas Bohm.

@ @ @ @ @ @

ANARCHY OBSERVED

....Roger Lewis.....

This article has been cut.

-- Editor.

Throughout the month of August an International Youth Camp was held in the Dordogne Valley (France). It was particularly interesting to observe the interplay of 'national characteristics' in a deliberately anarchist environment. The days at the beginning of the camp were spent "" working to prepare for the influx of campers due to arrive 'domingo' (a 'domingo' which we Anglo-Saxons mistakenly thought would be merely a Spanish 'manana'). If an individual preferred not to work he didn't work, although when it cam to singing verbal persuasion was employed generally with success. Meals were cooked in freely formed groups, often international. Different groups voluntarily ran the community shop at times which did not interfere with their enjoyment of the day. were discussions on anarchist thought, a library of books and pamphlets, and a showing of the film 'Octobre a Paris' (which describes the massacre of 250 Algerians during a peaceful demonstration in 1961). English socialists passed through the camp and seemed impressed, although a social democrat friend of mine looked rather surprised when a plumber from Marseille demanded what he thought of the social revolution.

In a recent issue of 'Freedom' an editorial used considerable space defending holidays to Spain. I wish the writer could have been at the camp when the news came through of the garrotting of Delgado and Granados. I have never felt so frustrated and impotent in all my life. We knew we could do nothing; many of the women cried; the faces of the men were drawn. The Spanish anarchists are some of the most open-hearted and

generous people I have ever met and to see this blow struck at them was sickening, as sickening as the garotting story. Yet they did not withdraw into themselves and the sense of solidarity was almost tangible. In the faces of the old who had fought and the young born in exile was the same frustration and same hatred of tyranny. Obviously many English anarchist-pacifists will condemn any form of violent militancy in Spain but I would implore them to put themselves in the same situation and think deeply before condemning all such action out of hand.

A surprising fact about the camp was the lack of violent arguments between anarcho-, syndicalists, communists and individualists. It would appear that a little communal living and tolerance in an anarchist atmosphere does more good than all the repetitious ravings of the self-righteous on the Letters Page of Freedom.....

ANARCHISM by George Woodcock (Pelican 7/6) by Nicholas Gould (This article has been cut)

Anarchism, George Woodcock's new Pelican, is a long, thorough and useful book; it is also at times a very dull book, and I confess that in places only my obstinate determination to read it from cover to cover prevented me from abandoning it. For this reason it is not really a book to make converts: I would look upon it primarily as an invaluable work of reference for those already interested in anarchism, as I assume anyone who reads this magazine must be. The author cannot be blamed for the book's occasional dullness; he has done as much as any man could, but the details of the endless squabbles of the extreme left have a depressing sameness, whether in 1870 or 1963, and much of this book is inevitably taken up with the history of such squabbles. If you want to read it for pleasure skip judiciously, at any rate in the second half of the book.

The book is subtitled "A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements", terms of reference which should surely be broad enough: but in fact Woodcock limits his scope somewhat. The second part, "The Movement", he rightly restricts to the period from the 1840s on, for we cannot talk of an anarchist movement as such earlier than that. Many readers will be disappointed, however, that this historical section does not include the years after 1939.

I found the first part of the book, "The Idea", more enjoyable than the second: here, after a general introduction, Woodcock deals, in a chapter each, with the six men whom, presumably, he thinks most important in the history of libertarian ideas - Godwin, Stirner, Proudhon, Bakunin, Kropotkin and Tolstoy. This method of history through biography is a sensible one: it is unfortunately true that the history of anarchism is largely the history of a number of outstanding individuals. It is hard to think of anyone else who has contributed

as much as these six men to anarchist thought, in its various forms, individualism, anarcho-communism, pacifist anarchism - everything except anarcho-syndicalism, which has been freer from the 'personality cult' than any other branch of the libertarian movement.

