

Freedom

Anarchist Weekly 6d

OCTOBER 28 1967 Vol 28 No 33

Vietnam Demos: Farce and Riot

LONDON'S part in the International Mobilisation began with a flop but restarted with a bang. On the Saturday, a debacle in Trafalgar Square, organised by the Committee of 100 with name support only from CND, YCND and the BCPV. The theme of British complicity in the Vietnam War (i.e. the Labour Party's acquiescence in their leader's licking Lyndon's dollar-padded arsehole), despite its justice, was too fine a point for a mass rally.

SATURDAY'S FIASCO

Less than 1,500 watched a rambling variety show from the plinth. The six supporting marches would barely have filled a double decker bus apiece.

The amplified music and folk—bar the satirical 'Let's go with Labour' record—belonged to five years ago.

The poetry, Adrian Mitchell, Denis Gould and Roger Barnard, was good but unthematic.

The speakers, Peace Movement regulars, rode hobby-horses and the chairman apologised.

The projected visual finale of the burning Labour Party cards, a highly relevant idea haphazardly executed, evaporated when police threats of future difficulties in booking the Square, brought the sole card burner off the plinth and out of sight.

Sudden rain washed out the scheduled hour of discussion-in-the-Square. CND's Foreign Office picket was likewise saved from fiasco. The indoor direct link with demonstrations abroad half-filled Finsbury Park Town Hall (thank you BBC for refusing us Alexandra Palace).

An abysmal show of weakness by the Peace Movement. Enough said.

UNITED FRONT

The sun shone all Sunday afternoon; we left Grosvenor Square after dark with bodies riot-hot. Sunday's demonstration, though under VSC auspices, was very much a united front (united in hate), a fact some anarchists preferred to ignore. 'Victory to NLF' was tempered by PPU, Young Liberal, Peace Action and Anarchist banners. Also present were Barbican strikers, Black Power brothers and Irish Revolutionary Workers. Libertarians twice stood aside from Liberationists to chant 'We want Peace', sound instinct when faced with VSC's mob emotion. However, imagination does need a body to rest in. What evidence have we that any Vietnamese are affording themselves the luxury of an anarchist analysis?

Unintelligible 'third world' rantings from the balcony microphones set the militant tone for the day. At least 5,000 left Trafalgar Square for the US Embassy, marching via Australia House (weekend empty) and Whitehall. At Downing Street the march stopped, shuddered with impotent rage, knocked a few cops, lost a few arrested, then moved

ANARCHY 81

NEXT WEEK DISCUSSES

Anarchists in the Russian Revolution

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

Gloves Are Off!

GUNTER, CARRON, WYATT, what a trio to pontificate on the rights of workers. They are the finest exponents of 'Red Plot-hunting' in the business.

The only point they have made, inadvertently, which is correct, is that the connection between the Barbican Dispute, Docks, Railways, Provincial Buses, and Print is the fact that it is basically a struggle against the Government's policy of keeping the workers in control. One factor we must never forget—Wilson was elected to do just that. A Labour Government can always be relied upon to wield the big stick, they have an infamous record for using troops to strike-break.

To get the record straight: the employers realise that on any occasion when they decide to make a stand against the demands of the workers they have the full support of the Labour Government, even to the extent of supporting opposition to trade union organisation as in the Roberts-Arundel dispute, support by doing nothing.

The gulf between the trade union leadership and the rank-and-file is clear and distinct. Whereas union leadership has, with tongue in cheek, verbally opposed Government industrial policy, the rank-and-file are, by their actions, opposing it. Heath, in his speech closing the Tory Party Conference, denied that the trade



BATTLE OF THE BARBICAN

union leadership is too powerful but in fact is not powerful enough to control their members. These are the opinions of the TUC and Government; they would not disagree with the Tories on this one.

The analysis of the situation by the three wise men is ludicrous, to say the least. They first claim it is a Communist plot, then a Communist-Trotskyist plot to disrupt the economy of the country—they must live in the world of science fiction.

Taking the pockets of struggle one by one. Liverpool Docks, with its very strong Catholic element, effective Communist influence could not be further from the truth. Whilst it is true that both the CP and the Socialist Labour League will fish in any muddy water and sup with anyone to gain control of a situation, in Liverpool Docks they are just peddlers of political rags.

The railway dispute. The 'most patient and conservative' of unions can be the NUR's proud boast. Make no mistake about it, rank-and-file pressure forced the NUR

leadership to make a reluctant stand. Where is the 'Red Plot'? The truth is that militants of different political persuasion or none are now working together because they are involved in these disputes. How far this embarrasses their 'leaders' is a matter for conjecture.

The tragedy of the whole situation is the fact that three sections of workers are fighting the Government with the practical liaison between them negligible. The industrial struggle will intensify and therefore the industrial rank-and-file must unite on an industrial basis, the politicians will lead where they always lead, up blind alleys, then 'sell out'. They are not interested in the aspirations of Joe Soap but only how they can use and manipulate him to gain control.

We hear a load of crap about the 'good of the country'. Joe Soap is the country and it's up to him, in whatever sphere he works, to take control him- or herself—this is the only freedom.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

DOCK STRIKE ISSUES

Since the Labour Government has imposed the wage freeze, stopped agreed wages increases between employers and unions, tried to make strikes illegal and caused half a million unemployed, it is interesting to look back to 1964. Then Harold Wilson spoke of the pre-election boom manoeuvred by the Tories and said it was 'to induce people to forget 1961 and the pay pause, and the brutal interference with established wage bargaining and arbitration procedures, the nurses, the teachers, the railwaymen, the unemployed which their policies created. Because their secret weapon on which they count is short memories.' (Philharmonic Hall, Liverpool, on March 8, 1964). Mr. Wilson seems to rely on short memories as well.

CHARACTERISTICALLY the Labour Government has tried to dismiss the present strike of about 15,000 dockers in London and Liverpool simply as a 'Communist inspired plot' (remember the Seamen's strike?) to cover up dissatisfaction with the Government and to stir public opinion against the strikers. Quite clearly this is untrue as all decisions to strike have been taken by democratic votes from the men themselves.

So Mr. Ray Gunter's remark that 'one of the tragedies of the present situation is that the actions of a committed few are deliberately designed to damage the well-being of the many' is nonsense. True the Unofficial Liaison Committees that call for the votes are heavily laden with Communists but this, if anything, acts against them, as the vast majority of dockers are anti-Communist.

The demands of the men are quite moderate and simple. In London the abolition of the Continuity Rule (which took place when the Government introduced the new Dock Labour Scheme on September 18) is causing trouble. This rule was the most strongly defended of all by the dockers.

It ensured that once a docker started

on a particular job he stuck to it right to the end. This was to make all dockers accept the rough with the smooth as some cargoes are dirty, heavy and not very well paid, while others are easy to handle and are paid very well. Without the continuity rule an employer could put a 'blue-eyed boy' on a ship's hold when cars were being unloaded and then move him to another hold or ship when something like cement was being unloaded. Similarly he could put a militant docker he dislikes on a hard, messy, un lucrative cargo all the time.

When the new Scheme started this rule was abolished to achieve mobility of labour. Now if an employer is short of men and another employer has too many a man can be 'temporarily transferred' from one job to another. This is naturally very unpopular when a man is moved from a job on cars to one on cement.

The men complain of being treated 'like shuttlecocks' and there is nothing to stop employers using this new power against militants they dislike.

In Liverpool the dispute is over pay. At present London dockers are paid a minimum of £16 a week (the employers were prepared to pay £17 but Ray Gunter stepped in and disallowed it). Elsewhere dockers are paid a minimum of £15. Liverpool want the same pay as London and have struck for it, since the start of the new Scheme.

London also struck over pay when the Scheme started, but this strike soon petered out. They wanted the £17 the employers were prepared to pay, but for a 40-hour week with all overtime paid for. At present a man can work two evenings' overtime and still only get £16.

