

Who Controls the Army?

The Military Puts the Boot in

LEICESTER PROJECT, a libertarian action group, staged a demonstration in Lewis's, the biggest department store in the city, on Saturday. Lewis's had lent the majority of their third floor to the Army Recruitment Office's 'Army '67' exhibition and after a morning of leafletting—which incidentally is prohibited by an 1868 by-law in Leicester—members of the group staged what was originally intended to be a happening. Half a dozen people dressed in bandages, covered in mock blood, descended upon the entrance carrying placards and a banner proclaiming themselves as 'Victims of War'.

There was a tremendous queue to enter the exhibition so, while the others began to prepare to picket the entrance, one member of the group entered by the exit and began speaking to those inside from a bridge across a remarkably clear stream in the exhibition's simulated tropical jungle. Immediately a young soldier sitting in a nearby bush telephoned outside and four hefty young recruits appeared and proceeded to eject the now limp demonstrator.

As soon as he was deposited at the doorway, the picket arrived and began informing the queue of the horrific 'glories' of militarism that the exhibition had ignored. Gradually a dialogue began between the group and the soldiers present, which unfortunately degenerated into a useless exchange of insults. Without orders to the contrary, the soldiers were nevertheless willing to talk; yet now their commanding officer appeared and ordered his charges to 'get rid of them'.

The demonstrators offered no resistance—they sat down—at which the 15 or 16 troops began kicking, punching and karate chopping their opponents. Still, however, they did not move. A large crowd gathered and several people fainted as the demonstrators were first kicked, then thrown down the stairs. I was kicked extremely hard in the testicles, kidneys and ribs. While I was limp my fingers were bent back and sprained by one volunteer. Another member of the group, punched in the face, spurted blood over the floor from his nose. This hardly seemed to check Her Majesty's Forces though, for they ran to the landing where we were lying injured and threw us down the next flight as well.

By this time almost all of those in the queue had left it, traumatically alienated from the young warriors. The store manager was surprisingly sympathetic to us and when questioned about the behaviour of the troops said, 'I'll see about them'. Most of the comment we heard from the spectators was also favourable, as was their reaction to our leaflet.

PETER GIBBON.

ANARCHY 73

ON SALE NEXT WEEK

DISCUSSES

SCHOOLS

ANARCHY is Published by FREEDOM PRESS at 2s, on first Saturday of every month

This is the Leaflet

You are entering Lewis's department store, Humberstone Gate, Leicester. On the third floor you will find an exhibition being held by the Army Careers Office. This exhibition is an attempt to illustrate the 'glory' of war, yet makes no mention of war's effects. There is nothing in this exhibition showing the agony of individual death, the horror of mass destruction, of the plague, disease and famine which follow war. The Army teaches mutilation, butchery and professional murder as a career, as a virtue. No glory will be found in the Army. There can be no pride in dying for the balance of power or for the domination of your country. The Army's only product is extermination, brutality and death. Ultimately, your death, or your children's.

Printed and Published

by

Leicester Project, c/o 13 Severn Street, Leicester.

WHAT IS CHINA UP TO?

TWO OR THREE years ago Max Patrick gave a talk to one of the London Anarchist Group's Sunday night meetings in which he stated his belief that the Pekin-engineered Sino-Indian border dispute was a military testing and that China's main territorial ambition is the re-conquest of those parts of Central and Eastern Asia, traditionally Chinese, but taken over by 19th-century Czarist imperialism and inherited by the Soviet Union. In other words, Max predicted war between Russia and China. I thought this rather far-fetched at the time (it was before the Sino-Soviet split had become the gaping breach it now is) but I now think that Max's prophecy may well turn out to be correct.

Let us try to ascertain the real ends of Chinese policy. For a start we can discount the official Western propaganda line. There is a tendency in the West, currently being fanned by right-wing politicians, to regard the Chinese as the 'yellow peril', the 650 million Asian barbarians only waiting their chance to pour across their borders and ravage the world. The Hunnish and Mongol conquests of the fifth and thirteenth centuries are usually cited as terrible examples of Chinese aspirations, a view which conveniently forgets that the Huns and Mongols came from Central Asia and that China suffered as much at their hands as other countries. The Great Wall of China was specifically built to keep the Huns out.

The reason for the suspicion and fear of China which has been built up in the West has nothing to do with real Chinese history or policy. It is, rather, a great cover-up for the aspirations of an imperialist power whose aims make those of China seem insignificant by comparison—namely the United States. To keep its economy on even keel, America needs foreign markets and a huge armaments expenditure programme. Being a country whose inhabitants fondly imagine (for the most part) that their rulers are inspired by ideals of freedom and democracy, it cannot admit that its foreign and economic policy are motivated by such worldly ends. Hence the

AT A TIME when anarchist propaganda is practically dormant in the country one is grateful to the Government, the Army and the Police for expounding, however unwittingly, the case for anarchism. Every time a stupid magistrate sends an expectant mother to jail for a technical offence the ordinary citizen will say: How dare they do this?

The recent case of Mr. Leslie Parkes and his arrest and subsequent release has also opened the eyes of many citizens to the nature of oligarchical rule and the collusion that exists between the Army and the Police.

Here is the story of a man who, having served his time in the Army and proved that he was a civilian in front of a magistrate, was lured to a police station seven months later and was promptly handed over to the military. This is how Mr. Parkes described the incident:

'The Stoke Police picked me up after saying that a van belonging to the firm for which I drive had been involved in a hit and run accident. They asked me to go to the station so that my van could be checked. I went down with a friend and the Police kept us there for an hour. No questions were asked about the so-called accident. Then the military police arrived. . . . The manner by which the Police lured Mr. Parkes to the station was later described by the Chief Constable of Stoke, Mr. William Watson, as 'untrue, unrehearsed and unnecessary'. But that the Police use such methods of lying and deceit is well known to political demonstrators. Now a large public also knows this. There is no doubt

now in the public's mind that there was collusion between the Army and the Police, who worked in this despicable case 'hand in glove'.

Mr. Parkes was then taken to the Royal Army Ordnance base at Blackdown, near Aldershot, where he was kept, handcuffed to a military policeman, in a windowless, corrugated-iron guardroom cell.

Mr. Jack Ashley, Labour MP for Stoke on Trent, saw Parkes and subsequently accused the Police of 'tricking Parkes going to a police station and acting like a twentieth century press gang'.

When this matter was raised in Parliament, Ministers had to take into account the public outcry in this matter and Parkes's release was ordered in a matter of days.

The fact that the Government acted so quickly is not because they wished to usher in a libertarian millennium but because they wished to assert their authority over the undue independence of the Army and the Police. Mr. Denis Healey was therefore grilled for 18 minutes in the House by MPs who represent Army and Police interests. What seemed to trouble these MPs was that a 'commanding officer's decision had been overruled by the Executive'.

In fact the point is made by the *Daily Telegraph's* editorial writer that until the commanding officer declared that Leslie Parkes was not a soldier but a civilian, *he was a soldier*. That means that the *Daily Telegraph* supports the view that the magistrates court's decision that Parkes was a civilian 'has been disposed of'. In other words only the

Army is entitled to say who is a soldier and who is not.

The 'morale' of the Army is of course very important to the civil authorities. The Army is allowed a great amount of independence in its affairs in the hope that when it is needed by the Executive it can be relied upon. That the Army cannot be relied on at all times (they would have rebelled if they were asked to crush Ian Smith) the politicians know only too well. But in peace time the civilian population must also be handled with care.

A crisis is created when the civilian population realises that the Army and Police are mere excrescences whose main function is to keep in check and, on occasions like in the Parkes case, terrorise the very public that pays for their upkeep.

When the public realises this, it has come near the anarchist position. It was good to read in *Peace News* that the Parkes case has completely justified their suspicions of the Establishment and confirmed their belief in pacific/anarchism. If nothing else has come out of our association with the peace movement, this is of considerable consolation that one of the most responsible newspapers in the country is taking the anarchist case seriously. We believe that many more people would agree with us if only we bothered to put our case across. The lesson that should be learnt from this case is that the Government, the Army and the Police are equally 'untrue, unrehearsed and unnecessary'.

R.

ing China makes sense. Various interpretations of it are put forward in the West. The first sees it simply as a power struggle—this is correct if meaning a power struggle between those Chinese leaders who believe in consolidating what China already has rather than embarking on expansionism. A second interpretation sees it as an attempt by the ageing Mao to ensure that the revolutionary spirit he largely created is carried on after his death by the Red Guards in spite of the technocrats who are more interested in building China's economy. A third interpretation, put forward by Guy Sears in a recent *Observer* dispatch and based on an article in *Red Flag*, the CPC's theoretical journal, sees Mao as deliberately wrecking the whole structure of Chinese government in order to turn China into a stateless society. Mao, fearful lest the Chinese state should not 'wither away' before his death, 'selflessly' sabotages it in order to fulfil, in a roundabout way, Marx's prediction. It is unfortunate for this idiotic theory that

Continued on page 2

BOLTON ANARCHISTS JAILED

THREE YOUNG ANARCHISTS were remanded in custody at Bolton, last month, following fires at an Army Information Office and a church. All three, Adrian Jeffrey, Les Smith and Ken Heap, were charged with maliciously setting fire to Bolton's Army Information Office and are due to appear before the Manchester Crown Court this month.

