

## 'Two, Three or Many Vietnams'

THIS WEEKEND sees the CND celebrating their sad Easter ceremonial. This year, the slogan is 'Make it One World in Peace'. Alas, it is all too obvious that peace is not yet to be and a world in pieces is a more obvious rejoinder.

When CND first started it was a widely popular movement with a good, valid case which everyone could accept, except the statesmen of the world. It was calling attention to the danger of nuclear weapons. Now even Lord Louis Mountbatten thinks it a not unreasonable idea. When an idea comes to being accepted so generally it is obviously time to move on to something more revolutionary, and even less acceptable. The Committee of 100 tried by means of direct action to galvanize the corpse of

nuclear protest but it never really made it. It left a heritage of anarchist ideas, of direct action, of confrontation with the police which may seem by some to have been squandered by the legates—those newspaper archetypes, the hippies and the student-protesters.

There was one snag, the apparatus—the institution of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament—had been set up and has refused, as institutions do, to die when its mission has been accomplished. Their purpose confused and their personnel changed and discouraged, CND lurched into vague peace-making with forays into opposing the Vietnam war. This made it an easy prey to those political opportunists, be they Maoists, Trotskyists, Sta-

linists, Communists or just Young Liberals who would hitch-hike their way to political power.

Undoubtedly CND contains many sincere idealists, convinced humanitarians, and dedicated pacifists as well as some confused peace-lovers. This 'stage army of the good' is always available to trot or march on to the scene when an expression of the peace-loving democratic will is required.

Vietnam provided the occasion. It became obvious, even to world statesmen, that when nuclear weapons revealed themselves as dangerous toys, only to be kept as threats, and only to be used by accident or under extreme provocation, the only kind of safe war was a war on somebody else's territory. Therefore quite obviously, having regard to the risk involved, it had to be in an underdeveloped country. The puppet-wars of the post-1945 'peace' have all been manipulated by the three great powers, America, Russia and latterly China. They have been wars looking for somewhere to happen.

America and Russia seem to have made their peace largely because they have settled their spheres of influence. Europe for Russia, Asia for America. The balance of power has teetered with the entry of China on to the list of world powers and she, by her possession of a bomb, has qualified for admission to the club. This she has been denied.

The rise of China to revolutionary power, as yet unblemished by the bourgeois compromises of the Russians, has nurtured a new generation of revolutionaries (who look and act suspiciously like the old) who turn to China for example and precept. In their turn they have built up a new Valhalla of revolutionary heroes taking their inspira-

tion from the nationalist guerilla peasant leaders and their 'liberating' missions. Even China's acquisition of the bomb was hailed by Dr. Malcolm Caldwell as 'the peasants' bomb'.

The Vietnam war was diagnosed as 'a struggle for national liberation from American imperialism' and as the heroic fight of the Vietnamese people. Between these upper and nether millstones of the Vietcong and the American advisers, the Vietnamese people have been crushed.

Not that victory came for either side. Now, after licking their wounds, both sides in the Vietnam war have decided that victory is impossible (as with the Korean war) and have decided to move the war into Laos, Cambodia or Thailand—

or perhaps all three.

One of the revolutionary heroes of the left, Che Guevara, said, 'What a luminous, near future would be visible to us if two, three or many Vietnams flourished throughout the world.' He was, of course, welcoming nationalist uprisings as giving opportunities for a communist (people's) revolt. This is, of course, the theory of increasing misery. The vain hope that a revolution will arise out of a war, that a revolutionary government can arise from bourgeois nationalism, or that freedom can arise from any government, come to that.

Che now has the prospect of seeing (from Valhalla) two, three or many Vietnams. Will mankind survive them? JACK ROBINSON.

## Docks: A Lesson to other Workers

DOCKERS IN THE Port of London are enjoying the last laugh. Their 'blackmail' methods paid off and they accepted a vastly improved pay offer by not backing down in the face of opposition from the press and television.