This is because the basic time rate for dockers in London is still only £11 1s. 8d. a week—and timework is based on this and not £16. So if a docker does not make much on piecework, his earnings off his own bat can

still fall below £16, even with two nights' overtime. Then it is made up to £16—as it would have been if he had not worked overtime at all. The dockers' day is from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. or 7 p.m.

So it can be seen the demands of dockers in London and Liverpool are not unreasonable—and the employers' spokesman has admitted the employers can afford them. Mr. Lindsay Alexander (Chairman of the Liverpool employers) said: 'The strike could always be ended by giving the strikers what they want. But we do not believe this would either be responsible or in the national interest. It does not seem proper therefore that allegations of irresponsibility should be against the employers.' This of course is a matter of opinion. It has been widely publicised that £100m. of exports are being held up and Mr. Anthony Cayzer (President of the United Kingdom Chamber of Shipping) has claimed the shipowners are losing millions of pounds. All for the sake of about £9,000 a week. The employers are saving more than that in London alone thanks to Mr. Gunter's refusal to let them pay an extra £1 a week. And if they are losing millions of pounds of profit, as Mr. Cayzer says, £9,000 would not make a very big hole in them.

So little is at stake for the employers compared with what they can afford that it seems ridiculous for them to accuse the men of disregarding the national interest. The employers are obviously putting their self-interest above the nation's, just like everybody else.

As it is they are capitalising on the unpopularity of the dockers caused by the accusations of 'red plots' and 'disregarding the national interest' (and the way it is hitting workers in textiles industries through lack of raw materials) to try and get them firmly under the heel when they do return to work.

Mr. G. E. Toye (Chairman of the National Association of Port Employers)

Continued on page 7

G.G.

October 1917—NO REVOLUTION AT ALL

This is the fiftieth anniversary of the 'Great October Socialist Revolution', which did not happen in October, and was not great or socialist or a revolution. On November 7 (October 25 in the old Julian calendar still used in Russia), 1917, the Bolsheviks began the counter-revolution by seizing power in Petrograd (then the capital, formerly called St. Petersburg, now Leningrad). How did this happen, and what was the result?

IN MARCH 1917, the February Revolution took place in Petrograd. Mass demonstrations on March 8 were followed by a general strike on March 10 and the fraternisation of the garrison with the demonstrators on March 12. The Tsar abdicated on March 15, and a Provisional Government was set up by the bourgeois politicians to stop things going any further.

The February Revolution was popular in both senses; it was made by the people of Petrograd, and it was welcomed by the people of Russia. The left-wing parties—Social-Revolutionaries (peasant socialists) and Social-Democrats, split between Mensheviks and Bolsheviks (moderate and extreme Marxist socialists)—and the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists not only did not begin the Revolution but were surprised when it happened.

The February Revolution was also libertarian. The important point was the destruction of the old regime rather than the establishment of a new one. Even before the bourgeois politicians had set up the Provisional Government, the workers and soldiers of Petrograd set up their own Council (*Soviet*, in Russian), and this example was followed all over Russia. The Provisional Government had official power, but it could do nothing without the Soviets.

Things went further. During the February Revolution, police stations were burnt and prisons were opened, and immediately after it a social revolution began, just as it had been described by anarchist writers for half a century. While the politicians quarrelled about what to do, the people did it. The factories were seized by the workers, and put either under the supervision or into the control of workers' committees. The land was seized by the peasants, and either divided among individual proprietors or put into the control of peasant communes. Production, distribution and exchange were in many places taken out of private hands, and put into the control of co-operatives. The army, which was mostly composed of peasant conscripts, was deserted by the soldiers, who carried out the greatest mutiny in history and returned to their homes and the revolution.

The liberals who led the Provisional Government did their best to prevent this revolution. Most of the left-wing parties supported the Provisional Government, even though they obstructed it through the Soviets, and therefore helped to obstruct the social revolution as well. The anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists hoped that the Provisional Government would go the way of the Tsarist regime, and in the meantime they worked for the social revolution. So did some left-wing Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and, after a time, the Bolsheviks.

LENIN'S RETURN

The Bolsheviks had supported the Provisional Government at first. But when their leader, Lenin, returned to Russia in April 1917, he quickly convinced them that the replacement of the Tsarist regime by the Provisional Government should be followed by the replacement of this bourgeois regime by the dictatorship of the proletariat—and not after a long interval, as in orthodox Marxist theory, but at once. In practice, this dictatorship of the proletariat would of course be the dictatorship of the Bolsheviks, though it was to be exercised through the spontaneous organs of the proletariat, the Soviets. The Soviets were dominated by the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks were not strong enough to seize power yet. They therefore prepared at the same time to win over the Soviets and to take over the state.

The Bolsheviks therefore adopted demagogic policies in order to gain the popularity which would enable them to win majorities in the Soviets and to obtain acquiescence in their seizure of power. They supported the workers who took over the factories and the peasants who took over the land; they supported the soldiers who took over their units or deserted the front; they supported the whole social revolution. These policies brought them close to the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists, as well as the Left Social-Revolutionaries, but the difference was that they supported the social revolution not as the last step but as a step on the path to political revolution.

One of the main reasons for the growing popularity of the Bolsheviks was their opposition to the war. Because of this the German government had given them money, and had also helped Lenin and other leaders cross Germany to Russia. It was the Provisional Government's attempt to continue the war which sealed its fate. In July an unsuccessful offensive on the German front led to an unsuccessful left-wing rising in Petrograd; the time was not yet ripe.

In September an unsuccessful right-wing *putsch* by General Kornilov led to a left-wing reaction, and the Bolsheviks won majorities in the Petrograd Soviet and then in other key Soviets. In October Trotsky became the chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, and a Military Revolutionary Committee of the Soviet was set up under him—and therefore in the control of the Bolsheviks.

In November the Bolsheviks decided that the time was ripe, and on November 7 the Military Revolutionary Committee overthrew the Provisional Government in Petrograd. This was not

COMMUNISTS CRUSH OPPOSITION

Once the Communists (as the Bolsheviks now called themselves) had got power, they crushed every other political organisation in Russia. They began with the Liberals and Right Social-Revolutionaries, and continued with the Mensheviks and Left Social-Revolutionaries. At the same time, the state, which had been taken over by the Communists, took over the economy. Workers' committees were forced into the trade unions, and the trade unions were subordinated to the state. Peasant communes were subverted by poor peasants' committees, and the poor peasants' committees were subordinated to the state. The Imperial Army was replaced by the Red Army. The *Okhrana* was replaced by the *Cheka*.

The Constituent Assembly, which had been intended to settle the political future of the country, was the result of the first (and last) more or less free election in Russian history, but when it met in January 1918 it was forcibly dispersed by the government. The reason was simple. The Bolsheviks had received only a quarter of the votes, and a clear majority had been won by the Social-Revolutionaries. No wonder that in the Civil War of 1918-1920 the Communists were fought not only by foreign interventionists and reactionary 'whites', but by liberals, socialists and anarchists as well.

The anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists, who had taken an active part in the social revolution of 1917, were the first group on the extreme left to be destroyed by the Communists, beginning when their Moscow headquarters was attacked by the *Cheka* in April 1918. When the anarchist army of Nestor Makhno finally defeated the Whites in the Ukraine in November 1920, it was immediately attacked by the Red Army under Trotsky's direct command, and the libertarian republic which had been established under Makhno's protection was wiped out.

Peter Kropotkin, who had returned to



Petrograd in the Early Days

PURGES

But appetite grows with eating, and in the absence of any other victims the Communists began to persecute Communists. First the leaders turned against dissident groups in the Party, such as the Workers' Opposition and the Democratic Centralists. Then, after Lenin died in 1924, the leaders turned against each other. Stalin, Kamenev and Zinoviev drove out Trotsky; Stalin, Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy drove out Kamenev and Zinoviev; Stalin drove out Bukharin, Rykov and Tomsy; then there was one.

When Stalin became supreme, in 1929, the Communist tyranny became worse than the Tsarist tyranny. The five-year plans meant the forcible industrialisation of the Russian economy, and the forcible collectivisation of Russian agriculture. No one knows how many people died in this process, but they are counted in millions.