It was alleged that one of the lads had said, on being charged, that 'I did it as an act against the State, not as an act of vandalism.' Bail was opposed by the police, 'in view of the gravity of the offences'.

The lads were then remanded in custody for one week. That was a month ago and, up to now, they are still being held by the police. Anarchists in Manchester are anxiously watching the situation, and will lend assistance as soon as this becomes possible.

Could readers who live near or around Bolton make enquiries on our behalf as to what is happening to our comrades.

EDITORS.

THE 'CULTURAL' REVOLUTION

Seen in this light, the Great 'Proletarian' 'Cultural' Revolution now sweep-

Alienation

THE WORD 'alienation' has, over the last few years, become increasingly fashionable. It appears in books and articles by Freudian and Marxist revisionists, sociologists and existentialist philosophers. It is applied to all aspects of human culture. Its meaning has become more and more imprecise. Surprisingly, however, the subject has been both brought out into the open and, to a large degree, brought down to earth in Hungary.

For the first time, a completely scientific and empirical study was reported in the November, 1965, issue of the literary monthly *Kortárs* about alienation among Hungarian workers under 'socialism'. Until fairly recently, the concept of alienation was confined to philosophical circles; but lately a few American sociologists began bringing the concept closer to the realities of working-class life. They began examining the actual conditions and attitudes of modern industrial society. During the last couple of years the pattern in Hungary has followed the American. (The discussion in Poland, with the recent publication of a book by Professor Adam Schaff, still seems to be in an early stage.)

In Hungary, three distinct views have emerged: one, that there can be no alienation under 'socialism' (actually bureaucratic State Capitalism); two, that the presence of alienation within 'socialism' is only a remnant of the past and, three, that in fact 'socialism' creates new forms of alienation. The latter was the majority view of the participants of a one-day conference of Hungarian philosophers.

Obviously, then, alienation—in spite of its fashionableness among existentialists, neo-Freudians, Marxist-revisionists and the like—is well worth our consideration if we are going to try and understand just a few of the problems of modern industrial capitalism and 'socialism'.

What does 'alienation' mean? What are its origins?

In a lengthy article in *New Society* (27.2.64), Norman MacKenzie discusses various aspects of alienation in considerable detail. 'Strictly speaking,' he says, 'alienation means estrangement; to alienate means to transfer something to the ownership of another.' Alienation means 'loss'. And, continues MacKenzie: 'Whether I use the concept to examine the relationship between a worker and his employer (economic), a man and his Party (political), a man and other men (psychological), or a man and his god (religious), I am, it is argued, analyzing essentially the same phenomenon—the way in which individuals lose some part of their human identity to objects outside of themselves. This process, it is said, is not unique to our age, but it has become peculiarly acute in mass industrial societies, accounting for much of our present discontents, denying modern man the full use of his human capacities and the ability to enjoy life.' Philosophically, he argues, the question of alienation presented itself as the separation of subject and object; the distinction between the 'I' (ego), which seeks to control its own fate, and the 'me' which is moulded by and meaningful only in relation to others.

In this discussion, however, I shall concern myself primarily with the concept of alienation as used by the early Marx (and the modern Hungarians), Marcuse and Erich Fromm. Although both psychological and philosophical, their approach is more down-to-earth than that of many psychologists and existentialists.

Originally, the word alienation was used to denote an insane person; but in the last century, first Hegel and then the young Marx referred to alienation not as insanity, but as a form of 'self-estrangement'. Marx claimed to have brought Hegel 'down to earth', by locating alienation in the labour process. These arguments he first formulated in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* in 1844, and then, with Engels, in *The German Ideology* in 1846.

Hegel, in Marx's view, understood that Man creates himself in a historical process, of which the motive force is human labour or the practical activity of men living in society. But in Marx's opinion, Hegel only conceived labour as the activity of pure spirit. For him, the historical process was a movement of abstract categories, of which individuals were merely playthings. Moreover, in opposition to Hegel's deification of the State, Marx regarded it as a transitional, external power dominating society. As a form of alienation.

In his 1844 Manuscripts, Marx claimed that private property is the product, the necessary result, of alienated labour, of the external relation of the worker to Nature and to himself. This alienation shows itself in the process of production. The more the worker expends himself in work, says Marx in a well-known passage, the more powerful becomes the world of objects which he creates in face of himself, and the poorer he himself becomes in his inner life, the less he becomes to himself. The worker puts his life into the object, and his life then belongs no longer to him but to the object. The greater his activity, therefore, the less he possesses. What is embodied in the product of his labour is no longer his. The greater this product is, therefore, the more he himself is

'DIVISION OF LABOUR'

Very early on in primitive communist society there arose what economists term 'the division of labour' or division of tasks. This first arose as a division based on sex. Later, this division developed with the break-up of the family and tribal group, with '... the separation of society into individual families opposed to one another...' and '... given simultaneously the distribution, and indeed the unequal distribution (both quantitatively and qualitatively), of labour and its products, hence property...' This division of labour, says Marx, implies a contradiction between the interest of the separate individual and the communal interest of all individuals. It is the genesis of domination of Man over Man and alienation—estrangement.

This 'division of labour', however, this alienation, 'this crystallization of social activity, this consolidation of what we ourselves produce into an objective power above us, growing out of our control, thwarting our expectations, bringing naught to our calculations, is one of the chief factors in historical development up to now,' says Marx. This 'estrangement' can, in Marx's view, only be abolished so long as it has become an 'intolerable' power over men. But it must have rendered the vast mass of humanity propertyless and, at the same time, given rise to conditions—on a world scale—wherein wealth can be produced in abundance in order to supply all human needs and wants. Such



diminished. The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labour becomes an object, but that it exists outside of him, independently, and alien to him; and that it stands opposed to him as an autonomous power, on its own existence. The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force.

'A direct consequence of the alienation of Man from the product of his labour, from his life activity, is that Man is alienated from other men. When Man confronts himself he confronts other men. What is true of Man's relationship to his work and to himself, is also true of his relationship to other men, to their labour and to the objects of their labour.'

Marx then mentions a concept—'domination'—which Marcuse takes up, and further develops, over a hundred years later. In another well-known passage from the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, Marx asserts that (within property society) '... all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers; they mutilate the labourer into a fragment of a man, degrade him to the level of an appendage of a machine, destroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated lot; they estrange from him the intellectual potentialities of the labour process...' A view also emphasised by William Morris in his *Useful Work Versus Useless Toil and Art and Socialism*, and touched upon very briefly by Oscar Wilde in the earlier paragraphs of his *Soul Of Man Under Socialism*.

In *The German Ideology*, Marx develops his ideas on alienation, and in his notes on *Pre-capitalist Economic Formations* where he discusses both alienation and domination.

were the views of the young Marx on alienation.

As he grew older, Marx no longer used such terms as 'alienation', 'estrangement', 'self-estrangement' or 'domination'—except in a very brief passage in his notes on pre-capitalist formations. In his latter writings, say some of his more libertarian apologists, he took the moral and philosophical ideas and ideals, acquired in his youth, more or less for granted. As he grew older, however, he became increasingly authoritarian and intolerant; as have most of his alleged followers of the traditional 'left-wing' parties. All the same, we should not belittle his efforts in attempting to bring Hegel 'down to earth' by locating alienation in the labour process.

Marx influenced William Morris. How much so is a matter of debate. He was also influenced by anarchism as well. All the same, a great deal of Morris' writings are a condemnation of alienation and domination (even if he did not popularise the words) and a demand for a free, non-alienated society. I do not, however, intend to discuss Morris' contributions to socialist or anarchist thought here, but instead mention first Erich Fromm and then Herbert Marcuse, both of whom have re-discovered—and developed—the concept of alienation in more recent times. Both have, in fact, deliberately gone out of their way to discuss alienation—and to popularise the word itself. Their, and no doubt others', efforts seem to be bearing fruit in the most unlikely places!

Writing in 1942, Fromm discusses in great detail the evolution of modern industrial society, its emergence from Feudalism, the character structure of the men that brought it about—and those who have been nurtured and conditioned by it—in *The Fear Of Freedom*.