They refused to operate new methods at certain berths which can operate under vastly reduced manning until ALL dockers were guaranteed a security wage.

The employers had tried to split the men by offering much higher wages to the men who operated modern methods but not making any reasonable offer to the others.

The men stuck together and banned any new deals with reduced manning. When Overseas Containers Limited wanted to start their container service to Australia a year ago they were prevented as a result from using Tilbury.

Predictably the employers, television and press squealed 'blackmail' and attacked the dockers for being stubborn, opposing progress and all the usual anti-worker propaganda. When OCL moved their service to Rotterdam and Antwerp it was not them but the workers who were supposed to be unpatriotic and ignoring the national interest.

But the workers stuck to their guns and in under a year the employers have been forced to reluctantly improve their offer tremendously. Less than a year ago they offered the normal docker a basic wage of £21 5s. plus bonus payments tied to productivity which could bring this up to £31 17s. 6d. Last week the dockers accepted a basic of £34 10s., with no strings attached, plus ten shillings for each day worked on the ship (instead of the quay).

It is still not a lot compared with some of the profits being made by the companies that run the container services (P & O Steam Navigation alone made a net profit of £12,642,000 last year and shareholders got a 12 per cent dividend). But it is a lot more than

originally offered.

In fact it was the employers' third 'final' offer.

In return the dockers have agreed to abolish piecework earnings, work a two-shift system and allow far more mobility of labour.

The lessons to other workers, who are probably paid less, are clear. Stick together and don't accept bribes offered to a small percentage of workers, don't be deterred by the biased mass media and ignore the term 'final' offer if it is not good enough.

PORTWORKER.

## In Praise of Anarchy

THROUGHOUT THE WORLD the crisis of authority continues to deepen. American youth dodges the draft in their thousands, while underground papers in the US forces are up in the hundreds. Nanterre is in ferment again, unable to find a dean for its faculty of letters who doesn't demand police protection as a condition for the job! In a dozen British universities and art schools sit-ins, protests, demonstrations, the drive for more say in the running of the universities, continue. London Airport is threatened with complete shutdown as a result of a firemen's strike, while Clive

Jenkins rocks the boat with opposition to airline merger and the people who live around the Airport are planning direct action to prevent Sunday flying, because they are fed up with the noise. Even policemen are demanding a change in the rule that forbids them striking (!), while Catholic priests want release from celibacy and lay Catholics in their millions disobey the Pope on the Pill. When not only students and pupils, but their teachers too take to direct action, it is not surprising that industrial workers are not only pushing up wage claims to highest-ever levels, but are demanding more and more control of their places of work.

### BOSSSES' ALARM

Although this may fall very far short of what anarchists demand, the signs are enough to alarm the bosses. In the House of Commons last Thursday, during the discussion on the new 'controversial' Ports Bill, Tory MP Edward Taylor spoke about the 'fantastic increase in the movement for more worker control of industry', which, he maintained, 'had led to a major clash between the traditionalists and the Maoist faction'.

Never a week passes but some industrialist refers to 'anarchy' on the shop floor, and last Tuesday's London *Evening Standard's* placards proclaimed 'Mr. Wilson alarmed by strikes'.

And well he may be alarmed by strikes. For they are the tip of the iceberg of dissatisfaction spread right through society—right through the world. The only countries where protest and demonstration is not the norm today are the openly totalitarian countries, like Spain, Greece, the Communist bloc, Portugal, South Africa. In these dictatorships, the world knows, public 'order' is maintained only by the ever-present, ever-visible, armed police, backing up total censorship and state control of the media. Yet even under these conditions of state terror, protests do occur. In Madrid Spanish students risk imprisonment; in the Asturias, miners likewise—with the added possibility of torture. Although the CIA has done its dirty work in Greece—and tried it on in Italy, but failed—underground the struggle goes on and may surface sooner than they think; in Portugal and South Africa they are biding their time, and we all