The Communists set up labour camps, concentration camps and even death camps in Russia before the Nazis in Germany. The first known death camp, at Kholmogor near Archangel, began in 1921—under Lenin. (It was pointing this out that first got Mihajlo Mihajlov into trouble in Yugoslavia in 1965.) During the 1930s, the Moscow Trials disposed of most of the Communist leaders still living in Russia who had taken part in the Revolution, and the accompanying purges kept the camps full. No one knows how many were imprisoned, but they too are counted in millions—and thousands of them, like Lara in *Doctor Zhivago*, 'died or vanished somewhere, forgotten, as a nameless number on a list which was later lost'.

The Communists talked a lot about the threat of Fascism, but they betrayed the socialists and anarchists who fought Fascism in Spain, and in August 1939 Stalin actually made an alliance with Hitler. At the beginning of the last War, Russia helped Germany to conquer Poland, went on to conquer Bessarabia, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and tried to conquer Finland. At the end of the War, when Germany was defeated as a result of attacking Russia, Russia took the rest of Poland, half of Germany and Austria, and the whole of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Yugoslavia. Lenin had called imperialism the last stage of capitalism, but 20 years after his death the greatest imperialist power in the world was Communist Russia. In 1949 Russia became the second country to make and test the Bomb.

Everyone knows that things are better since Stalin died in 1953—but how much better are they really? The Russian empire is a bit smaller than it was, and so is the Russian army, but Russia is still the second military power in the world. Russian soldiers smashed the East

German rising in June 1953 and the Hungarian rising in November 1956, and they would do the same again if the need arose. Communists support disarmament by the West, but Russia still has the Bomb—the 'Workers' Bomb'—and exploded the biggest one ever in October 1961. Russia is one of the few countries which has universal conscription (with no provision for conscientious objectors).

The Communist Party is still the only political organisation allowed in Russia, as in all Communist countries—including Yugoslavia. There are still no free elections, and the Soviets still have no power. There are still no free trade unions, and in the workers' paradise strikes are illegal. The peasants are still serfs, for they are tied to the land and may not leave their farms or villages without official permission. All Russians must carry identity papers, and may not leave the country without official permission. There is still strict censorship, and nothing may be printed without official permission. Writers who defy the censorship are at best ostracised (like Pasternak) or exiled (like Tarsis), at worst put in lunatic asylums (like Yessenin-Volpin) or labour camps (like Sinyavski and Daniel).

WHAT WE NEED TO TELL PEOPLE

Russia is one of the greatest countries in the world, but also one of the greatest tyrannies. When we are asked to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Russian Revolution let us remember that it destroyed one tyranny only to put another in its place, and let us remember the revolution which tried to destroy tyranny altogether. Let us celebrate the fiftieth anniversary not of the successful *coup d'état* of the Russian Communists, but of the unsuccessful social revolution of the Russian people. And let us look forward to the day when we can celebrate a successful social revolution in Russia.

In the meantime let us learn the necessary lessons from what happened in Russia 50 years ago. We don't need to tell anyone about Stalin any more, since his own friends have already told everyone. But we still need to tell people about Trotsky, who gave the orders for the Bolshevik *coup d'état* and later gave the orders for the attacks on Makhno and on Kronstadt. And we also need to tell people about Lenin, who lied to the Russian people and established the Bolshevik dictatorship, censorship, *Cheka*, death camps and all. And we need to tell people about the Communists, who in Russia and every other country have done what Bakunin said they would do a century ago—worked for a revolution which would (and could) only lead to their own dictatorship, a revolution which was no revolution at all.

N.W.

BETRAYERS OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION



Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Molotov, Bukharin and Beria

great—it was a petty battle for power. It was not socialist—the Soviets exercised no more power than before, and they soon exercised less; the socialist decrees which the Bolsheviks issued after seizing power simply confirmed the social revolution which had already taken place, and they were soon changed. And it was not a revolution—the new government, the Council of People's Commissars, which was set up on November 8, was entirely composed of Bolsheviks, and soon this one-party government became a one-party dictatorship; it was a counter-revolution.

When the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks left the Soviet Congress in protest against the Bolshevik *coup d'état* they were consigned to 'the dustbin of history' by Trotsky (who later joined them there). Many anarchists had believed that the Bolsheviks were sincere when they opposed the Provisional Government in the name of the social revolution, some had helped them overthrow the Provisional Government, and a few went on trusting them to the bitter end. But Kropotkin, who had been so wrong about the war, was right about what happened on November 7. 'This buries the revolution,' he said. And it did.

Russia after 40 years of exile to support the Revolution, died under virtual house arrest in February 1921; his funeral in Moscow marked the last anarchist demonstration in Russia. Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, who had been deported from the United States for their revolutionary activity in December 1919, had to leave their native land for the same reason in December 1921. Some anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists were released from prison at the insistence of foreign trade unionists, but they were the lucky ones. The survivors of the once great Russian anarchist movement died in exile, or disappeared in the great purges of the 1930s.

The final victory of the Communists was celebrated in March 1921, when the Kronstadt rising was drowned in blood by the Red Army under Trotsky's direct command. The Kronstadt rebels had called for power to be restored to the Soviets, for land to be restored to the peasants, for factories to be restored to the workers, for the political prisoners to be released, for freedom of speech and assembly—for socialism. After Kronstadt there was no excuse for not knowing what Communism meant. After Kronstadt there was no challenge to the Communist regime.

FREEDOM IS NOT A GIFT FROM CAPTAIN FINK

THE HIPPIES have become victims of their own ideology. In their rejection of the grand spectacle — Hollywood/Madison Avenue/America — they have accepted a spectacle no less destructive, one which substitutes synthetic play for real life, while at the same time they have become tools of those against whom they have supposedly rebelled. They have been added to the rostrum of 'stars' who entertain the corpse of the bourgeoisie, a corpse which seeks to remake the world in its own image.

Baby, you haven't dropped out—you've been forced out because this goddamn system is rotten. But what they will never allow is for us to remake our lives, because that will signal their end: they must instead attempt to either recoup

our revolt by making it into a spectacle which reaffirms their vitality while it drains ours or they will seek to crush us. And we must fight either. The one by refusing to 'play their games' while real life is denied, the other by open struggle. 'If they want to play Nazis, we ain't going to play Jews.' And so our struggle crosses that of the blacks and together we can tear this shit down.

The American Indian was forced onto reservations (concentration camps); he did not retire there to smoke and groove. Life cannot be limited to a 'reserve' specified by those who seek to control us. We must decide where and when we will live, play or die, otherwise our freedom is a lie.

New York

BLACK MASK.

BLACK POWER OR COLOUR BLINDNESS

DETROIT TODAY, London tomorrow—is this the slogan we are increasingly to hear from the radical Negro leaders, the Stokeley Carmichaels and their English followers? Already we have Michael de Freitas (*alias* this, that, and the other) attacking the 'white' majority in England in terms usually employed by racialists about 'coloured' people. The radicals are not simply changing their means; their ends have changed too. They are, they tell us, not interested in civil rights, in racial equality, in integration. They reject 'white society', and claim variously to hate and despise the 'whitey'. In the United States, the Black Muslims form an internally coherent sub-culture, in which exogamy, for instance, is regarded with horror.

With this rejection of a society that has done so much to injure and insult the Negro (or Afro-American, to use the preferred—and more consistent—term), we can have a certain sympathy; nevertheless, the more human vision is that of a world without 'race', not one divided by a system of voluntary *apartheid*, with each group sealed off from, and despising, the other. In the United States, there has been at least multi-racialism, at most coalescence, between Slavs and Latins and Nordics; from this, Afro-Americans have been largely excluded. Can the situation in England of at least multi-racialism, at most coalescence, between Gael and Celt and Saxon, come to include the new wave of settlers of non-European stock? No one regards the term 'black-haired British' as one denoting a category of the population, or indeed as having any real meaning. Will the term 'black-skinned British' become similarly absurd?