Although Man has reached a remark-

able degree of mastery over Nature, argues Fromm, society as a whole is not in control of those very forces it has created. The rationality of the system of production in its technical aspects is accompanied by the irrationality of our system in its social aspects. Man has built his world. 'But he has become estranged from the product of his own hands, he is not really the master any more of the world he has built; on the contrary, this man-made world has become his master, before whom he bows down, whom he tries to placate or manipulate as best he can. The work of his own hands has become his god. He seems to be driven by self-interest, but in reality his total Self with all its concrete potentialities has become an instrument for the purposes of the very machine his hands have built. He keeps up the illusion of being the centre of the world, and yet he is pervaded by an intense sense of insignificance and powerlessness which his ancestors once consciously felt towards God.'

In Fromm's view, modern man's feeling of isolation and powerlessness is increased still further by the character which all human relationships today have assumed. 'The concrete relationship of one individual to another,' he continues, 'has lost its direct and human character and has assumed a spirit of manipulation and instrumentality. In all social and personal relations the laws of the market are the rule. It is obvious that the relationship between competitors has to be based on mutual human indifference.' This also affects the relationship between employer and employee. In fact, the word 'employer' itself betrays the whole story! 'The owner of the means of production, of capital, employs a human being in exactly the same way as he 'employs' a machine. He buys a factory, raw materials and human labour-power—and then puts them all to work. The worker is purely a means to an end. The relationship between a businessman and his customer is very much the same. Moreover, the attitude towards work in modern industrial society has the same quality of what Fromm terms 'instrumentality'. In contrast to the medieval artisan, the modern capitalist manufacturer is not primarily interested in what he—or more correctly, his workers—produces. '... he produces essentially in order to make a profit from his capital investment, and what he produces depends essentially on the market which promises that the investment of capital in a certain branch will prove to be profitable.'

INITIATIVE RESTRICTED

This buyer-seller relationship affects not only economic activities, but all the relationships between men. All social relationships have this character of alienation. They, in fact, assume the character of relations between things.

It is Fromm's case, however, that the most devastating instance of this alienation, this 'spirit of instrumentality', is the individual's relationship to his own Self, his whole being. It may appear that men sell commodities, that the labourer sells his 'physical energy'. But this is not all. He really sells himself; his image, his personality. 'This personality should be pleasing, but besides that its possessor should meet a number of requirements: he should have energy, initiative, this, that, or the other, as his particular position may require.' For, as with any other commodity, it is the market which decides the value of these human qualities and attributes.

The development of Big Business, of what both Fromm and the orthodox Marxist-communists call the 'monopolistic phase of capitalism', has tended to weaken the individual Self, or what Wilde terms 'Individualism'. Says Fromm: 'The individual's feeling of powerlessness and aloneness has increased... his possibilities for individual economic achievement have narrowed down.' The concentration and centralization of capital has restricted the possibilities for individual initiative, courage and responsibility. Today, both in the so-called private enterprise West and in the spurious 'socialist' East, an enormous, though secret, power over the whole of society is exercised by relatively small groups. It makes very little difference whether the country is 'democratic' or 'totalitarian'. This, naturally, weighs most heavily on the worker.

In the old days, at least, the worker knew who the boss was; he often knew him personally. Despite inequalities and unequal social status, there was a 'face-to-face' relationship between employee and employer. Today, the worker in an office, factory or plant which employs thousands is in a completely different position. The boss has now become an abstract figure, the 'management', an anonymous power, or a government bureaucrat. The individual worker has become insignificant and even more alienated than he was in Marx's day. In Fromm's view, this situation

THE YOUNG MARX ON ALIENATION

In what does this alienation of labour consist? First, that the work is external to the worker, that it is not a part of his nature, that consequently he does not fulfil himself in his work but denies himself, has a feeling of misery, not of well-being, does not develop freely a physical and mental energy, but is physically exhausted and mentally debased. The worker therefore feels himself at home only during his leisure, whereas at work he feels homeless. His work is not voluntary but imposed, forced labour. It is not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs. Its alien character is clearly shown by the fact that as soon as there is no physical or other compulsion it is avoided like the plague. Finally, the alienated character of work for the worker appears in the fact that it is not his work but work for someone else, that in work he does not belong to himself but to another person.

Just as in religion the spontaneous activity of human fantasy, of the human brain and heart, reacts independently, that is, as an alien activity of gods or devils, upon the individual, so the activity of the worker is not his spontaneous activity. It is another's activity, and a loss of his own spontaneity.

—From Marx's *Economic and Political Manuscripts* (1844).

has been partly balanced by Trade Union activity. The Unions, he feels, have helped to improve the worker's economic position, and have also given him a feeling of collective strength. But he is forced to admit, however, that many Unions have also grown large and often bureaucratic, like industry. There is very little democracy or room for individual initiative in many of them. Of the member, he says: 'He pays his dues and votes from time to time, but here again he is a small cog in a large machine.' This trend has accelerated enormously since Fromm wrote *Fear Of Freedom*. In a very interesting chapter on Trade Union bureaucracy in *T. Cliff and C. Barker's Incomes Policy, Legislation And Shop Stewards* (published in May), they rightly observe that '... the Trade Union bureaucracy, rising above the rank-and-file membership of the Unions, and feeling that it belongs to a group with a higher social status, hardly ever thinks of going back to the rank-and-file. To this degree it is alienated from those it supposedly represents.' In fact, most Trade Union leaders are not concerned with the problems of alienation (in any form). Why should they be anyway? They no longer work in a factory or car assembly plant!

AN ECONOMIC ATOM

In 1956, in *The Sane Society* (a less satisfactory book, in some respects, than *Fear Of Freedom*), Erich Fromm returns to the problem of alienation in modern industrial society. He does this, he says, because the concept alienation seems to him to touch upon the deepest level of modern personality; and because it is the most appropriate if one is concerned with the interaction between the contemporary socio-economic structure and the character-structure of the individual in our society.

'Alienation in 1956, in modern society, has become almost total. It pervades the relationship of Man to his work, to the things that he consumes, that he does, to the State, to his fellow man, and, above all, to himself. Man has created a world of man-made things as it has never existed before. He has built a complicated social machine to administer the technical machine that he has constructed and developed. And yet this whole creation stands above him. He now confronts himself with his own forces embodied in things he has created, alienated from himself. He has lost the ownership of his Self, of himself.'

What has happened to the worker? asks Fromm.

He has become an economic atom that dances to the tune of atomistic management. Fromm quotes J. J. Gillespie as saying that 'Work is becoming more repetitive and thoughtless as the planners, the micromotionists, and the scientific managers further strip the worker of his right to think and move freely. Life is being denied; need to control, creativeness, curiosity, and independent thought are being balked, and the result, the inevitable result, is flight or fight on the part of the worker, apathy or destructiveness, "psychic regression".'

Continued on page 6

AT WHOSE EXPENSE?

SOON after I started this series, I was reproached by a fellow syndicalist for allegedly having written off the working-class as a revolutionary instrument—this was because I said that it may well be that the working-class, certainly the white working-class, is no longer the most exploited stratum within our society. Homeless, gypsies, old age pensioners, prisoners. . . .

Two days later, in another journal, I read an article by a comrade who should know better, who took exception to the fact that I had said that many people earn livings at the expense of their fellow workers; on a misconception of which he then proceeded to build a farrago of nonsense which allegedly represented my views. It ought not to be necessary to prove either point since in both cases evidence lay in the article.

To the first, I started by instancing the police, whom he immediately said were not workers; but had I asked to define workers, he would have said all who are employed and work by hand or by brain for a boss. He said, after I had continued with prison officers, soldiers, munitions workers and others, that of course one must make up one's mind as to whom one considers workers, those who do not do anything useful or do harm being excluded. But if the definition of a worker is purely the subjective views of the anarchist movement, then quite frankly it bears no relationship to the traditional view of anarcho-syndicalists, and the term might well be better dropped.

Police, soldiers and so forth are, in point of fact, workers who earn their living at the expense of other workers; so too are those who advertize shoddy goods knowing them to be shoddy; those salesmen who talk people they know cannot afford goods into buying these, and so forth; those people who work for stockbrokers to play the market (indeed the stockbroker may well be employed); those who do the spying out that precedes take-over bids — often throwing other workers out of work.

The NAB official who refuses money to a hungry family is as much a worker as the kinder one who might give it (though, since he has a senior breathing down his neck, he may not), as are those who maintain the hostels for the homeless with King Hill-type conditions, and very often quite liberal-minded ones at that.

It is no condemnation of them personally to say they are caught up in the system, it is impossible not to be. I work now in a bookshop—though not for a fat salary by any definition. In all sorts of instances I see that the normal trade rooks the customer, and that my pay is therefore at the expense of others. Before this I worked at OXFAM, a less obnoxious way of earning one's crust than most, but since many of the policies of the top executives cut down possible efficiency for the sake of respectability, and since the radicals who resist this have to make compromises, to continue doing so even here one did things one knew were less efficient than they might be and therefore from OXFAM at the

expense of one's fellow man.