See back page about our Anarchist Pamphlet Supplements



# 'MURDER IN VIETNAM'

**A**NARCHISTS, and a few 'marxists', look at modern war differently from other people. We argue that war between states is largely caused by the struggles of various national ruling, capitalist, classes over trade, trade routes, spheres of profitable investment and such natural resources as tungsten and oil. Nigeria was a glaring example of the struggle between Britain, France and Russia over oil. Vietnam is another example of the conflict between robber-states over mineral rights and spheres of profitable investment and exploitation. The peasants of Vietnam and the young American (mostly working-class) draftees are the victims.

Of course, the workers of America, the workers and peasants of Vietnam—North and South—and, indeed, the workers of the world have no material stake in such struggles and armed conflicts. Nor should they support one side or the other, despite the claims of the Pentagon and the Kremlin or the silly little Trotskyist and Maoist groups here and abroad who so loudly shout for 'Victory to the Vietcong'. Workers have no country, and have nothing to be patriotic about; they are, to all intents and purposes, entirely or almost entirely propertyless. They should oppose, not just the murders of 'innocent babies' in My Lai, or just the war in Vietnam, but all wars between states.

The present series of outrages and

alleged outrages, and crimes now coming to light, are really part of a far greater outrage—that of world capitalism itself. War is just one (albeit the most destructive) aspect of present-day society. And the massacres at My Lai are only an aspect of modern warfare. Furthermore, American imperialism is not alone in committing such atrocities. Such acts of barbarism have been committed by all states—and not only during war. At least that half-demented nut, George Brown, was right when he said that 'we' have been responsible for similar outrages.

Surprisingly, however, whilst many people are shocked at the news of massacres of 'innocent babies' or peasants in Vietnam, or of starving Biafrans, or even of police brutality in, say, Paris or Derry, they have become conditioned to the more subtle, but usually far more devastating, remote-controlled murder of napalm bombing, the 'conventional' bombing of Hanoi (or London, Rotterdam or Dresden in the last war) or even the atom bombing of Hiroshima. Hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, of people including 'innocent children', have

been blown to pieces and maimed by bombing raids, and by aircraft many thousand feet above their 'targets'. The American bomber pilot in Vietnam, the former British bomber pilots over Hamburg during the last war, the Luftwaffe pilots over Coventry and the 'Nigerian' Mig bomber pilots over the former territory of Biafra, were all just as much murderers as were the blood-soaked, trigger-happy GIs of My Lai. Yet to the average Englishman, or American, or Russian, such types are looked upon as heroes who receive DSOs, Purple Hearts or Orders of Lenin. But, in fact, they are just as depraved, just as sick, just as 'guilty' as the murderers of 'innocent children' in a Vietnamese village.

Moreover, most of the left-wing politicians who scream 'atrocities' over My Lai are equally as hypocritical as the Nixons and the LBJs. They do not object to, or work for the abolition of, the sort of society which causes such atrocities and murders; they often support the state-capitalist bureaucracy of Russia and North Vietnam and they are as much political power-seekers as those they condemn.

No; national liberation, 'Victory to the Vietcong' (also perpetrators of atrocities and their own My Lais), is no answer to the crimes of capitalism and its national states. The only real and lasting solution is the destruction, the abolition, of a system that demands conflicts and struggles over the world's natural resources. The resources of the earth, the means of production, instead of being the private property of individuals or of national states, should become the common heritage of all mankind. Production should be geared for use instead of for profit. And states should, as Engels once noted, be relegated to the museum of antiquities. Then, and only then, will such atrocities as My Lai—and Coventry or Dresden—be a thing of the past. Reliance on politicians or political parties, of left or right, will never achieve such a change, such a revolution. That must be the task of the people as a whole. In the words of the Preamble of the 1st International: 'The emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself'.