The biographical method serves to outline the main trends of anarchist thought; and it is more interesting than any bleak exposition of ideas could be. These six men, after all, are interesting as people: and Woodcock, who has written full length biographies of at least three of them, is well qualified to portray them to us. More questionable is his dismissal in twenty pages of "The Family Tree" of anarchism. It is true that the movement which arose in the nineteenth century was spontaneous and owed little to the inspiration of earlier libertarian thinkers: but in a "history of libertarian ideas" these earlier thinkers surely have their place. Woodcock devotes some pages to Winstanley and the Diggers, though he admits that their movement was completely forgotten until the 1890s; surely many earlier libertarians deserve equally generous treatment — as do primitive anarchies.

A recurrent idea in the book, and one which will annoy some people, represents anarchism as always opposed to modern industrial society as such. It is in rural districts, among peasants and free craftsmen, that anarchism has been most popular and most nearly successful - read especially Woodcock's account of the agrarian collectives in Spain during the Civil War. Syndicalism, the major libertarian attempt to fight the industrialists on their own ground, represents to Woodcock " a compromise with the trend towards centralisation" and its successes in the trade union movement are therefore "equivocal triumphs".

According to Woodcock, the point of anarchism is to act as an antidote, "a counter ideal," to "the movement towards universal centralisation." Presumably this means that anarchists will always be a tiny minority: "permament protest", not World Revolution, is what they must work for and they will no doubt go one being imprisoned, hanged, garotted and shot, in the future as in the past. Is this really all we can hope for? Surely not:if it were so, it would not be worth being an anarchist. The only thing that nerves people to endure persecution and even martyrdom is the conviction that their ideas will triumph in the end. We shall overcome some day. We must be revolutionaries, not merely rebels: we must only destroy in order to construct something better. That is anarchism as I understand it.

But this is only a minor criticism of Woodcock's book; the future aims of the anarchist movement are not really within his scope. He calls his work a history and we should not expect it to be a manifesto as well. Anarchist propaganda is plentiful and accessible enough already: but there has been no history of anarchism in English for half a century. We must be grateful to George Woodcos for giving us one so scholarly and so sympathetic: show your gratitude, if you have not already done so, by buying this book - it's your's for the price of four pints of beer, and it will stand the test of time far, far better.

The Negro People are on the march. The great American Revolution for freedom and justice NOW has begun and is sweeping the negroes, and the rest of the nation with them, into the greatest social conflict that the power structure, and the whole of American society, has had to face since the days of the great unemployment. We can see now that the action taken by the power structure in the face of that crisis, only postponed it. The impending civil rights bill, which the liberal and reformist Negro leadership is hailing, will neither end the struggle, nor will it end the crisis. FREEDOM CANNOT BE LEGISLATED. The struggle has come out of the hands of the "leaders". The people have come out of the debating halls, and out of the halls of legislature, AND INTO THE STREETS. We must move forward, and hail every step taken in the right direction, towards equal opportunity, but we must face the political realities. A civil rights bill, even if it were more radical, more demanding than the one proposed by the "Democratic" administration, is not going to solve the problem which is facing American, and in a larger sense, human society. The full breadth of the problems which are sending the people into the streets, and their "leaders" into fits of anxiety and fear, will not, and cannot, be solved in the present social contexts within the framework of the existing capitalist society. The ideals, the deepest aspirations, which run through the entire social mass, are not to be realized without the overthrowal of the basic social relationships from which have sprung the inhumanities of War, Poverty, Intolerance, and Oppression.

The movement for civil rights is beginning to see the direct connection between discrimination, and the economic problem of unemployment. The imperialist nature of American capitalism is become more obvious, with the linking up of the revolt of the negro people in the United States, with the uprisings of the colonial people in Africa and Asia. A movement which had at one time merely political IMPLICATIONS, has finally begun to have a political DIRECTION.

(Reprinted from NEW VANGUARD, published by the Revolutionary Opposition Group, New York.)

'We will not wait for the courts to act, for we have been waiting for hundreds of years. We will not wait for the President, the Justice Department, nor Congress, but we will take matters into our own hands and create a source of power outside any national structure that could and would as ure us of victory.'

John Lewis

(Students Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee.)