Years ago there was a song about the man, the dreadful man, who watered the workers beer, no doubt a capitalist took the decision, but a worker no doubt did it or helped. Now perhaps this is peripheral, but adulteration is a commonplace, and many are employed in more positively harmful tasks. Cigarette workers understandably object to the publication of the full facts of the relationship between smoking and lung cancer, they continue to work at the expense of their fellow workers' health. Car workers favour the closing of public transport and the proliferation of more cars and more giant roads, destroying the food-producing fields of the country-side, they work at the expense of their fellows' lives.

One cannot say this is their fault, but one must take cognizance of this fact and realize that in agitating for a changed society there are now enormous numbers of working-class vested interests in the preservation of the existing system.

The Revolutionary Left during the war assumed that Capitalism would be so exhausted from the war, would have so boosted production during the war beyond peacetime needs, and would have shown its defects to such an extent, that the war would be followed by fundamental worldwide social change. When all that did in fact follow, the war was an extension of Stalinist-tyranny into Europe and East Asia, and of social-democrat treachery in the West; many were immediately disillusioned, others

assumed that this was merely an interim stage and that the pseudo-socialists would soon dig their own grave, playing on the historical scene the same role as Kerensky.

This failed, and yet others were to leave the movement in disillusion, particularly since this was a period in which more facts became known of Stalinist concentration camps than had ever previously been known, particularly since the social-reformists were even more timid than they had been expected to be. It was at this time when revolutionaries first, in any numbers, began to look at the implications of such analysis of the new class society as those of Simone Weil, Bruno Rizzi, Ure; this was the time of Orwell's 1984, and of Macdonald's *The Root is Man*.

Many of those who did stay and were then to be found round the anarchist movement (and I confess I was one) were then prepared to be dogmatic that the Stalinist and Fascist regimes had been so able to condition their slaves that it was impossible to consider revolution as being again a viable concept in those countries. It was obvious that the whole tendency of state reformism was to mirror this in the West and, though undoubtedly we had not yet this degree of despotism, and undoubtedly there were in the West remnants of an older and less efficient (therefore less oppressive) class system, we nevertheless for the most part believed that the position would soon be the same.

For these there was still, no doubt, reason to fight the state but the fight was defensive; we might quote Macdonald who, whereas Trotsky said that if there was a new ruling class one had to accept socialism had ended as an Utopia and confine oneself to minimal defensive demands, argued instead that no doubt we had ended as an Utopia—'so, what

was wrong with Utopia?—it was time to take another look at the ideas of the Utopians'. But those who were as optimistic as Macdonald in the first place were apt not to last the course and to slide over into liberalism. The rest of us, however much we may have scorned this—as all other theories of Trotsky's—were in fact not so far removed therefrom.

Hungary changed this. There had, of course, been East Berlin, there had been Vorkuta, there was in the West Montgomery; but it was Hungary that once again put revolution back on the map.

No doubt there are still those who would wish to cut the revolutionary perspectives out of anarchism; the Permanent (lack of) Protest-ers 'ye have always with you'; but their view is as it was in the early days of the anarchist movement, just pessimist belief that revolutionaries are inevitably captured by new elites (in so far as certain revolutionary techniques are not themselves egalitarian these do indeed promote new ruling classes); such preserves of the pessimist are by no means the same as Dwight Macdonald's carefully reasoned theories argued from novel factors observed in world-wide social developments.

Since Hungary we have seen in this country a remarkable upsurge of political militancy—whereas a writer in *FREEDOM* in 1956 could say students are, of course, not noted for their radicalism, no one would say this now. The anarchist movement now numbers more groups than it used to number members, and if any say that not all the groups are active, the reply is you should have seen the members. On the Bomb, on Apartheid, on the Homeless, on Land for the Gypsies, people have come to use DA and to popularize essentially anarchist means of struggle far outside the anarchist movement. L.O.



ALIENATION

Continued from page 5

Fromm then discusses alienation in relation to the manager. The manager, very much like the worker, deals with impersonal giants. And here Fromm introduces an important aspect of alienation in modern, 'mature' capitalism. That of *bureaucratization*. Both Big Business and government administration, he observes, are conducted by bureaucracy—by bureaucrats. (Trade Union bureaucracy has already been mentioned.) 'Bureaucrats,' he continues, 'are specialists in the administration of things and of men.' Moreover, due to the bigness and centralization of the apparatus to be administered, the bureaucrats' relationship to people is one of complete alienation. Relationships are completely—or almost completely—impersonal. This is not due to some inherent wickedness of the bureaucrats. It is a symptom of the ineluctable development, and evolution, of capitalist society. 'Since the vastness of the organization and the extreme division of labour prevents any single individual from seeing the whole, since there is no organic, spontaneous co-operation between various individuals or groups within industry, the managing bureaucrats are necessary; without them the enterprise would collapse in a short time, since nobody would know the secret which makes it function.' In countries such as America or Britain, bureaucracy, although increasing all the time, is as yet not absolute. In Soviet Russia it is. And so has it been in Poland and Hungary. Absolute bureaucracy means absolute alienation.

Before leaving the concept of alienation in our society, Fromm touches upon the process of consumption. For consumption under industrial capitalism is as alienated as the productive process. In our society, unlike in previous ones, we acquire almost everything that we require for our sustenance through the medium of money. And, as Fromm points out, money means labour in abstract form. If a person has sufficient money, he can purchase anything he requires—whether he has worked for that money or not. In his view, the truly human way of acquiring a thing would be

through individual effort qualitatively commensurate with what a person needs.

What do we do with things after we have purchased them? Do we, in fact, even need much of what we have acquired?

Quite often we acquire things in order to just have them, to possess them, to own them, because it is 'the thing' status-wise. Society has conditioned us to 'want' a new car, TV, washing machine, suite of furniture, every year or so, not because the new is necessarily better than the one we already have (it usually isn't!), but because we are pressurised to demand it. Indeed, modern industrial capitalism is so organised that it would 'collapse' if we did not behave thus. As Vance Packard has so ably demonstrated in his *Waste Makers* and *Hidden Persuaders*, we are now slaves of the Admen.

Today, then, we consume as we produce, without any concrete relatedness to the objects with which we deal. All this results in a situation where we are never really satisfied. Our craving for consumption has lost all connection with our real needs. Consumption has become merely an end in itself; not a means to greater happiness. Consumption has become compulsive. Our gods today are no longer Jehovah or Allah but Ford or Hotpoint! Moreover, this alienated attitude toward consumption affects our whole existence. It increases our passivity. To a large extent, we have become 'watchers' and 'listeners' rather than 'doers'. We still 'do' things, make things, have hobbies; but in the main we 'consume' TV programmes, films, sport, newspapers and magazines, 'pop' art, even the countryside that we rush past at 70 m.p.h. Alienated consumption permeates our whole existence, resulting in total self-estrangement. In Fromm's view, this total alienation is inherent in the socio-economic structure of modern capitalism.

At about the same time that Fromm wrote *The Sane Society* Herbert Marcuse wrote *Eros And Civilization*. Although he does not explicitly say so, Marcuse attempts to read Marx into Freud. He wants to resurrect the 'explosive' aspects of Freud's theories, although if Freud were alive today he would not probably recognise his own theories as interpreted by Marcuse. Here, however, I am primarily concerned with his observations

on alienation rather than, say, the oedipus complex.

The performance principle (that is the prevailing historical form of the reality principle), which is that of an acquisitive and antagonistic society in the process of constant expansion, says Marcuse, presupposes a long development during which organised domination has been increasingly rationalised. Under such conditions, therefore, the mode and scope of satisfaction for the vast majority is determined by their own labour—but their labour is work for an apparatus which they do not control; which operates as an independent power to which individuals must submit. And, says Marcuse, echoing Marx, 'it becomes the more alien the more specialised the division of labour becomes.' Indeed, 'Men do not live their own lives but perform pre-established functions. While they work, they do not fulfil their own needs and faculties but work in alienation. Work has now become general, and so have the restrictions placed upon the libido: labour time, which is the largest part of the individual's life time, is painful time, for alienated labour is absence of gratification, negation of the pleasure principle. Libido is diverted for socially useful performances in which the individual works for himself only in so far as he works for the apparatus, engaged in activities that mostly do not coincide with his own faculties and desires.'