Any book not in stock, but in print can be promptly supplied. Book Tokens accepted. Please add postage & cash with order helps.

- New Books on Anarchism and kindred subjects
- Floodgates of Anarchy Albert Meltzer and Stuart Christie 21/-
  - Eros and Civilization Herbert Marcuse 50/-
  - Birth of Our Power Victor Serge 30/-
  - Revolutionists in London James W. Hulse 48/-
  - Roads to Freedom Bertrand Russell (paperback) 6/-
  - The Ego and His Own Max Stirner 60/-
  - Rebel in Paradise: A Biography of Emma Goldman Richard Drinnon 54/-
  - Holy War in Belfast Andrew Boyd (paperback) 8/6
  - The Hawkspur Experiment W. David Wills 24/-
  - Neill and Summerhill: the Man and his Work Pictorial study by John Walmsley (paperback) 7/-
  - Summerhill A. S. Neill 7/-
  - Three Works by William Morris (paperback) 10/6
  - The Rights of Woman Mary Wollstonecraft, and On the Subjection of Women John Stuart Mill 14/-
  - Summerhill: a Radical Approach to Education A. S. Neill 30/-
  - Anarchy and Order Herbert Read 21/-
  - Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism J. Hampden Jackson 12/6
  - William Morris: Selected Writings and Designs (ed.) Asa Briggs (paperback) 7/6
  - Contemporary British Art Herbert Read (paperback) 8/6
  - Education Through Art Herbert Read (paperback) 16/-
  - Selected Writings P. J. Proudhon (paperback) 20/-

## STRIKES FOR POLITICAL ENDS

**R**ECENT EVENTS at London's Heathrow Airport and the one-day strike by dockers have been attacked as being strikes for political ends. Those loudest in their attacks are, of course, the politicians, for all party spokesmen have condemned these disputes, while Richard Marsh even went as far as saying that the action of the dockers was a 'complete negation of democracy'. The action by the airport workers in 'blackening' the airlines who use the services of General Aviation Services has been similarly described.

Mr. Clive Jenkins of the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staffs has threatened to call out his members if British United Airways is not taken over by BOAC. These actions are called political and, according to the politicians, these decisions regarding nationalisation should be taken by them alone. Mr. Marsh's remarks show an arrogance and a contempt for workers who want to be involved in the decisions which will affect their lives. This is broadly what most people understand as democracy as opposed to letting Mr. Marsh hand down what he and the Government think is good enough.

But it is easy to understand why there has been so much condemnation of these disputes since they represent a challenge to the power of the Government. Opposition MPs similarly see where the real power in our society lies, and are anxious that when workers decide to intervene in an attempt to influence changes, it will be in such a way that it will suit the Opposition's interests. There was no similar outcry when the Government intervened in industrial affairs, froze wages and set norms and assisted companies with their merger plans. These were not, of course, considered to be political decisions!

The Department of Employment and Productivity is now seeking an official

inquiry into industrial relations at Heathrow, for they are really concerned about the power of those who take action. The firemen's pay dispute is really a side issue and it is just a coincidence that the two disputes came to the surface at the same time. What the British Airports Authority and the Government are concerned with is the growing strength of the airport workers. An earlier Court of Inquiry, in 1958, said: 'BOAC held the actions of the local Stewards' Committee accountable for the strike of October, 1958. BOAC said that it was the culmination of a trend over the last six years or more towards increasing unconstitutional interference with normal working.' No doubt the present inquiry will reach the same conclusion.

### 12,000 ATTEND MEETING

The legal action taken by BAA and GAS against Ian Stuart, the chairman of the Joint Shop Stewards' Committee, shows how worried they are about the continued 'blackening'. However the response by 12,000 airport workers at Brentford Football Ground shows that they are not prepared to allow GAS, a private American company, to operate a ground handling contract at Heathrow. Freddie Gore, a BEA shop steward, warned GAS to 'Go back from whence you came—you are not going to get in at London Airport'. Shop stewards feel that the servicing contract should have gone to International Aeradio which is partly owned by BOAC and BEA. It is felt that the contract with GAS could bring unemployment, for they could reduce manning schedules. BAA asked BEA to give an assurance that there would be no resulting unemployment, but they refused.