That this is a more desirable state of affairs than *apartheid*, few readers of this journal will surely doubt. Mr. MacInnes will, perhaps, raise his usual point about how nasty it would be to see all those jolly West Indians becoming staid, 9-5 Englishmen, but if this is what any of them should want, it is not for us to play 'Darkies, sing a song ob de old plantation'.

How is integration to be achieved? Well, of course, we can wait for The Revolution, but 'pie in the sky by and by' has never been much use to those who are hungry here and now. Or we can start The Revolution (or 'insurrectionism') as Mr. Meltzer calls it in *Anarchy* 59: The White Problem—any volunteers? Or we can try to achieve our end by working for integration, by trying to break the barriers that divide the host from the immigrant communities. Not all of these barriers are inherent in our socio-economic state; some can be removed without having to take on the larger, and slightly unrealistic task of scrapping the constitution of England and starting again. And, *pro tanto*, we will have created a more pleasant place to live in.

Voluntary Groups

Efforts to attain this are increasing; the end is regarded as desirable by people of all shades of opinion (and, without more, I am not prepared to question their sincerity merely because they do not fall in under the black and red banner). Up and down the country are appearing local, voluntary, race relations groups such as the Islington Friendship Council, the Oxford Committee for Racial Integration and the Camden Committee for Community Relations. Their efficacy in removing tension and promoting integration in their areas depends *a priori* on their approach and structure, *a posteriori* on their personnel; those who support their aims, and have definite views about means, might do well to join them, or at least set up ones of their own if the existing ones are too far gone in bureaucracy. If Camden is typical, however, the prevailing spirit is that of inquiry, not pontification. (Mr. MacInnes, again, has written (*Encounter*, September 1967) that the Negro struggle is only for Negroes; cannot one say that the human problem is for humans? In any case, Mr. MacInnes does see a rôle for the white integrationist in fighting the white racist—but is this not what the Negro is doing? Mr. MacInnes' usual lucidity of thought here seems to desert him. Moreover, he is talking about the United States; here, the situation is not really 'whites v. coloureds' (as my school football notice board used to say), but newcomers (Irish and Cypriots as well as West Indian and Indo-Pakistani) and established residents—though of course racial overtones do appear.)

On the national, and more remote, level are organizations like the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination (CARD) and the National Committee for Com-

monwealth Immigrants (Nicky) (*pace*, Mr. Meltzer, who apparently would like to see them called by offensive names like 'Society for the Poor Blacks'—*Anarchy* 59, p. 4). More powerful are the Race Relations Board, and, yes, the Government. Politicians, like the rest of the country, have divided on the 'immigration question', the 'colour problem'. Some have followed a consistently racist line, like the noxious Sir Cyril Osborne; others, perhaps not personally racist, have exploited the situation for grubby political ends—the Conservative campaign in Smethwick in 1964 being the *locus classicus*. Others again have avowed that racial discrimination is 'a blot on our national life' (the Home Secretary, quoted in the *Sunday Times* newspaper, 14.5.67).

'Mr. Jenkins is prepared to try to "outlaw" discrimination—hurray!—by legislation—oh!' This, I think, is roughly the reaction of anarchists who dislike legislation and Government activity *per se*, and of the Right, which dislikes this particular piece of proposed legislation. 'Freedom to discriminate' is, however, a rather tawdry freedom, to say the least; one we can well do without, like the freedom to rape schoolgirls. If, as a result of legislation, people are going to have jobs, houses and credit facilities where they did not before, it does not lie well in the mouths of those who have never suffered discrimination to complain.

Racial Equality

The Fabian Society has published a pamphlet edited by Anthony Lester, of CARD and Nicky, and Nicholas Deakin, of the Institute of Race Relations, the recommendations of which seem likely to be adopted by the Government with a speed that would have bewildered Shaw, the Webbs, Bland and the other original Fabian essayists (*Policies for Racial Equality*, Fabian Research Series 262, 4s. 6d.). In common with them, I suggest that the cause of racial integration can be furthered by Government pressure, or, as the editors put it 'There is very little time left to shape the future of race relations in Britain. . . . There will never be another period in which the situation will be as capable of being influenced by positive government action.' The pamphlet suggests what that action might be. There are two approaches to criticism; in the first, that legislation can only be mischievous, exacerbating the situation, I have never been able to find any force; the second, that legislation cannot be more than one factor in society's attempt to be free from racialism, is my adopted one. I am also of the opinion that it is my brother, and not the Government, that is my brother's keeper, and I, not the Government, who must be my brother's helper.

The first essay in the pamphlet merely gives the background to, and some statistics of, the present communal constitution of the country; the student would, however, be well advised to prefer the excellent little compilation *Colour in Britain* (BBC Publications, 8s.). Next, Mr. Lester puts a case for legislation that anti-Parliamentarians would take issue with. Thus, he writes 'The voluntary approach, unaided by Government intervention, has been tried and found wanting. . . . Law encourages voluntary action.' It is true that the voluntary bodies have felt hampered by the ability of discriminators at the end of the day to snap their fingers at conciliation efforts: it is also true that employment patterns in the United States and Canada have been affected by legislation. Be that as it may, the denigration of the work of the voluntary bodies is misplaced, and those of them that see the path to racial equality lying, not in 'doing good works for the blacks', but in involving newcomer and native in community life, have a continuing rôle. Legislation, by removing race relations from the voluntary to the official sector, could discourage the former, and a fine movement would die out. It must be pointed out, however, that these bodies, without exception of which I have knowledge, favour anti-discrimination legislation, both to strengthen their hands and to reassure the immigrant communities that they are not being left to the wolves—or, at any rate, to those wolves who wear black shirts.

The legislation advocated by Mr. Lester, by the local bodies and by such people as Professor Marshall of Sheffield (article in the forthcoming issue of the *CCCR Bulletin*), has its emphasis on conciliation, not punishment. It is designed to create the mechanism for resolving disputes, and as such is, I believe, something new in legal practice. 'The law,' says Mr. Lester, himself a

barrister, 'should attempt to alter conduct, not to punish.' Penologists, of course, have been urging this for years; the Race Relations Act 1964 accepted it, and new legislation will certainly follow it. Making discrimination something between a crime and a tort is an interesting innovation, and one wonders if it will be adopted in other spheres.

Mr. Lester acknowledges that 'legislation is only the first step in promoting racial equality'. Actually, it comes rather late, but if, with non-discriminatory clauses in Government contracts, it represents what may be termed a turning of the public face against discrimination, and if it does indeed help discrimination on its way to becoming a hole-and-corner thing, practised secretly and furtively, at the last to be terminated by public disgust, then I shall have no quarrel with it.

Of course, we know that it would indeed be a remarkable law that achieved this, for though it might sap or even end racially discriminatory practices, it could not end racial prejudice, the disease of which discrimination is the pimply symptom. How can prejudice be ended, short of lobotomy? It is beyond the scope of this pamphlet to study the source of prejudice. Philip Ward in *Anarchy* 59 makes some contribution to this, but one really has to turn to the works of Drs. Storr and Stafford-Clark for the psychology of it—otherwise, how can one relate an understandable, but illogical, fear of economic competition, as propounded by C. H. Pearson in *National Life and Character* (1892), one of the earliest works on racialism, to dislike of somebody for the degree of melanin in his pigmentation? For those, and they exist, who feel a physical repulsion toward 'coloured' people, no solution lies outside Harley Street.

General Recognition

The next category, those who repeat racist nonsense parrot-fashion, and who are often 'cured' simply by meeting the objects of their dislike, is numerically greater. Only a general recognition of the human dignity of non-Europeans—or of non-English—can resolve this. The average Englishman is chronically prejudiced, against the Scot and Frenchman, when not against the Jamaican or Pakistani. His insularity is a national joke; foreigners with comic accents are always good for a music-hall laugh. The nineteenth century has had no longer-lasting legacy than this. Time is probably the only thing that can change it, as increasing mobility of population, as workers or travellers, scrambles mankind into a more coherent omelette.