Alienation of labour is almost complete, says Marcuse. The mechanics of the factory assembly line, the routine of the office, the 'ritual' of buying and selling, all are freed from any connection with real human potentialities. Work relations have become to a large extent relations between persons as exchangeable things, objects of scientific management and efficiency experts. Individuality is literally in name only. Even so-called competition tends to be reduced to prearranged varieties in producing gadgets, wrappings, flavours, or colours, he argues. 'Beneath this illusory surface, the whole work-world and its recreation have become a system of animate and inanimate things—all equally subject to administration.' Unfortunately, however, much of the individual's awareness of the prevailing domination and alienation is blunted by the manipulated restriction on his consciousness, of his Self. With this decline in genuine consciousness, with the control of information from above, with the absorption of the individual into mass communication, real knowledge is confined. Today, the average individual does not really know what is going on. It is Marcuse's argument that Man no longer realises himself in labour; that his life has become an instrument of this labour; that his work and its products have assumed a form and power independent of him as an individual. But the liberation from this state of affairs, he says, seems to require, not the arrest of alienation, but its consummation, not its reactivation, but its complete abolition. The more external to the individual the labour becomes, the less does it involve him in the realm of necessity.

All the technological progress of

modern society has not eliminated the necessity of alienated labour, says Marcuse. The necessity of working mechanically, unpleasurably, in a manner that does not represent individual self-realisation, still remains. Progressive alienation, however, does increase the potential of freedom.

'Relieved from the requirements of domination, the quantitative reduction in labour time and energy leads to a qualitative change in human existence: the free rather than the labour time determines its content. The expanding realm of freedom becomes truly a realm of play—of the free play of individual faculties. Thus liberated, they will generate new forms of realisation and of discovering the world, which in turn will reshape the realm of necessity, the struggle for existence. . . . To the degree to which the struggle for existence becomes co-operation for the free development and fulfilment of individual needs, repressive reason gives way to a new rationality of gratification in which reason and happiness converge,' says Marcuse optimistically.

In these brief notes I have attempted to convey the concept of alienation as viewed by Marx in the middle of the last century, and then by Fromm and Marcuse one hundred years after.

Marx brought Hegel 'down to earth' by locating alienation in the labour process; Fromm demonstrated how alienation in production led to powerlessness and a feeling of isolation; how individual relationships lead to a spirit of manipulation and instrumentality, and how alienated production also presupposes alienated consumption; and Marcuse, arguing that alienation of labour is almost complete, evidences how it permeates the whole of society by blunting and restricting our consciousness, and confining our real knowledge of society.

And society itself? What is it really like today?

It is still a capitalist society. It is still a society of conflicting and warring socio-economic classes. But it is very much different from the *laissez faire*, every-man-for-himself capitalism of the 19th century. Competition, as Marcuse pointed out, has largely given way to prearranged varieties of the same. Indeed, productive forces have become ever larger. Production today is dominated by giant trusts and combines. One important aspect of alienation, mentioned particularly by Fromm, is bureaucratization. Society has become increasingly bureaucratic. This applies both to State and non-State institutions. The State, however, has become far more powerful in all countries. Here in Britain, for example, the State, national and local, accounts for over 40% of the Gross National Product and employs over 25% of the labour force. Administratively, its tentacles spread far and wide, affecting all our lives.

How have these developments of increasing bureaucratization and deepening alienation affected the masses?

It has, as Fromm says, diminished and restricted initiative and responsibility. This we can see today in what we call the 'couldn't-care-less' attitude towards

work and society in general. Because of alienation, work has lost all meaning. Indeed, life itself has lost all meaning for the majority. So, today, very many people retreat into a kind of private dream world. Community life, particularly in big cities, has largely disappeared.

INCREASE IN STRIKES

All this, however, has not made people entirely passive. In Britain, for example, there has been an enormous increase in strikes in industry. These, however, are very much different than they were before the war. Previously, they were almost always official (that is before Trade Union officials became part of the Establishment), whilst now they are generally unofficial. They usually involved large numbers of workers and lasted a long time, sometimes months on end. Today, strikes generally involve small groups and often last only a day or less. Like society itself, they have become localised, fragmented—almost private affairs. 'The growing number of strikes in Britain,' says Cliff and Barker in *Incomes Policy, Legislation and Shop Stewards*, 'express the worker's rebellion against this subordination, this mutilation, limitation and alienation of his own creativity, only too clearly.' And: 'Even in strikes for monetary causes, the rebellion against the basic alienation is never far from the surface.' In the so-called Communist countries, we have seen much the same thing. Strikes and 'rebellion' are illegal in these 'Workers' States', but although less frequent, they occur—and are usually far more violent and explosive. However, as in the West, dissatisfaction and opposition to powerlessness, meaninglessness, estrangement, i.e. alienation, usually takes the form of apathy, lethargy and restlessness. An illustration from the Hungarian weekly *Elet Es Irodalom* (Life and Literature) shows what I mean. In the Csepel Iron and Metal Works, in 1964 alone, more than one-third (11,638) of the total number of workers employed left their job. And of those who left, 62% were under thirty years of age and had been working there less than one year. Said one writer to the paper hopefully: 'Probably somewhere else they'll treat me as a human being.'

These, then, are just some of the aspects, some of the problems, of alienation in modern industrial society. Is there a solution? There is; and, of course, the simple one is: abolish our present society and establish a free society. But it is not quite as simple as that. People have become conditioned to our present way of life. To shout from a soapbox 'Overthrow the system!' is the negation of the very responsibility and freedom that we desire. Education for freedom, for a non-alienated society, will be a long and very difficult task; but I agree with Marcuse that probably progressive alienation itself will increase the potential for freedom. Unlike the 'scientific' socialists who claim that their Utopia is inevitable, I am, however, optimistic that we shall ultimately see a New Dawn. Despite the onward rush to '1984', history, I think, is on our side. I hope so!

PETER E. NEWELL.

VERY LITTLE NEWS this month from anarchist groups. Activity is at a low ebb. Or, in true anarchist fashion, comrades keep all good news to themselves. Bad news reaches us fast enough which made an acquaintance remark: 'If I want a headache, I reach for my FREEDOM.'

ANARCHISTS AND THE COMMUNITY

Alistair Ratray writes from Chorley: How about this 'rave' notice in the Chorley (ultra-Tory) Guardian. Anyway, it indicates that we are beginning to move:

Public 'happenings' in the form of satirical dramatic sketches directed against the war in Vietnam; demonstrations against the bad conditions in schools and the use of corporal punishment; distribution of anarchist literature and anti-Spain leaflets in the town.

These and other forms of peace activities may be held in Chorley within the next few weeks by the Chorley Anarchist Group which held their first 'action meeting' on Wednesday. Many and varied ideas, all aimed at making Chorley people aware of this group and its aims, were discussed at the meeting.

It was decided that the group will begin their first active campaigning in the town in two weeks, when they plan to sell copies of 'Freedom', the anarchist weekly newspaper on Saturday afternoon.

There was also a lengthy discussion on the possibility of opening an adventure playground in Chorley if a site could be found. This would be the anarchists gesture towards the people of Chorley to show that their aim was essentially to serve the community.

MEETING IN BELFAST

Belfast comrades have written to say that they are considering holding a meeting in Belfast of all those in Ireland interested in anarchism. They know of people in Bangor, Derry, Newry, Armagh, Cork and Newcastle and some of them are going to Dublin to meet a newly-formed group. All those interested should write to Roy McLoughlin, 46 Mooreland Park, Belfast, 11.

RICHMOND COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

Pete Polish writes: 'The proposed Richmond Community Workshop has its origins in the need for a radical social change. The themes, which have been discussed in the context of community organisation, have included the increasing powerlessness experienced by the majority of people in influencing government policies, the need for greater individual responsibility, the inability of party politics to deal with the major issues of our time and the decreasing quality of life in an urban and technological society.' He is writing a full account for the next FREEDOM.

BLACK AND RED GUARD

Harlow anarchists are now circulating a newsletter for West Essex and East Herts readers.

REVOLUTIONARY FOLK

Graham Moss writes: 'Recently an effort was made in an article in FREEDOM to put more revolution into folk songs.

At the General Picton pub, in Caledonian Road, N.1, an endeavour is being made to run a folk club on (business-wise) a Syndicalist basis. Directly involved are three anarchists and an Italian sympathiser. If you would pass it on to anyone who might find this useful, especially singers, I'd be grateful. We are open every Wednesday night. Admission is 4/- at the moment but we wish to reduce this soon.'

HELP WANTED

The non-aligned peace activists in Scotland need further funds for demonstrations against the British Polaris

system. In late June they are planning a return march to Coulpport with two-day-camp-cum-weekend-school on the beach. On Hiroshima day there will be a prolonged fast at Ardnam Pier with distribution of an Anti-Vietnam War leaflet written by an U.S. Sergeant. They want to raise £25 by March 1, so that they can organise the activities properly. All communications to Alan Parker, 40 Murano Street, Maryhill, Glasgow, N.W. The letter to us was headed by a delightful drawing of the campfire by the Coulpport base and was signed by George Williamson, Walter Weir, David Young and Alan Parker.