While I would not hold any brief for nationalisation, the airport workers are concerned about 'creeping denationalisation'. After all, the Edwards Report on

Air Transport in the 1970's recommended a privately-owned 'third force', and it is this that these men are resisting. Certainly the Government, by its action over British United Airways, wants such an arrangement.

### GROWING AWARENESS

Nationalisation of Heathrow is a different story from that of the railways, for airlines are an expanding service and profits can be made. Those working there feel that they will get better pay and conditions with nationalisation than with the privately-owned companies and that this is a principle and must be defended as such. However, the issues involved both at the docks and at Heathrow are the growing awareness of how

things are managed, by whom and the amount of control the workers have in their own industries. It shows that workers are increasingly concerned about this control and that there are other issues than the economic one and the general defensive actions over conditions.

Trade unionists have to go on the offensive, for while there is no revolutionary demand for workers' control, workers are being affected more and more by political decisions concerning industry. Government intervention in industrial affairs is so widespread that differences between a political strike and others is only marginal. Organised strength should be used to affect political decisions, for the simple reason that these workers should be making those decisions for themselves. But until workers want and desire that responsibility, then the real decisions will be made for them.

P.T.

## Student Files, etc.

Dear Comrade,

It seems to me that the class struggle is essentially that of those ruled with their rulers. If this is the case, then when students take issue with university authorities they are engaging in the class struggle, as it is relevant to their situation. Indeed, since with sit-ins and the examination of files they are questioning the right of those in authority to have such power, they are challenging the whole social power structure of our society (is this as revolutionary as striking for more pay?).

No militant students were at all surprised by the files, everyone knows that files are kept and will be kept. However, many of the less militant students were rather surprised by the nature of their contents. This has had the effect of raising the level of student militancy, and has concretely shown to many the real nature of our society. If Ian disagrees with the above then I think he should say exactly how students can play their 'vital role' in defeating capitalism. I note that 'it can only be defeated by the conscious and autonomous action of the working class' (Ian's own italics).

Until now most students went into the university at one end holding 'A' levels, did the required work, learned the appropriate responses, and came out at the other end (clutching a degree), just the right size and shape to drop into their

pre-ordained niches in society. These people are the very building bricks, beams and lintels of our society (most of the architects are dead) supporting

## Letters

the existing power structure and without conscious effort resisting change. Indeed the lack of conscious effort is an essential part of their specification, for as soon as people begin to think and act on their own account they are out of control. What will our society look like when the component parts arrange themselves according to their own pleasure and needs?

As the students at our universities gain more control of their courses and conditions, and study what they feel they have to, then they will, in effect, write their own specifications, and they will come out of university with minds of their own, really able to initiate action and to determine their own roles.

Fraternally,  
BOB TURNBULL.

## Floodgates of Anarchy

Dear Editors,

Dave Poulson, in his review of 'The Floodgates of Anarchy' is, of course, entitled to his own opinion as to what constitutes 'good English and good sense' but it is hard to take him seriously when the one instance he puts forward as typical of their lack is 'man is robbed of the full value of his labour'.

The most one could say of this was that it was not good Marxism or good (orthodox) economics, but it does not profess to be. Dave is assuming Marx's criterion of surplus value to be the only conceivable one, but he is not entitled to state that we meant to say that man was deprived of 'part' of his labour—our point in the book was that he was

deprived of the full part of his labour by right of conquest, and is expected to be grateful for what he receives back, by way of reward, from the employer or the State—in the token currency of the State, which is the key to material success, not the degree of one's labour.