### APPROACHES TO INDUSTRY Adrian Cunningham

The distinction between economic and political power is fundamental to anarchist and syndicalist thought. In revolutionary terms economic power is decisive; only direct control of the sources of production by the masses can eliminate the take-over by political fictions or degeneration into compromise and, finally, reaction. In terms of a non-revolutionary situation, as in Britain today, the major conflicts of freedom and authority are to be found in the day to day work situation - less dramatic but more fundamental to our society than any issue of war, injustice, persecution, etc., valuable as it is to protest against them. People are compelled to spend the greater portion of their time working; it is the only means of livelihood, it is the most important social relation of our lives.

If there is any hope for a free society, or even a shift of social values in that direction, it must be grounded in industry - in terms of eliminating inhuman work, fighting specific issues in anarchist terms, guaranteeing the finality of the 'revolution', or simply bringing a libertarian tendency into society. Any attempt at general social change that lacks a concept of work as one of its leading features is doomed to be still born.

It is difficult though for students to feel this as a real issue. It is something they have little direct experience of, something they feel unqualified to talk about, or see any way to taking action over. Granted the basic necessity of the work question, what can be done if student anarchism is not to become a spineless, armchair libertarianism, the turning over of things intellectually daring, the occasional waving of flags?

Specifically, now that ANARCHIST STUDENT is expanding to ANARCHIST YOUTH, and with the existing Y.C.N.D, Y.S. groups in university and home towns, there are centres at which this problem is concretely relevant; and there are activist groups, like the Syndicalist Workers' Federation, and Solidarity, that we can support. With the current break-up in the traditional left (and now of the New Left) there is a phase of "regroupment", in which specific problems of anarchist approach and general updating of theory provide legitimate areas for the concern of the intellectual. Also there is the change of values that must be set in motion before anything can be hoped for, fundamental criticizms of the regime to be forcibly made, innumerable fetishes and misconceptions to be destroyed; in university Labour Clubs, etc., anarchists are in contact with, and contributing to the ethos of those who, whether we like it or not, will be the future decision-makers. I would like to note some of the topics that could be usefully handled.

1. The exposure of the social-democratic failure. The way in which socialism has lost its original direction towards a new society of any kind. The aim and strategy of fighting on the work question, and fanning out from that to a general transformation of society, has been prostituted to the pursuit of solely political ends which must work within the present set-up. The Labour Party, with its calls for

higher productivity, increased capital investment, sufficient nationalisation to capture "the co manding heights of the economy" is simply

a reformist capitalist party.

"Lets Go with Labour" - yes, more efficiently and speedily in the same direction. In the Unions we have a reflection in industrial terms of the same outlook. They are an establishment as much as any other, spending more energy on disciplining their own members than on making any real progress. Moderate and paternalist, craft unionism way have once had a point when the crying need was simply to raise the level of wages; but now, by splitting a single work-process into innumerable craft factions, poaching members, making secret agreements to ensure the exclusive organization of certain new factories etc., it not only prevents any feeling of solidarity and effectiveness in making even limited wage advances, but above all, craft organization plays the capitalist game. It accepts the idea of work as simply an acquisitive activity. It takes for granted the stability of existing relationships, and intervenes to adjust incidental disputes on the assumption that their equity is recognised and their permanence desired. This is not a 'betra al' by the leadership. The ideas implicit in present union organization are wrong. The present nature and relations of production are merely accepted, and not viewed against the concept of a functional, creative, responsible activity of social benefit. The distortion of "social purpose into economic mechanism" must be examined, and contrary values asserted - the change from production for profit to production for social needs. Similarly the distinction between work and employment must be formulated and made a point of argument

- 2. This general outlook must inform the conditions of the day to day struggle. The shop stewards movement of the last fifteen years in creating rudimentary forms of basic democracy in policy and organization, and the emphasis on the relationship of work and control as much as on pay is encouraging. While rejecting the dogmas of leadership and the CP notion that workers are only copable of "trade union consciousness" there is no room for illusions. After decades of subjection, the workers are as generally imbued with acquisitive, paternalist ideas as their masters; freedom and responsibility must be fought for and concretely experienced wherever they can, only in the slow development of mass-consciousness is there any hope of a far reaching social change. In this connection previous shop-stewards' movements (e.g. that of 1910-1922); particular forms of direct action and workers' councils must be re-examined; anarcho-syndicalist theory must be brought to bear on quite new problems - there is a desperate need to get beyond the limitations of the general social strike idea as the be-all and end-all. (Some of the most useful work on this is being done in SOLIDARITY - no matter what one hears about argon, or uncertainty as to their aims.) This examination ranges from experiments like the Factory for Peace to the relevance of concepts taken from cybernetics, cf. ANARCHY 31.
- There are many other points of erosion within they system which can be emphasised and extended. The fact that working to rule brings work to a stand-still, i.e. that the economy only runs on the systematic disobedience of managerial rules and depends upon the on-the-spot organization of those involved. Similarly the experience of the gang-system at Coventry, cf. ANARCHY 2 and 3. One point on which pressure could be applied is that of the "collective contract"; a group of workers undertaking a certain task and allocating work, time and wages