AND IN SICILY

Danilo Dolci has written to us asking to publicise a march he is organising (March 5-11), through Western Sicily against the poverty that exists there. He would welcome anarchist friends to march with him all the way. He would appreciate messages of solidarity or 'simultaneous action linked up in some way with our demonstration'. Danilo Dolci's address is Centro studio iniziativa, Portinico (Palermo), Italy.

DEATH OF WHO?

We received a beautifully printed black edged card from our crazy friends in Strasbourg University 'that they announce with deep regret the death of Guy Debord as far as the International Situationists are concerned'. We think he is alive but hiding in Argentina.

R.

Copenacre

THE MEETING HELD in Bath on Saturday, February 18 (convened by the National Committee of the Committee of 100) was reasonably well attended, especially by people from Bath and Bristol. Laurens Otter was in the chair.

There was unanimous agreement that a demonstration at Copenacre should take place. The latest information is that the planning and development of Polaris has recently been moved to Copenacre from Bristol and that Copenacre is also an RSG.

The immediate problem was timing. With only five weeks left to Easter, and a good deal of work to do to make the demonstration a success, there was a strong case for having it at Whit instead. If it was at Whit there would then be no unnecessary conflict with the Aldermaston March, planned by the London Committee of 100 for Easter, and there would be an opportunity for doing something in the meantime to start the build-up process in Corsham, the town that is in the centre of the military complex. To have it at Whit was agreed.

The Copenacre Action Group was constituted by the meeting and it was decided to have only a preliminary, small scale, locally based one-day action on Good Friday. This will start from the field on Pickwick Road at 10 a.m. and will involve leafletting the whole town to explain the meaning of the Whitsun demonstration, holding an open air meeting outside the local church at the end of the morning service and various other activities. This is envisaged as being undertaken by up to 50 people mostly from the West Country. The contact addresses of the new group are as follows: Tony Allwright (and Steve Davis), 105 Ashley Road, Bristol 6; Andrew Ross (and Janet Burns), 31 Englishcombe Lane, Bath; Peter Cadogan and David McLellan, 13 Goodwin Street, London, N.4.

PETER CADOGAN.

'Thank God for the Press!' - Daily Mail

THE MORNING STAR in mentioning that Stuart Christie had passed his Advanced Level General Certificate of Education examination in history said that Christie was serving a four-year sentence—nought for history—the sentence is still twenty years. Hugh Delargy of the Sunday Citizen referring to the same event says, 'Splendid! May he soon leave a Spanish prison for a British university.' I can remember Mr. Delargy making less complimentary references to anarchists. Mr. Delargy goes on, 'In British prisons about 1,500 prisoners were sleeping two and 7,000 three in a cell. Fat chance they have of passing "A" levels.'

JIM GARRISON, District Attorney of New Orleans (no doubt hell-bent on re-election), boasted that arrests will be made in New Orleans in connection with Kennedy's assassination. Now he tells us he has been converted from believing in the Warren Commission report. 'We already have the names of the people in the initial plot. We are not wasting our time and we will prove it. Arrests will be made, charges will be filed and convictions will be obtained.' He did not deny a report that his office was hunting 'a big and dangerous' 26-year-old Cuban known to have lived near Oswald in New Orleans.

REFERRING TO AN ALLEGEDLY non-existent incident at Caxton Hall, on November 17 last, the American Trotskyist journal Spartacist makes great play with Healy's reference to 'allowing passengers alighting from coaches to enter the Hall without being obstructed'. They comment in fine style: 'This grotesque legal language only serves to point up the hypocrisy of a man claiming to be a proletarian revolutionary leader using such a law—from the period when lords and ladies descending from their coaches had the right to

smash beggars, petitioners, children and anyone else in their way—against another member of the labour movement.' Come down off that peroration comrade-editor! To set the record straight 'coaches', in this context is merely an English word for 'buses'.

COMRADE ERNEST TATE, the allegedly ci-devant, quasi-victim of a so-called assault, contributes his letter on the imagined event and repeats his asking for full support from all people on the left at the next public meeting of the SLL. For the record, the Irish Militant were there, Ernie Tate was there, so were FREEDOM sellers but where were the Morning Star, Peace News, Tribune and the Socialist Leader? Bus-loads of young SLL-ers were brought in, but FREEDOM editors were denied admission to the meeting. In Newsletter (for August 20) the Political Committee of the SLL stated, 'We shall not hesitate to deal appropriately with the handful of United Secretariat agents who hawk it [the offending pamphlet] around the cynical fake-left in England.'

COMRADE KOSYGIN and Comrade Wilson did at least one useful deal, at the expense of Latvians, Lithuanians and Estonians. Britain will pay half-a-million over to Russia from the blocked gold reserves of the three republics, which were invaded by Russia in 1939. The other five and a half million pounds will be used to meet claims of British nationals who hold bonds on Estonia, Riga or Vilna. Mr. George Brown was heard to say something about recognizing the Oder-Neisse line but this was a misunderstanding. The Editor of the Morning Star, interviewed on the BBC, welcomed Kosygin's proposal of a Treaty of Friendship with Britain. The BBC interviewer questioned the usefulness and

permanence of such pacts citing the Ribbentrop-Stalin pact as an example. The Editor refused to be drawn and the question did not appear in the Morning Star.

THE TAILOR AND CUTTER magazine complained about the decision of Buckingham Palace to wear lounge-suits when entertaining Mr. Kosygin. 'It is ironic,' they say, 'that the British monarchy should be publicly exposed to what history may regard as the last symbolic step in the victory of the proletarian revolution.' Furthermore the magazine claims that Mr. Kosygin dined in a 'shiny mohair suit—one of the wryest strokes of sartorial one-upmanship we've seen for years—which was only removed from a real dinner-jacket by the absence of silk facing on the jacket and a couple of stripes down the trousers.'

BYRON DE LA BECKWITH, unsuccessfully accused in 1963 of the murder of Medgar Evers is standing for Lieutenant-Governor of Mississippi. District Attorney Bill Waller who prosecuted Beckwith is standing for Governor. Both are Democrats. Beckwith is on bail pending a third trial, for which no plans have been announced. . . . WRITING TO The Times (where else?) the wife of an Oxford don described keeping a ferret as a pet. 'She loved the sound of music, and in the evenings would climb up on my husband's knee and on to his shoulder. Sitting there, sometimes for an hour or more, with a rapt expression on her small face, she would listen to him playing the spinet; only to nip his ear sharply whenever he stopped. So often, curious simple things in life can give us the greatest pleasure, and the friendship bestowed by a ferret is certainly one of these.'

JON QUIXOTE.

I am tired of making excuses for Elizabeth Windsor

Dear Comrades, I am whole-heartedly in support of Robert Halstead's letter (28.1.67) asking for some strong protest about the monarchy.

In general it is government rather than the monarchy that we want to hit out at. At most demonstrations it is assumed that people are protesting against the government's policies whilst in fact half of them are protesting against government.

I feel that one of the best ways to strike at the whole system of British government is to hit where they feel it—the monarchy. It has long been felt by many that anarchists often are not even rebels because they never make any serious attempt to topple the crown.

I am sure there are many who would be willing to come and demonstrate and, I think, we could be quite successful, and why be quiet about it? I think we should go and demonstrate outside Buckingham Palace at the queen, so that they will know that anarchists really exist.

Yours fraternally,

PAM PEARCE.

An Uncertain Smile

Dear Comrades, Mr. Kosygin was welcomed into Glasgow by two large paper banners and several posters made by me for Glasgow Youth Against the Bomb Group—which,

LETTERS

according to the Scottish Sunday Express, took the smile off his face.

As an exercise in communications it was pretty good, as the Express states:

'The banners of Nuclear Disarmers mushroomed above the crowd. They read "Scotland will die when Kosygin's bombs hit the Polaris bases . . . Welcome to your No. 1 target area Mr. Kosygin."

'He smiled and waved until one of his aides translated the messages.'

Most of us thought we made our point, which was replicated in many newspapers.

Yours fraternally,

Glasgow, N.W. ALAN A. PURBEN.

Foulness

The Editors,

The East London Committee of 100 is proposing a two-day, weekend, march, in the near future, to the military installation on Foulness Island, near Southend, for the purpose of reclaiming it for peaceful purposes.

At the present time, a permit is re-

quired to enter the island and the population virtually live under a state of martial law. It will be remembered that the Christian Committee of 100 demonstrated there two years ago because the church is behind barbed wire and a permit is required to go to church.

We should like to hear from all those groups and individuals who will be willing to join us in this action.

Yours sincerely, ROGER SUTTON, (Convener, East London Committee of 100.)

72 Lawns Way, Romford, Essex

Holiday Camp

Dear Comrades,

My leaflet about the holiday I am organising at a small seaside camp in Kent was enclosed in many copies of FREEDOM. Briefly, booking is for either or both of two weeks beginning September 2 and September 9 and costs (full board) approx. £8 10s. per week, less for children, coach laid on from Victoria £1 return, 10/- children. If you want all the gen, send me a 4d. stamp. Please hurry all those interested.