As to the somewhat reactionary suggestion of 'leaving sociology to the sociologists'—or theology to the parsons?—with many indoctrinated students of sociology and economics it is necessary to preface one's remarks with a sort of magic incantation—such as 'According to Galbraith' or 'Keynesian economists insist'—before one can be expected to be taken seriously.

London  
STUART CHRISTIE.  
ALBERT MELTZER.

## CLYDESIDE SACKINGS

**T**HE Upper Clyde Shipbuilders (UCS) have announced that one-third (3,500) of the labour force will be made redundant by the end of August this year. This is part of the employers' programme for increased productivity and sackings that has been going on since the UCS was formed in 1968. This latest announcement puts the Geddes plan into full swing; 2,500 finishing trade workers and 1,000 boilermakers, including 60% of the office staff will be laid off, despite the company having a full order book.

It wasn't that long ago that Bro. Dan McGarvey, the Boilermakers' President, got his members to accept his plan to save the shipyards. Some plan indeed! 5d. an hour cut in wages for 2,000 men in UCS's Govan (Fairfields) Division; to refuse a 6/- a week increase due in December 1969 to all boilermakers in the UCS; to accept, in principle, three-shift working by setting up a monitoring committee on productivity.

McGarvey is now saying, 'We bent over backwards to help the company and this is how they repay us.' What McGarvey has done was give his appro-

val for the rationalization of the shipyards along the lines of the Geddes Report. Last year the labour force was cut from 14,000 to 12,500 as part of the management's plan.

But this isn't only taking place within the UCS, there are similar moves taking place all over the shipbuilding industry. For instance at Cammell Laird's on the Mersey, the company has hinted that 3,000 workers might lose their jobs by mid-1970, despite an order book going into 1972.

The Clydeside is the experimental ground for the Geddes plan where all these new fangled productivity schemes are being tried out. Today it is the Clyde; tomorrow it will be Merseyside, Tyneside, etc. Let the Clydeside be a lesson to the rest of the workers in the shipbuilding industry to make them realise that this is a fight between the employers and the workers. The workers have been kicked in the teeth by the employers and the McGarveys; now the workers must kick back.

Latest news: Boilermakers will strike if any members are sacked.

A. MCGOWAN.

# Freedom Press

publish  
**FREEDOM** weekly at 9d.  
and **ANARCHY** monthly at 3s.  
from  
84b Whitechapel High Street  
London E1  
01-247 9249

Entrance Angel Alley,  
Whitechapel Art Gallery exit,  
Aldgate East Underground Stn.

**ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION**  
Freedom: £2.3.4, \$5.40  
Anarchy: £1.16.0, \$5.00  
Joint Sub.: £3.19.4, \$10.00

Airmail  
Freedom: £3.3.4, \$9.00  
Anarchy: £2.15.0, \$8.00  
Joint Sub.:  
Both by Air: £5.17.0, \$15.00  
Freedom by Air, Anarchy  
by Sea: £4.19.0, \$12.50

**SPECIMEN COPIES ON REQUEST**  
Opening Times:  
Tuesday-Friday 3-7pm  
Saturday 10am-4pm  
Closed Sunday, Monday

## Form Local Groups

Dear Comrades,

At the film show and meeting organised by the Chemical and Biological Warfare Action Group (CABWAG) at Central Hall, Westminster, on February 4, it was suggested that local CABWAG groups should be set up.

The last thing I want to do at the moment is to take on any further responsibilities, but I am willing to convene a meeting in the Waltham Forest area (Chingford, Walthamstow, Leyton, Leytonstone) or in the near vicinity to try and get a local group of CABWAG formed.

Anybody who is concerned about the possibility of genocide by germs and chemicals for war and live in East London are asked to get in touch with me.