Another factor is the anglicization of immigrants, or their descendants, which is as inevitable as the anglicization of the French Huguenot and Russian and German Jewish settlers, and which ought to go hand in hand with an increase in cosmopolitanism in the community at large. How many people (to take a superficial instance) today eat food which they regard as being ordinary English fare, but has in fact been introduced by immigrants? Tomorrow, baklava may be as 'English' as porridge.

The parents and children of the host society are as much in need of education as the immigrants, writes Mr. Bell, of the University of Lancaster, in the fourth essay in the pamphlet, on education. Unfortunately, this is not an aspect upon which he dilates. Of course, villagers from the back hills beyond Rawalpindi, cane-cutters from St. Kitts, goatherds from the Trouous, are sadly ill-adapted to the sophisticated urban civilization that dominates in England. They need help too in learning to live with the English. But we need help in our acceptance of them and our appreciation of what their different cultures

can contribute to ours, be it the Negro Theatre Workshop or curry; and this is more important than their learning how to furl umbrellas correctly. This aspect of integration, its being a two-way process, is sadly overlooked by the Fabians; one would like it not to be overlooked elsewhere.

Jack Jones, of that same TGWU that was 'neutral' in the recent dispute between a would-be turban-wearing Sikh 'bus conductor and his employers, next outlines how it can be difficult for anyone, let alone 'coloured' people, to get into, e.g., the London docks; deplores the closed apprenticeship system; and goes on to state that 'The outstanding need is for individual unions, the TUC, employers' federations, and the CBI, to take a firmer stand on the fair treatment of the immigrant worker'. As the Iron Duke said, 'If you can believe that, you can believe anything.' Even Mr. Jones seems to find his Utopianism a bit far-fetched, for he says later that, as a suggestion, it is no substitute for legislation—which the TUC opposes. I fear I can make nothing of all this.

Language Groups

Getting people employed is not the same as getting them promoted, nor is it the same as integrating them with the work-force as a whole. Non-English-speaking gangs under an English speaker of their own language group are perhaps inevitable, short of compulsory language classes (quite impracticable); it does mean that greater efforts are needed from shop stewards to get them as effective trade union members. The danger otherwise is that in any industrial dispute, either section may not be supported by the other. On the whole, English labour has not been undercut by immigrant labour, whether Polish, Hungarian or Commonwealth, but only effective integration on the shop floor can continue to ensure this. Solidarity at work may be one of the biggest factors in integration afterwards; integration afterwards is necessary to maintain solidarity at work. Neither Mr. Jones nor Mr. Hepple, of the University of Nottingham, who also write here on employment, touches on this: perhaps not surprisingly.

Housing is even more fundamental a need than work, and in this sphere the immigrant has all the problems of the native with additional ones of his own. Legislation here would not create a 'privileged class', merely by removing a disability, and those who see legislation as perhaps exacerbating racial tensions should, as Mr. MacInnes indicates, get on with the job of drawing the teeth of the white racialists. In the pamphlet, Professor Rex gives a digest of the views he expounds eloquently and at greater length elsewhere, while Mr. Warren Evans, also of CARD and Nicky, gives an answer dear to syndicalist hearts: Organize. Tenants' and housing associations are vitally necessary, for it would be unrealistic to look to housing authorities to make special provision for immigrants when they are sensitive to 'English first' cries. Voluntary associations may also be able to acquire special accommodation where needed, e.g. homes more suitable to the social pattern of the 'extended family' than the decayed dwellings of the Victorian bourgeoisie. In this way a valuable social concept could be preserved.

The Camden Committee for Community Relations does sponsor a housing association; it is up to other organizations to do the same. Even if we follow American example and burn down our slums, which may be no bad thing, housing has still to be provided for those displaced, and this is a bit more difficult. Arson is not, however, advocated by the Fabians, and I am

sufficiently old-fashioned to advocate violence as a last, and not as a first, resort.

Mr. Warren Evans also has a list of other palliatives, like cheap mortgages, but these anyway are a national, not just a sectional, need.

Finally, Dipak Nandy, of the University of Kent and CARD, pertinently inquires 'Why should they conform?', and wonders if 'what [the immigrant] is asked to put up with is humanly worth putting up with'. Much of the English way of life is rather appalling, though it is as well to remember that even our ghastliest social moeurs (gin and Jaguar, or what you will) are voluntarily adopted by their practitioners. Those who reject them can help in several ways to change, whether through the agency of the anarchist movement or the Council for the Preservation of Rural England! Or, more to the point, by benefiting from the diversity of cultures at present in England. Yet it is to be supposed that there are Chinese and Turks and Tamils who cherish a wish to become suburban Englishmen; certainly for their grandchildren, it would be rather an affectation to be anything other than English (witness, again, the descendants of earlier arrivals from Holland, France, Russia, etc.). It is hardly for us, as I have indicated, to try and 'protect' immigrants from the Saturday car-washing parade or from becoming policemen or magistrates or burglars or beefeaters: it is too much like trying to preserve the noble savage. Yet conformism, like non-conformism, must be the choice of the individual (even if we think it the wrong choice); what is intolerable is the concept of 'educating' 'them' to be like 'us'. Actually, most of those despised liberals are liberal enough to be aware of this, and if the *desiderandum* is a cosmopolitan society, tolerant not because it is uniform but because it is diverse, its advocates are more to be found in the 'liberal' ranks than in those of radical movements that are exclusively Negro.

No Despair

'We have a duty,' says Mr. Nandy, 'to be pessimistic, for an illusion of competence is, in the long run, costlier and more dangerous than simple incompetence.' To doubt one's competence is perhaps the best spur to greater activity, but pessimism sometimes leads to giving up in despair. The contributors to this pamphlet do not despair, but, for all their assertions of the need for individual action, place a rather naive reliance on action by official bodies—the TUC, the CBI, the council, the Government. Should these bodies indeed adopt the policies outlined, things might turn out well, but meanwhile the best people to work for good race relations are those with the most at stake: the immigrants themselves, and those in sympathy with them as a matter of personal conviction rather than of administrative necessity.

D.C.R.

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



U.S. - Two Letters in Search of a Movement

I WROTE the article 'Anarchism in North America Today' from what contacts I have made and the information I have collected. It is, I know, by no means complete nor correct in all its estimates and analyses. But no one else was apparently ready to light the fuse. I hope to stimulate replies from you. I am not prepared to act as a one man North American correspondence clearing house and information bureau but I can return acknowledgements, collect lists of names and addresses (is it all right if I list yours on a mimeograph list to be sent to other comrades, or not?) and turn it over to the group which is strong enough to undertake such a task (who volunteers?).

I hope that, out of the general interchange that may develop, correspondence will be supplemented by personal meetings and eventual regional and even continental conferences. Some of this may lead to one or more ad hoc committees, federations, and central service-exchange bureaux, a loose structure that might support some publishing activities for instance.

Incidentally my opinion on the proposed international conference is against an international federation of national federations. Since when are anarchists bound within the chains of 'their' nation states? In North America the ethnic national question is very confused. Even the very establishment, recent New Politics conference here made room for individual as well as group participation and voting. Would Anarchists do less?

But back to the main topic. If we are interested in anarchism, the radical analysis and revolutionary change of society toward anarchy, then we should want to see a movement with some content emerge to combat not just the present system and its war state but offer libertarian alternatives and public education in the general market-place of revolutionary activity. The centralist authoritarians among revolutionaries have walked off with the prize, that is the potentially free society, and counter-revolutionized it enough times.

At least one (indeed many) conscious and specifically anarchist, widely circulated periodical is needed here, as are bookshops, meeting-contact centres in the major cities, publishing centres and all which can give a general comradeship consciousness to all the scattered groups, communities, tendencies and isolated people; a fraternity in struggle and general mutual aid in activity. It's up to us.

Your fraternally,
ED STRAUSS.