BRONIA McDONALD, 80 Marten Road, London, E.17

Through the Anarchist Press

AMERICA-RUSSIA

IT will be remembered that some weeks ago the US announced selected details of the Nike-X, a missile designed for the defence of their major cities, and that the equally peace-loving Russians countered this with the news that Moscow and Leningrad were already protected by systems using similar missiles. At a time of increasing world hunger, the estimated cost to each side for complete systems covering all important cities is 50,000,000,000 dollars.

IVORY COAST

The press doubtless tends, from time to time, to exaggerate the situation in some of the 'emerging' African states, but it would seem that strange views are held by some African politicians on the subject of democracy and individual rights generally. France *Eurafricque* for November 1966 offers the following statements by M. Philippe Yacé, President of the Ivory Coast's Chamber of Deputies:

'Although in theory our constitution allows for several political parties, the people of the Ivory Coast and their leaders have in fact instituted a single party, as we feel that we do not have the right to divide ourselves.'

'A vote is the expression of a choice, of an opinion, and as such implies a degree of commitment; seen from this point of view, a vote inevitably leads to dangerous outbursts of feeling. . . . On

November 7 the people's vote did not involve any kind of choice, since for them there is but one President of the Republic, President Houphouët; it was simply a question of letting the President know that now, and always, he can count on their loyal support.'

JOHN THURSTON.

BETTER!

WEEK 7, FEBRUARY 18, 1967:
Expenses: 7 weeks at £90: £630
Income: Sales and Subs.: £429
DEFICIT: £201

Surrey: P.C. 10/6; Libertaria: Anarch. 5/-; Utopia: M.K.W. 5/-; Freedomville: J.O.T. 5/-; Fraternaland: Pax 5/-; London, S.W.2: B.L. 14/-; London, N.W.6: N.B. £3; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; J.L.* 3/-; Peterborough: F.W. 2/6; Sheffield: Anon £1/1/-; Leeds: D.S. 1/3; Solihull: G.H. 6/6; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* 10/-; Manchester: D.P. 7/-; Anon: Special donation to 8-page issue £35.

TOTAL: £42 17 9
Previously Acknowledged: £148 6 8

1967 Total to Date: £191 4 5

*Denotes regular contributor.

Introduce Your Friends to FREEDOM

SIX SHILLINGS EACH WILL BRING THEM 'FREEDOM' AND 'ANARCHY' FOR TWO MONTHS WITH YOUR COMPLIMENTS.

Subscription Rates

FREEDOM only (per year)
£1 10s. (\$4.50) surface mail
£2 16s. (\$8.00) airmail
ANARCHY only (per year)
£1 6s. (\$3.50) surface mail
£2 7s. (\$7.00) airmail
COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION
FREEDOM & ANARCHY (per year)
£2 10s. (\$7.50) surface mail both
£4 15s. (\$12.50) airmail both
FREEDOM (airmail) &
ANARCHY (seamail)
£3 17s. (\$10.50) (per year)

DEATH AT SEA

Continued from page 8 OWNERS' Association, is a man with a natural turn of wit, and he has gone on record that 'People do get swept overboard, but they often get swept back again'. But ignoring Cox's odd approach to this for the harsh realities of profit and loss, and one is faced with the fact that many a skipper is said to be earning over £10,000 a year, which to my primitive mathematical reasoning works out at £1 a corpse, and the owners state that an eighteen-hour day is not adverse to the crew because they are making money, too, but though extra work on a big catch may supplement a seaman's earnings, the seamen claim that the figure of £30 IN A GOOD SEASON is an exaggeration.

At Hull this year they are already mourning the death of 12 seamen on board the *St. Finbarr* that caught fire and sank off Newfoundland on Christmas Day and no graves will mark the land for the men, even at the moment of their death, became part of the harsh and

lovely legends of the sea. Yet we cannot expect men to risk death or mutilation that we may eat of the fish of the sea and death in abstract may pander to the romantic within all but the dullest among us, but to the drowning man it is still death, cold, wet and evil, and all for a boardroom profit. For let there be no mistake about this, the Norwegians have enforced the use of protections of winches and the heightening of the ships' railings and their figures for dead seamen is 6 per 10,000 compared to the Hull rate of 9.3 per 10,000.

In that owners own the ships, it is only just that the last words should be given to Lionel Cox, Secretary, to give him his full title, of the Hull Fishing Vessel OWNERS' Association and the Hull Fishing Industry Association who, speaking on the problems of recruitment, said, 'We get a lot of boys who are attracted by an advertisement in a careers book, but there is a tendency for them to leave after a couple of trips.'

LUMPENPROLETARIAT.

The Creeping Paralysis

THE GOVERNMENT is pressing forward with its plans of controlling incomes. Of course, ostensibly this is being done in consultation with the TUC and CBI, but in fact the Government is playing at dutch auctions, allowing outrageous proposals to leak out so that their intended proposals do not appear too bad.

The Prices and Incomes Board, under the chairmanship of Aubrey Jones, is to have more power; there will be no back-dating of wage rises, and prices and incomes increases can be delayed for one year.

As was to be expected Part 4 will not be renewed after the expiring date on August 11. Part 2 of the Act is to be implemented. The PIB will be the sole arbiter of any increase and any additional delay. The Government will not initiate delay without reference to the Board.

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Anarchy. Will exchange copies of 2 and 33 for 37 and 38. Box 48.

Abolition of Royalty. Individual Action being discussed now in all parts of the country and abroad. For details of meetings apply Box 49.

Badges. 'Free Stuart Christie—Franco's Prisoner', 3/6 for six (including postage), minimum order. Proceeds to new campaign expenses. Orders to John Rety, c/o Freedom Press.

Who wants the Easter meeting? £8 10s. was raised in December towards the cost of an indoor anarchist propaganda meeting; to be held in London on Easter Sunday (cost of last year's meeting: about £20). The group who organized the fund-raising now find themselves unable to organize the meeting. Anyone undertaking this work should apply to Donald Room for the £8 10s., which will otherwise be given to Freedom Press. D.R., 13 Savernake Road, N.W.3.

East London Committee of 100. Social Evening. Friday, March 3, 7.30 p.m. Downs Hotel, Downs Road, Clapton, London, E.5. Admission 3/-.

House or Apartment wanted for July. American comrades (4) need house or flat to rent for month of July. Box 50.

Speakers. Harlow Anarchists intend to run a series of public meetings and indoor forums. Comrades willing to speak on anarchistic topics will be paid expenses if necessary. Please contact the Harlow Group (see groups column) with offers or suggestions.

Conference on 'Race Toward Tolerance.' Islington International Friendship Council. Speakers: David Pitt; Eric Silver of the *Guardian*; Mrs. Shirley Williams. Chairman: James Cameron. 2.30 p.m. Saturday, February 25, 1967. Islington Town Hall, Upper Street, London, N.1. Refreshments and collection.

Voluntary Editorial Secretary. Wanted for FREEDOM editors. Two evenings a week. Fridays and Mondays. Shorthand not essential but own typewriter desirable. Write Freedom Press.

Christian Anarchists wishing to meet other Anarchist or Libertarian Christians please write to Carl Pinel, c/o West Suffolk General Hospital, Hospital Road, Bury St. Edmunds.

Pageant. PPU Pageant. 'Tools for Life or Weapons for Death'. Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, February 25. Assemble Bethesda Methodist Hall, off Broad Street, 2 p.m. Supper party/peace concert. 8 p.m. Keele University.

Lecture (in Spanish). 'Two Literary Lectures'. J. C. Pradas, Sunday, March 5 at 3.30 p.m. Lecture Room, Royal Hotel, Woburn Place, W.C.1.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

although such a reference would mean a four-month delay anyway. By the time one has been through the process of protracted negotiations with the employers, have it referred to the PIB, who could recommend an extended delay, the original increase negotiated could work out at about twopence.

The necessary legislation envisaged will be limited to 12 months, and is not framed so that it can be repeated. This is pure window dressing. Parliament is supreme and can do what it likes, therefore fresh legislation having the same effect, could easily be introduced.

The 'no back-dating' is a real knife-stabber. Back-dating to the expiring date of the last agreement, is one of the main features of collective bargaining which forced the employers to make progress during wage negotiations. Now they will be able to take as long as they like, knowing full well that an increase can only commence when all and sundry have given it the 'once over'.

The Confederation of British Industry welcomes the delay appertaining to wages, but is upset at the possibility of the PIB, in fact, recommending price cuts. John Davies, Director General of the Confederation, stated, 'This is a brand new and very disagreeable concept'.

The TUC General Council when it

meets on Wednesday will discuss the Government proposals and decide on its recommendations for the March 2 meeting of all union executives.