With best wishes,

21 Vernon Road, DOUGLAS KEPPEL,  
Leytonstone,  
London, E.11

# ABERDEEN

## Threatened Rents Increase

**P**OOOR ABERDEEN CITY Labour Party! Not only were they having an awful job deciding on what to say about council house rents in their local election manifesto, but their annual general meeting (thoroughly undemocratic it was too) had been infiltrated—by a member of Aberdeen Anarchists!

When it was proposed, by Mark Bush, Labour councillor for Woodside ward, that the manifesto should clearly state

that the Labour Party was opposed to an increase, the rest of the Labour councillors present nearly had a fit. The reason why? They admit that they will impose a rents increase in July. When the sum of 5/- was mentioned at the meeting, they failed to confirm or deny that such would be the increase.

Members of Aberdeen Anarchists will shortly get out brush and bucket, and will be putting down slogans all over the

city's housing estates. 'Rents up 5/- on July 28—don't vote—organise!' We have warned other left-wing groups in the city about the Labour Party's little post-election secret and we will be advocating industrial action against the increases.

One really nasty point about the new increase is that no adjustment will be made to the rents rebate scheme. The councillors at the AGM expressed the hope that the Ministry of Social Security will see poor people all right for the 5/-. They know, and we know, this is shit. Trying to get money out of the Social

Security is like trying to get blood out of a stone.

We are well aware that agitation on the rents issue could cost Labour the local election. If the other 'left' groups in Aberdeen won't push the issue, we will. A neat illustration of how much Aberdeen Labour Party care for the people came the other day when the council voted £645 to send councillors and officials on a jaunt to Finland and voted £50 to give poor kids horse riding lessons. Like, we dig the priorities? Fellow citizens of Aberdeen, stand up and fight!

## Invasion Threat

**A**FTER ABERDEEN ANARCHISTS organised a meeting in the university to discuss the case of 72-year-old Jimmy White, of 34 Kintore Place, Aberdeen, we sent out letters to every councillor (via the Town Clerk). Since the letters have been sent, the council has met twice—once in full session and once as the housing committee.

At neither meeting was the plight of the old man discussed. While the councillors prevaricate, slates continue to slide off the rotting roof. One was found embedded two inches in the ground—edge on. It could have been in someone's head.

Bob Hughes—Ferryhill councillor and Labour candidate for Parliament—dodged phone calls from the University Chaplain (who is helping our fight to rehouse Jimmy) for over two weeks.

He has finally said that they are instructing the Chief Sanitary Inspector to visit the tenement and to make a full report on its condition. We still maintain that this is evasive; still no mention has been made of a new council house for Jimmy.

Unless a firm offer of a house has been received from the council by first post on April 16, we intend to interrupt the full council meeting being held that day—and thus force them to discuss the case. We call on all members of revolutionary groups in Aberdeen—along with any concerned citizens—to join us.

For two years we've played it 'respectable'; played the council's game—now we'll play it our way! Direct Action gets results!

IAN S. SUTHERLAND.

## CORRECTION

**S**INCE the Ministry of Whatever-it-is did not think it necessary to inform me in advance about the publication of the Registrar-General's statistics on births to immigrant mothers, I foolishly appeared in print last week saying that Enoch was soft-pedalling on race when he was actually foaming at the mouth about it again. Correction, therefore: Enoch is not showing 'uncharacteristic discretion' and has not heard his own 'deafening clangers'. He is acting characteristically (isn't that comforting!) and is still dropping them.

With regard to another apparent inaccuracy, or misjudgement, readers must decide for themselves. In my article I maintained that the (English) teachers had won their fight for more wages, since

getting £120 on demand for £135 is, in my view, a considerable victory for workers using militancy for the first time. And differences in negotiating procedures have been agreed, to make wage-bargaining more flexible in future. But on page four, Ian S. Sutherland poured scorn on the English teachers' organisations (and even more on the Scottish ones) just as they were 'winning' what they set out for. We can't blame organisations for not being what they are not supposed to be, and even reformist unions should be encouraged to be militant and use direct action, to give support to the militants and even revolutionaries that may be working within them.