R.D.2 Woodstock,
Vermont 05091

II

WHEN confronted for the first time with the history of Anarchism in America, the young activist is usually somewhat disturbed to realize that it tends to be an apocalyptic accretion to a series of blatant atrocities (and I use that word in the full sense of its meaning): the killing of the Anarchists after the Haymarket Affair, the newspaper campaigns of vilification against Johann Most, the manipulation of the McKinley Assassination by Teddy Roosevelt in order to create a Calvinist-Capitalist stereotype of Anarchists as diabolic entities (a stereotype which survives in healthy vigour and vulgarity throughout American society today), the brutal and illegal deportation of Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman, and scores of other Anarchist activists, and the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti, etc., etc.

Now, obviously, any social movement inflicted and paralyzed by such atrocities is in danger of producing a considerable psychological reaction: 'social paranoia' (i.e., the creation of introverted, sado-masochistic communities of the

faithful who are primarily concerned with memories and moralism and quite definitely will not make any attempt to influence or change their larger socio-economic environment through direct action). Unfortunately, this is exactly what happened.

The trial of Sacco and Vanzetti provided the final mumbled bead of that rosary of apocalypse: many of the Anarchists were so horrified at this ultimate atrocity on the part of the State that they could not even bring themselves to continue the defence campaign. They resigned themselves to quietism. With the possible but pallid exceptions of Felicani, Hennacy, etc., the past few decades have not witnessed an activist Anarchist Movement of any importance in this country.

There is a slogan still muttered with slobbering regularity by Stalinists and Trotskyists in America: 'the Anarchists are the moralists of the Left'. I do not wish to deprecate the fact that Anarchism does provide a powerful perspective on moral issues in social action (which Trotskyism and Stalinism do not); but, even so, the historical sado-masochistic withdrawal from 'a programme of thoughtful action' (and an activist commitment to it) on the part of our antecedents (who were more interested in an intellectual ethical elitism) has created several serious problems for the American Anarchist Movement today: (1) a prevalent assumption (with many Anarchists) that Anarchists actually are the violent, diabolic entities of the Calvinist-

Capitalist stereotype and that, consequently, it is useless to be concerned with any positive aspects of libertarian theory . . . or any theory at all; (2) a prevalent assumption (with many Anarchists) that Anarchism is merely a doctrine of personalizing ethics and does not actually provide an alternative to the horrors of Capitalism and the State; and (3) a prevalent assumption (with many Anarchists) that, because (1) and (2) are true, there is no purpose in having a cohesive movement and no reason to support any libertarian publications.

These attitudes are not only suicidal and impractical, they are based only on illusions and stimulated only by the dead hand of the past. But, during the last year, these assumptions have come into open conflict with the unbridled activism of some of the younger Anarchists and have generally had a corroding influence: (1) I have met several wandering preachers of total violence, hatred, and nihilism who spend most of their time writing impassioned poetry about destruction, dragons, and drugs, and usually disappear when the people are in actualized revolt; (2) there have been at least half a dozen libertarian publications that have collapsed from lack of funds, lack of support, and lack of cohesion in the movement; and (3) the New York Federation of Anarchists, and several other important libertarian groups, have dissolved, it seems, into feuding, unproductive, unco-operative sects. (Why were there only two Anarchist groups listed in the recent

publication by the Central Committee of Correspondence of a mailing list of organizations opposing the war in Vietnam?) The movement is in danger of total disintegration.

The wholly negative quality of the American Anarchist Movement appears to be all the more unfortunate when we realize the extreme potential of revolutionary libertarian ideas in American society today: (1) there is a growing disgust and disillusionment among advocates of black liberation at the voter registration, civil rights legislation, and fake 'non-violent' methods of M. L. King, and the Blanquism and opportunism of Carmichael, Brown, and the Marxists; and (2) there is a growing commitment to resistance and direct action rather than mere dissent by those who oppose the war in Vietnam. The American Anarchist Movement, it appears, could be extraordinarily influential with its socialist, libertarian, direct action, and anti-war ideas . . . provided that it can overcome its nihilistic appearance and general disintegration.

I am convinced that something must be done. It would be futile, however, to propose another publication. It would be equally futile to confine ourselves to expediency and elitism. We must begin at the beginning. After discussing these problems with Anarchists in Minnesota, I have decided to convene a continental, libertarian, membership organization to be called Insurgency Anarchist Association. It will have three functions: (1) the formation of an adequate mailing list of Anar-

chists in North America; (2) the collection of funds to support a future Anarchist publication (something like FREEDOM) in America; and (3) the production and distribution of occasional pamphlets of interest to Anarchists in America.

Insurgency Anarchist Association will not initiate action nor pontificate on theory; it will not interfere in the life of any group or federation concerned with theory or action. Its only purpose will be to develop an extensive perspective toward the multiplication of Anarchist propaganda in America. It will exist as a service organization (membership being required to provide financial solvency and the involvement of isolated comrades). Participatory democracy and the federalist principle will be the basic guidelines. I shall act as secretary for one year. A Conference (and referendum) of the members will then decide the effectiveness and future of the organization. I am aware of certain disadvantages and dangers in this plan; however, I still believe that, with vigilance and solidarity, it is necessary.

I request that all Anarchists in North America write to me immediately for further information and/or dialogue.

Yours for the Revolution,
JAMES W. CAIN,
Secretary,
Insurgency Anarchist
Association,
323 Fourth Street,
Cloquet, Minnesota,
USA. 55720.

ANARCHISM IN NORTH AMERICA

WHERE IS ANARCHISM in North America? There seems to be a bit here and a bit there, and there does not seem to be much interest or caring of one bit about another. There is little fraternity, mutual aid or self-organizing beyond some isolated groups, no general co-operation or federative activity; at most a much broken web of contacts exists. There is apparently a growing interest in anarchism, especially in the New Left, as witnessed by a number of new books published on anarchism, a short-lived new magazine or two, new groups in several centres but there is no consciousness of a general movement.

It is over a decade now since *Resistance*, the last really creative periodical that bore the anarchist banner, folded. Lately *Views and Comments*, along with its originator, the Libertarian League, has gone the same way. There has recently been a 'Good Soup', some 'Rebel Workers', and even a short-lived anarchist sort-of-bookshop, the 'Torch', in New York. Groups appear and vanish regularly in the metropolitan centres. But there are somewhat stable groups still in existence.

PERIODICALS

There are several periodicals surviving from the heyday of 'foreign' language groups: *L'Adunata Dei Refrattari* (P.O. Box 316, Cooper Station, New York), the long-lived but still quite fresh Italian newspaper, *Die Arbeiter Stimme* (Room 808, 33 Union Square, New York 3, NY), a Yiddish language and introverted journal. There were once Finnish, Spanish and Russian periodicals. Here and there are still local groups of older people from these national traditions.

Among the current English language publications is the newsletter of 'the Seattle Group' (1815 18th Avenue, Seattle, Washington). From New York we have *Black Mask* (P.O. Box 512, Cooper Station, NY), put out by an activist group; *Comment* (P.O. Box 466, Peter Stuyvesant Station, NY), an occasional bulletin; and rumours of another magazine, *The Black Flag* (address same as *Comment*).

There are rumours of something new out of Chicago also. The Industrial Workers of the World (IWW, 2422 Halsted Street, Chicago, Ill.) is still organizing anarcho-syndicalists and publishing monthly the wobbly *Industrial Worker*, which has recently shown some signs of freshening. Some claim *Manas* (P.O. Box 32112, El Sereno Station, Los Angeles, California) for the anarchist camp and there has recently appeared an occasional magazine of a group of intellectuals who have moved from the

old isolationist, libertarian right, to a new general libertarian position. *Left and Right* (Box 395, Cathedral Station, New York).

The School of Living, with its back-to-the-land, decentralist libertarianism, has a centre in Freeland, Maryland, and two publications, *A Way Out* and *The Green Revolution* (Jones' End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio). It has a fairly widespread group of sympathisers.