as a group. Linked with this, perhaps, the revival of the guild socialist idea (most readily found in Tawney's "Acquisitive Society") of professional organization of industry, both in the possibility of independent co-operative associations, e.g. building, as an extension of shop steward activity. The promotion of creative standards in work; breaking down of the idea that there is some mysterious difference between building schools and teaching in them, between providing food and providing health; the elimination of wage differentials.

4. There is the problem of reconciling short and long term aims. Too often, as Philip Holgate notes, "after winning striking victories in bitter struggles using direct action, the workers have not profited by their experience and extended the class war until final victory, as the syndicalists hoped they would. The bosses and the State have profited far more from their experience and have modified the economic structure of society, so that the conditions in which syndicalism flourished no longer prevail". This again brings up the need for historical examination and rethinking.

All these are points on which the "intellectual" can make a valuable contribution. If university anarchists formed study groups on these or allied topics, the results could make extremely useful articles in future issues of ANARCHIST YOUTH. Support can be given to specific groups and issues, the recent building workers strike for example - simply making the facts known. But most relevant for us, as students, is to work within the university left, to expose the phoniness of the whole system within which the Labour Novement functions to keep things ticking over; to demonstrate that current socialist policy and organization is quite incapable of going beyond managerial efficiency to any form of responsible and human social purpose in work.

### Incitement!

Big fat arse-up pigeon
On my window-sill
Grey-felt fatso
With your twidgy ND feet.
Chunter, bumble, cushy-doo,
With your red eyes look.
Fluster, floppit, off you flap:
Crap
On Henry Brooke

# An Argument for Nonviolence

I'd like
To kick
The State
But it's got iron balls.

SPAIN	AND THE	ANARCHIST	MOVEMENT	IN	BRITAIN
		. Wynford	Hicks		

In Britain we protest when George Clark gets 18 months for 'incitement': in Spain last year two young men were sentenced to 11 years prison for publishing and distributing the underground paper Juventud Libre. It is not only the planting of bombs and attempts on Franco's life which are treated with brutality: political activity in any form is savagely repressed. In the Asturias last year miners were jailed and exiled from their homes for striking. And this summer, while British trade unionists were basking in the Costa Brava sun, between twenty and fifty Spanish miners were arrested for subversive activities - for organising strike action. Nor is the fascist terror restricted to Spain: the French Govennment, which has already several times suppressed Spanish anarchist newspapers printed in France, recently arrested 50 anarchists (the majority Spanish);17 of these are in custody awaiting trial, charged with 'associating with malefactors'.

It is obvious that for anarchists of any country the Spanish situation is urgent: the struggle of the Spanish people is our struggle. The difficulty lies, not in recognising that we must assist the fight against Franco, but in choosing our strategy and our weapons. Since we are part of an international movement we are concerned, not only with our actions, but with those of our Spanish comrades.

When the Council for Iberian Liberation plants bombs and organises attempts on Franco's life they accept responsibility for their actions. BUT IT IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY ALSO. We are concerned not that the name anarchist should be free from shame but that the ends for which we struggle should be achieved. And if we are convinced that violent methods are a strategic mistake we cannot remain silent. The question of violence is discussed elsewhere in this issue but it is relevant to point out: 1, that if you condemn fascist methods you should not use them; 2, that if Franco is assassinated fascism may be strengthened rather than weakened; 3, that those who play about with bombs are responsible for any accidents which occur - as has continually been argued on the subject of nuclear weapons and; 4, that so-called 'propaganda' bombs are bloody bad propaganda.