The T & GWU is expected to lead the opposition to the Government proposals at both meetings, with what success is anyone's guess, although Jack Jones, Assistant General Secretary of T & GWU, may have cemented some support for the Government, when he was reported as saying that if the TUC supported the Government plan the T & GWU might have to consider disaffiliating from the TUC. This august body may be open to gentle persuasion but to hell with being blackmailed, particularly by Frank Cousins.

The outlook for the people of this country looks pretty sick. The State is daily increasing its hold over the lives of people. The basis is gradually being laid for the establishment of a corporate state, our Duce is far more subtle than Mussolini ever knew how to be. Our State intervention is like a creeping paralysis, introduced with the hand over the heart and a smile, but, nevertheless, just as paralyzing. If we don't wake up real soon we will wonder what the bloody hell has hit us.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

A Potential Power

IT IS STRANGE how the traditional left wing clings to the lobbying of Parliament as a means of correcting a grievance. Many admit it is a waste of time and those who queue up, fill in the request form and, if their MP is there, finally express their grievance, often come away with the feeling that they have achieved very little. This is the general impression that one gets from those who have carried out the lobbying exercise. Yet once again workers are being called upon to lobby their MPs.

This lobby, on Tuesday, concerns a campaign adopted at the National Conference last December for the 'Defence of our Trade Unions' (see FREEDOM, 17.12.66). Many who attended the conference belonged to various left-wing political organisations and consequently the campaign adopted was one of compromise. In the 'Declarations of Purpose' of the conference, delegates pledged a 'National Week of Protest and Campaign, according to local circumstances' and 'leading to Mass Demonstrations or Lobby to Parliament, TUC and, by its members, to their Trade Union head office'.

This is a very tame way of starting a week of protest, unless something else happens on Tuesday, and even *The Week*, a strong supporter of Labour's left, is getting apologetic for the failure of those MPs to act against the Government's income policies. They write: 'There have been a number of lobbies of Parliament and the point must be crossing people's minds as to what good these demonstrations do. We will say quite bluntly that if the lobbies stop short at the point of merely advertising how best Labour can save the capitalist economy they are no good at all. If however they have as their aim the stimulation of struggle it is another matter.'

Chatting to your MP is, I should think, the last thing to stimulate struggle, unless it is with the MP concerned. Lobbying these MPs can only contain the struggle in that some become very disillusioned. *The Week* is also very worried because many have blamed the 'traditional left leadership' for the lack of resistance to the Government's policies. They apologise and say: 'But we must qualify this by saying that many have supported the Government or have been slow to resist it for good intentions. We do not believe that every MP, every trade union

leader has been lost to the cause.'

There has been very little resistance to the incomes policy. What has come has been from small isolated groups who have successfully gained their claims. Obviously it can be done, if workers are determined and take the necessary action. However, there is more to it than winning a pay increase. There is the question of control by the Trade Union Congress and their relations with the Government. If this centralised control becomes a reality, then what little say trade unionists now have in policy decisions will be lost.

This trend of centralisation of more control from the top is one that should be reversed. Even the second action, of a lobby of trade union executives at the Central Hall, on March 2, indicates that some think that they can influence them. A demonstration of our contempt would be more appropriate. **The third action of a demonstration and march from Speakers Corner to Trafalgar Square on Sunday, March 12, at 2.30 p.m., is a far better way of expressing opposition to Government policies.**

While our voice and influence may be small among trade unionists, many are seeing the futility of changing or appealing to the leadership. Workers are forming their own organisations in their industries and localities to fight against the effects of Government policies and the drift towards more State intervention which accompanies these.

The potential power within a rank and file organisation would be very strong, not only strong enough to defeat the policies of the Government, but also to effect a radical change in our society. After all, we have to go further than defeating the Government's intentions, for whichever one is in power, it will assist the capitalist system to exploit and control the vast majority of people. We know that this exploitation is not so obviously oppressive as in the last century, but is more subtle, and affects our whole environment.

If from the present struggle workers turn to a direct approach in preference to the usual constitutional methods, then as anarchists we should welcome this. To a certain extent the nature of this struggle will force workers to take this action. It is important that our ideas have a platform in this struggle and that we play our part.

P.T.

Freedom

For Workers' Control

FEBRUARY 25 1967 Vol 28 No 6

Myton's Site Stays Idle

THE MYTON SITE on the Barbican has been in dispute for 17 weeks. The men were locked out after taking strike action when the management sacked three steel fixers.

Two union executives (the Transport and General Workers' Union and the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers), gave their support, while other unions, notably the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers, backed it at district level. The Executive of this union has been very vicious in its attempts to break their members who have continued to picket the site. They even sent a circular to union branches saying that members should not give money to appeals from the lock-out committee. As far as the ASW executive was concerned, they had no dispute with the management and said the dispute was one of rivalry between the T & GWU and the AUBTW.

Now the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives has reached an agreement with the management, without consulting the lads, that the site can be reopened without the reinstatement of six stewards. Lou Lewis, the ASW Federation Steward and one of the six, said: 'This is our reward for sticking to trade union principles. Our reward for listening to the NFBTO is victimisation.'

This agreement allows Mytons to start 50 men this Monday (today), another 50 the week after and then if the site has progressed satisfactorily, make the job up to full strength the following week. Len Eaton, Regional Secretary of the NFBTO said the agreement allowed the six stewards a chance to use the disputes machinery and during the three weeks this would take, Mytons would pay them their wages. However he did not mention that it is the same cronies who reached the above agreement that would be sitting on the disputes panel, so they would not have a snowball's chance in hell of winning.

Following the sending out of letters by Mytons to employees, telling them to return to work on Monday, a mass picket was organised. Lads from other

sites on the Barbican voted to clock-in an hour late so that they could give their support and other jobs in London sent delegates. When the men turned up for work they were met by a mass picket, but this was not really needed, for those returning soon made it clear that they would not start back without their stewards.

At a meeting of Myton lads, at which Len Eaton tried to justify the agreement, but was verbally torn to pieces, they voted to stay outside the gate. Then a full meeting was held at which the Federation Steward, Lou Lewis, reported the decision to the other pickets. He said they were determined to beat Mytons and if necessary would oppose those union officials who were willing to sacrifice the stewards. He explained that the agreement also meant a 10% reduction in bonus earnings and a site negotiating procedure which would hamstring the stewards by bringing in national union officials. He said they were determined that the site would open on their terms and that they would say what price Mytons would have to pay for completion.

Now this struggle enters a new phase in that the rank and file are openly fighting their national officials and the management. Whether these union officials will escort 'scabs' into the site remains to be seen, but it seems certain that by today's vote none of Mytons men will go back without their stewards. Many have had a hard time since the lock-out started, having worked for five or six companies, earning low wages. After this experience they have come to recognise the benefits of a well-organised union site.

The other sites on the Barbican have pledged further support if it is needed. If the site remains idle for another two or three weeks, there is a good chance that, due to pressure for completion, Mytons will give in and take back the six stewards.

Readers can help financially by sending money to A. D. Leadbetter, 9 Wells House, Rosebery Avenue, London, E.C.1. P.T.

DEATH AT SEA

WE are an island race born to the poetry of Kipling and Masfield and death and the sea have long been part of our cultural heritage. It has been our cathartic and our escape, both in reality and in fantasy, from the brute world of factory and office. We hear of the dead at sea only in retrospect when their bodies have long been lowered into the grey and unmapped waters and their human screams have mingled with the vagrant winds and we have accepted the mutilated seamen as a welcomed persona from an odyssey that was old before the Romans stepped upon these shores.

But in this age of computers, television and multi-coloured statistics, the small and lonely ship creeping along the horizon to ports that poets have loved to log becomes for us all the floating slum that the underpaid and overworked crews have long accepted as their normal working life.

In 1965 Professor Schilling of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine carried out his own analysis of the national average death rate in the fishing industry and found that it was over twice the figure for coal miners. Schilling's figure was 9.3 per 10,000 men

which, in human terms, means that of the 2,500 fishermen at Hull, two will be killed while working each and every year. Seamen at Hull have already voiced their protests that their's is an occupation that leads to more injuries and loss of life than in almost any other industry and the pamphlet written by three students of Hull University and published by the Socialist *Humber-side Voice* has the blessing of the TGWU and the local Labour Party.

The seamen's claims of graft, black-mail, greed and gross negligence may not be easy to prove, as so many of us know to our cost when we have sought to examine our own industries, but when men stand before you with missing fingers, arms or hands, then the evidence is there by sheer non weight of physical default. The pamphlet claims that elementary safety precautions are too often absent such as winches are insufficiently protected and regularly cause maimed hands, loss of fingers, etc.; the trawler's rail is usually so low as to not prevent men being washed overboard. Lionel Cox, who beside being the secretary of the Hull Fishing Vessel

Continued on page 7