Finally, among those who would explicitly call themselves anarchists or libertarians, are recently formed groups or concentrations of comradeship individuals in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Seattle, Boston, Toronto, Montreal, Troy (NY), Hanover (NH), Ithaca (NY), Berkeley (Cal.), Cloquet (Minn.) and surely other places. There is one bookstore/book service, and sometimes publishing centre, Solidarity Bookshop at 1644 Meyer Ct., Chicago, Ill.

GROUPS

Among the radical pacifist groups is a consciousness and tendencies which would call themselves anarchist or so mightily fairly be designated. The War Resisters League (WRL, 5 Beekman Street, New York) is the oldest of these. The Committee for Non-Violent Action (CNVA, 5 Beekman Street, New York), which may soon unite with the WRL, publishes the excellent *WIN Peace and Freedom through Non-Violent Action*, which is, I would say, the best anarchoid publication here.

Both of these 'National' groups have a number of local affiliates. 'Liberation' (also 5 Beekman Street, NY) certainly

had anarchist foundations but many would say that many of those have slipped away. The 'Catholic Worker' (175 Christie Street, New York), even though some of the Spanish comrades have doubts, is both Catholic and anarchist (and militant!). Let me not conclude this list without mentioning Paul Goodman who is currently the most famous, but some would say too practical, anarchist personality.

The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS, Room 206, 1608 W. Madison, Chicago, Ill.), a national service organization and a federation of 250 local groups with 30-40 thousand members, has a large and at least a vocally conscious anarchist tendency (happily not a caucus). The SDS itself is based on decentralist, anti-elitist, direct action (participatory democracy), and personalist concepts. It is very broad, also including numerous types of Liberals, Social Democrats, Marxists and general Radicals.

THE HIPPIES

The hippy phenomenon (soon to be re-named or no-named as *Time Magazine* has already co-opted and commercialized the image) presents a sort of multi-hued anarchy, a mixture of individualist and communist schools, all rather consciously inarticulate. This can be as important as much formal anarchism which tends to be political, economic criticism. Hippysm is a kind of social, moral-cultural criticism in action.

There are also several Summerhillian schools and a growing interest in free (free of the state or church) education. The Summerhill Society is at 5 Beekman Street, New York.

Libertarian, Marxist-Humanist, Anarcho-Marxist and Bakuninist ideas in various permutations are found among

several smaller, neo-Trotskyist groups such as 'Facing Reality-Speak Out' (14131 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Michigan), and 'News and Letters' (415 Brainard, Detroit, Michigan). Direct actionism, anti-parliamentarianism and even a certain rebelliousness against 'democratic' centralism is found among Muscovite, Pekinese or Havana CP or Trotskyist-derived groups. In some way the old battles of the First Internationale are being refought. Not a little anarchist recruiting has been done from such groups as these last ones.

BLACK POWER

Within the Black Freedom-Black Power movement are also heavy strains of direct actionism, resistance (violent and otherwise), anti-electionism, all of which are a kind of Fanon-Bakunin re-birth-through-fire phenomenon. Interests in group autonomy, community self-control are mixed with nationalism and even racism. But the whole situation is very confused and supporting blacks against oppression doesn't depend upon their anarchist purity.

Out of the Anti-Vietnam War movement are emerging resistance activities directed against the draft (conscription), tax paying and other forms of anti-statism. These very actions are self-educating and raise much broader questions of the role of the state, legalist politics, etc., in the minds of people new to any kind of social consciousness.

It is among the first-mentioned, more specifically anarchist, publications, groups, tendencies in broader organizations, and scattered individuals (and individualists) that there exists anarchism and even, if still vague, a kind of theoretical-activist movement in North America.

ED STRAUSS.



The Barbican Struggle

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, saw a new phase in the struggle to get the six Myton stewards their jobs back on the Barbican site. Failure to get the site open by any other means led to the police being called in to escort the 'scabs' onto the site. This is the extent to which the authorities were willing to go in order to succeed in their object. On that morning, the Myton picket line had been reinforced by workers from the Turriff site, who had been sacked the previous Friday for leaving early to join the same picket, and men from Laings. During the weekend 100 police had been on duty round the site and this number was more than doubled on the Monday.

Four pickets were arrested in the morning when two vans brought in about 14 'scabs', but it was in the afternoon when the pickets were marching back from a meeting, at which proposals for a settlement had been agreed upon, that the police finally took off the kid gloves

Contact Column

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

Concert in aid of Greek (and English) political prisoners. November 2, 3, 4, 7.30 p.m. Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1. Tickets: 10/-, 15/-, 25/-.

Arts Festival anyone? Salford Art Gallery. Provisional date: January 20, 21, 1968. Contact David Stringer, c/o International Centre, 64 George Street, Manchester, 7.

Libertarian Prisoners' Fund. To send money and food to anarchists in prison. Secretary: Stuart Christie (c/o Freedom Press).

Green Revolution? New book, 'Go Ahead and Live!' Tells how. \$4 from The School of Living, Brookville, Ohio 45309.

Work Wanted. 19-year-old male seeks employment. Anything considered. Liberal boss preferred who will allow absences for major demos. Phone Brian at GAL 1130.

International Anarchist Camp 1969. Proposed to hold it in S.E. England—offers of assistance, suggestions for suitable sites to Jim Huggon, 173 Kingshill Avenue, Northolt, Middlesex.

'Save Greece Now' Defence Fund. Donations for Terry, Mike and Del) to Brettia Carthey, 8 Vincent Square Mansions, Walcott Street, London, S.W.1.

Correspondent. Young anarchist wishes to correspond on anarchistic philosophy and principles. J. Weissmiller, 802 W. 12th, Topeka, Kansas 66612, USA.

Pirate Press. In spite of savage sentence passed on Terry Chandler, the Pirate Press is still going, under the management of Mike Seaman and Neill Collins, 116 Whitfield Street, W.1. 01-387 8864.

Going East? Lift offered to young man overland to India-Nepal. Leave UK November 6, 1967. In return share petrol. Apply G. Parker, 2 Talton Road, Wavertree, Liverpool, 15.

Just off the Press. Anthology of protest-poetry by Flemish, Dutch and English poets, with many drawings and photo-collages. 125 pages, only 10/-. To be had from Freedom Bookshop or direct from Gerda Ides, Post Box 772, Haarlem, Holland (send Int. M.O. in latter case). A Dutch anarchist publication.

Books Hand-bound and Engraved to Order. De-luxe Leather Bindings—Mosaics—Full-leather Parchment—Half-leather Bindings. All books hand-sewn and repaired. Designs for Parchments, Mosaics, are original. For further information contact Mr. J. B. Wagner, c/o American Consulate, Calle Serrano 75, Madrid 6, Spain.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

and used their truncheons. The last time they had done this was during the Camden Town rent demonstrations in 1960.

The police waded in and arrested anyone, but they also made certain that they grabbed a number of known militants. Photos in the papers are an indication of the amount of violence used by the police. The *Morning Star* wrote, 'It was not pleasant to see several huge policemen frog-marching a struggling worker into a waiting Black Maria, arm twisted up the back or a forearm round the throat; not pleasant to see a policeman grabbing at a young man's testicles in order to get him off a wall.'

One picket, Dave Leadbetter, had his wrist broken and was taken to hospital. The National Council for Civil Liberties took a statement from him. In all 24 men were arrested, mostly charged falsely with not only insulting behaviour, but assault.

The proposals put forward at the meeting, which were later taken to the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives, were that national union officials should call a meeting of all Myton operatives, that all Myton men should be re-employed, including five plumbers who worked for a sub-contractor, and the six stewards and three steel-fixers, whose sacking started the dispute, be offered employment elsewhere. The Federation's General Secretary, Mr. Weaver, was asked to address the men the next day and give his answers to these proposals.

AID FUND

Mr. Weaver did not turn up the next day and lied when he said that he never received an offer to speak. At a midday mass meeting, pickets did accept certain proposals put forward by stewards representing a number of jobs. The main proposals were that an aid fund should be set up to pay the fines of those arrested and to assist families if any of the men go to prison, and that a demonstration be organised for November 2, when the 24 arrested pickets appear again at Guildhall Magistrates Court.