How long is it going to take the anarchist movement to learn that there is such a thing as bad publicity and that to make large numbers of people aware of the existence of anarchists is not necessarily to advance the cause for which they stand? Delgado and Granados died for freedom: they were heroes but were they right? Yet here - as with the activities of those who are fighting tyranny in South Africa - we are hardly in a position to criticise: how can we instruct those who are liable to brutal prison sentences, torture and the garotte?

We cannot blame those who use violence: nonviolence is difficult enough to maintain when we are faced with the comparatively mild behaviour of the

British police. We are not human if we are not angered by brutality and oppression; but our anger must be controlled if we are not to repeat the crimes of our opponents. I think that if we are convinced that only non-violence can attain a free society we must say so, but without moral right-eousness and bitterness.

At present, however, we are not likely to be listened to: who the hell listens to the armchair critic? There is, nevertheless, plenty to do. For example, the MLE (the Spanish Libertarian movement) has called for a campaign against Spanish tourism. Not only would this campaign attempt to put pressure on the Spanish Government but it is also a valuable way of drawing attention to the bestial nature of the Spanish regime. The argument for a boycott is not that it is morally wrong to visit Spain, but that we should concentrate on one form of protest - this being the one which our Spanish comrades have asked for. As with South African goods our boycott is only effective (in drawing attention to and weakening the regime) as a social action. The individual salves his conscience: the group aims at social change. If boycotts are opposed on the grounds that they may be detrimental to the workers' interests, as they are to those of their rulers then strikes are to be opposed for the same reason.

Although the tourist trade plays an important role in the Spanish economy even a successful boycott would not smash the Spanish State: only the Spanish people can do that. Last year the industrial working class surprised those who thought they were cowed: this year the miners of the Asturias have again come out on strike and, according to Le Monde (September 16), there is 'social unrest' in the South, in the mines of Rio Tinto and Puertollano. In the words of Le Monde's special correspondent;" The industrial problem is for the moment the most serious the regime has to face. The working class has sufficiently realised its strength to challenge the present structure of union organisation".

For once we can hope that the Spanish Communist Party is right when it declares that the Asturain miners' strike "is the herald of the general political strike which the masses are beginning to regard as the best means to accelerate the downfall of the dictatorship". Apart from publicising social and economic conditions in Spain, campaigning for a tourist boycott, and sending aid to strikers we can best assist the Spanish people by increasing the struggle against the ruling class in our own country: ABAJO LAS DICTADURAS! VIVA LA LIBERTAB!

## ... EDITORS' NOTE ...

Please send all contributions, etc., for our Special Xmas number to ANARCHIST YOUTH at 148, Fellows Road, London, N.W.3., by not later than November 22. Unlike many of our contemporaries we have not yet asked for money. If we manage to sell the 750 copies of this issue we shall still make a loss: donations will be gratefully received

FROM THE YOUTH PAPERS
....September.....

Young Guard: "Young Socialists should demand the destruction of MI5 with all its files and anti-left subterfuge. Bring the police more under public control....."

Keep Left: "In Spain socialists and communists are garotted ...."

Challenge: "There is every possibility that the peace movement throughout the world can be developed to an unprecedented extent on the basis of the policy of the Soviet Union...when people are defending an untemable political standpoint they get themselves involved in absurdities and lies".

LETTERS TO THE ADULT PAPERS
.....September.....

Sunday Mirror: "Citizen '63 promised so much, but the subject of the last programme, a drinking, smoking, teenaged advocate of free love did not seem a worthy spokesman for modern youth. She told us that she was a rebel and associated with anarchists - that certainly does'nt sound typical" - Mrs L.A. Swash - Bournemouth

Freedom: "You pacifists, with your "sit down or pay up" crap, and your "no violence please", are a pain in the neck, don't you ever read a history book?.... perhaps you should try to learn something from Castro and Mao Tse-Tung" - Peter Neville - Birmingham.

SYNDICALIST WORKERS' FEDERATION

National Conference im London...
London, Sunday, November 10....

for further details -

write c/o Christopher, 34 Cumberland Rd London E.17