Lou Lewis, one of the six stewards refused re-employment, said that 'Provocations and attacks by the police make this dispute the property of the Labour Movement of this country', and 'You are a long way from provocation by building workers when you get six coppers on one man'.

The NFBTO condemned the pickets and described the 'scabs' as 'loyal trade unionists'. It seems that the national union officials would rather have these 'scabs' than proper trade union organisation on sites, for following the disbanding of the Works Committee on the Brunel University site, the Federation have done the same on the Turriff site and are also threatening the same action on the Laing job.

The Executive Council of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers has also called upon Lou Lewis and Rolfe Langdon to explain why they are still picketing. The ASW has already expelled them once for this, but they were re-admitted following an appeal. It seems probable that they will be expelled again and that the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers will do the same with Mike Houlihan. The executives of the building trade unions and the Federation will stop at nothing to smash any militant shop stewards. The Federation will probably be setting up an inquiry into the unofficial activities of members of

affiliated unions. The Cameron Report recommended a similar scheme, but the Federation will be 'naming names' and actually keeping a dossier of when and how often members have stepped out of line. The information would then be given to the members' union, who would then either expel or take some disciplinary action.

AGAINST UNION EXECUTIVES

From the moment the Myton men rejected the union-management agreement for the opening of the site in February, the struggle has mainly been against the union executives. The vote taken at that time said that the NFBTO did not represent them. An editorial in the *Guardian* put it plainly: 'To suggest that the NFBTO represents the workers on the Barbican site is like saying that General Chiang Kai-shek governs China.'

Union executives are taking more and more decisions that do not represent the views of their members. To the employers, stewards are a nuisance. They are always interfering in management affairs, but they do bring the grievances of the men before the management. Unlike union officials, if stewards fail to carry out these tasks, they can be easily replaced. With the union officials, they have a real stake in their job, for they do not want to be back on the tools again. They have become detached from the struggles of their members and the agreements they make often go completely against the members' wishes, who are expected to honour them.

Fear is making the union executives and the Federation take these actions. They fear any organised expression of discontent from their members and so they are disbanding the works committees on these sites. This detachment has increased with the Government's wage policies and, at the same time, it has encouraged the managements to be tougher.

The task of getting the six stewards re-employed at Mytons does indeed seem an impossible one. The site is now being prepared for the commencement of building. A labour force is likely to be moved in at any time. The Cameron Report recommended that all of the original labour force, with the exception of the six, should be re-employed. However, certain operatives have not been asked back by Mytons, who are therefore breaking the agreement.

It is essential that the demonstration on November 2 is successful. This dispute is, as Lou Lewis says, 'the property of the Labour Movement', and it should be seen that they are not intimidated by the violence of the police. For it does seem to me that the violence on Monday was a deliberate show of strength against dissident rank-and-file members. It was meant as an example to other workers who are at odds with their executives. Massive support on November 2 is essential, but even this will not get the six stewards back. Support from other industrial workers, over a much longer period, seems to be the only answer if Lou Lewis and the other pickets are going to get back at Mytons.

P.T.

Support Barbican Strikers!
MASS MEETING - November 2
7.30 a.m. onwards - Myton Site
(opposite Aldersgate Tube)

Freedom

For Workers' Control

OCTOBER 28 1967 Vol 28 No 33

SUPPORT FROM PRINTWORKERS

We are printing this leaflet issued by the 'Printworker', which is the publication of the Association of Rank and File Printworkers, because we feel that solidarity extended by other industrial workers will help the Barbican strikers in their struggle.

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16—the Battle of the Barbican! Hundreds of police surrounded Myton's building site on the Barbican to escort scab labour brought in by the employers to break an eleven-months-old dispute. When the scabs and the police escort appeared, the building workers inevitably—and heroically—tried to stop them entering the site.

The police moved in with batons waving. Twenty-four arrests were made. That night the evening papers carried large

NUR CAVE IN

THE DECISION, by 17 votes to 7, of the executive of the National Union of Railwaymen to call off the ban on guards doing second man duties, is a victory for the tough attitude taken by the British Railways Board and the Government. In the past, the NUR executive has managed to wring some small increase out of BR, but all they have got from this is that the Minister of Labour, Mr. Gunter, will chair the meeting between them and the Board.

Mr. Green, the NUR General Secretary, was against the ban in the first place and was all in favour of accepting the findings of the inquiry. His executive thought otherwise, but now, in the face of the threat by Mr. Gunter that the Government would introduce emergency powers (using troops) and the threat of the Board that it would suspend the guaranteed weekly payments to men laid off because of the ban, the executive has thrown in the towel.

Both the Board and the Government have taken a much tougher attitude towards the NUR than they have in the past. For example, the last (and first) time the guaranteed week was suspended was in 1924 during a dock strike. Having succeeded now, it will be so much easier to run the present labour force down, a procedure that the Board thinks is so essential if they are to eliminate their financial losses.

The NUR has really been fighting a losing battle for years now because they have accepted, in principle, the necessity for this run-down. They have never said that they do not accept this and fought for the jobs of their members. Because of this failure, the railwaymen are demoralised and although they have followed their executive, and in some areas taken unofficial action in support of the ban, I doubt if railwaymen will carry on the struggle themselves.

They will, I think, fight further redundancies, but they need support from other transport workers. This will not come about by the action of the union executive, but only by transport workers getting together and working out a joint policy of mutual support if jobs and conditions in either section are threatened.

P.T.

pictures showing building workers being punched, beaten, dragged along the gutters and half-strangled by hordes of burly coppers.

Here was the 'law' in action. The law as it really is. Organised violence in blue uniforms protecting the employers and forcing working-men to accept the employers' terms. That these building workers stood up to this assault and fought back is a fact which should endear them to every trade unionist who is worth his salt.

Now they face charges which could carry prison sentences and/or large fines. They and their families are confronted with real hardship because they have fought to improve their wages and working conditions.

WHAT THE DISPUTE IS ABOUT

Some may ask what has all this got to do with us as printworkers? It's got plenty to do with us. The men at Mytons have been on strike—or been locked out—for eleven months because they have refused to accept the sacking of their elected site stewards following a dispute over a bonus payment.

Despite appeals—and threats—from the employers, from their own Trade Union officials, and from the Government's Court of Inquiry under Lord Cameron, they have refused to go back to work without the men they had elected to be their spokesmen on the job.

They have refused to betray their stewards. This is the very stuff of which good trade unionists are made. This is REAL trade unionism. Without such loyalty the trade union movement is a paper tiger.

WHAT IT MEANS TO US

Where is the FOC who wouldn't want men like the Barbican builders in his Chapel? Men whom he knew would stop work till kingdom come if the employers dared to victimise an elected representative for voicing the demands of the members.

And don't imagine it couldn't happen. Right now the printing industry is involved in a dispute over wages. There is an overtime ban in the provinces. It could lead to lock-outs and attempts could be made by the press barons to sack chapels and recruit scab labour. If this happens wouldn't you get angry? Wouldn't you have a go at the scabs? Wouldn't you expect your members to stand loyally by the elected chapel representatives? Of course you would.

That is what the Barbican workers have done. They have refused to be intimidated. They have stood by their elected stewards.

That is why we in the print must show our appreciation and our solidarity. They didn't leave their stewards in the lurch. We, in our turn, mustn't desert them.

An appeal has been launched to set up a Defence Fund to aid the arrested men and their families. We appeal to all printworkers to give generously to this Fund. There is also to be a mass demonstration in the City on November 2, when the arrested workers appear at the Magistrates Court in the Guildhall.

We urge printworkers—and indeed all workers—to do everything possible to attend this demonstration in support of trade union principles.

It is estimated that £500 will be needed for the men's Defence Fund. Please do all you can to get support in chapels and branches, as well as individual donations, all of which will, we feel sure, hearten the building workers now facing these charges as a result of their solidarity.

Please send your donations, and offers of support to:—

Bro. G. Gordon,
Defence Appeal Secretary,
20 Goldsworthy Gardens,
Silwood Street,
London, S.E.16.