JUSTIN.

## Ends and Means

**A** RECENT FREEDOM editorial stated that for anarchists 'the ends determines the means'. This formula I consider unsatisfactory. Nothing short of a rejection of all distinctions between ends and means will satisfy me as being distinctly anarchist, and I include this rejection among the five or six basic principles of anarchism. Without it, much anarchist criticism of government action and political parties loses the better part of its strength, and anarchism itself would be but indifferently different from other ideas and ideologies now competing for the allegiance of the young.

A man is to be judged according to his deeds, and not according to his intentions, because these are exclusively his, sacred and unobservable. So-called ends partake of the nature of intentions, and are accordingly irrelevant material for a moral judgement. The fact that ends are professed only makes them highly suspicious. A profession of ends or intentions ask for assent to something that is not there, at least not in any ascertainable way, and tends to inhibit or condition judgement of much that is there and ascertainable.

No sooner do we distinguish between ends and means than we politicize moral judgement. I mean that we seek a moral justification for certain deeds done by us while we refuse the same justification for similar deeds done by people who subscribe to a cause which is not ours. Our ends are ours because they are good, and they are good because they are ours. Other people's ends are bad because they

are theirs and, should they coincide with ours or should some objectively good thing be done in their name, we speak of hypocrisy and deceit.

Motives and intentions are, of course, of paramount importance to moral life, but each moral person can competently judge only of motives and intentions that are his own. Other people can be judged only by their actions, on the assumption that they are free agents, and that their will is involved in what they do. We cannot honestly say that we do not want to punish a child, and yet punish him. We cannot say that we don't want murder and deceit, and yet kill and deceive. Why we kill and deceive is ethically irrelevant, especially to the person who is killed or deceived. If we say that it is necessary to kill and deceive in order to achieve certain ends, then one may pertinently ask us why we chose ends that thus rob us of our freedom, how we hope that freedom will result from our submitting to necessity, and whether we did not want to kill and deceive in the first place, and then saw necessity as a convenient argument to put us beyond the reach of moral judgement.

Ends and means are here discussed in connection with human beings, as existing moreover in historical societies, and not in the scientific conditions of a laboratory or a torture chamber. In this connection there is no evidence whatever that any so-called means ever led of necessity to any so-called ends. The path of history, like the path of hell, is all laid with good intentions. As a matter of fact and common sense, ends are never attained, for they would mean an end to history, while the stuff of history, its movement, what is suffered by men in their mind and flesh, all goes under the name of so-called means.

If 'wanting' is the motive force of actions accompanied by conscious endorsement, and no mere wishful thinking, then there is something meaningless or contradictory in an anarchist's wanting an anarchist society. An anarchist society is one in which every man acts according to his own (presumably ethical) will, and no anarchist may want other people to want anything but what is autonomously wanted by each. To want a society to be this or that is to deny or usurp other people's autonomy of will, and to consider them as things, as more or less malleable material to be made to fit some preconceived shapes whose general scheme is called ends.

That is not to deny the value of clear and precise ideas about an anarchist society as an image of what is right. Such ideas are a help to judge, not only of much that is wrong in the society in which we live, but also of anything that we may do ourselves. Whatever we do now that would be considered wrong in our ideal society we can be sure is

**S**OME HUNDRED or more of the more self-consciously liberal-minded among the teaching profession met together in the School of Education of the University of London on Saturday, March 7, for a conference organised by STOPP (Society of Teachers Opposed to Physical Punishment).

That children should no longer be beaten to make them produce 'socially acceptable behaviour' was taken as understood, for, as the first speaker (a psychologist) enigmatically phrased it, 'use of corporal punishment produces emotional changes in the child which are both aesthetically unacceptable and incompatible with intellectual progress'.

The impasse created by the avoidance of the cane need no longer cause the establishment any disquiet, it seems—for exactly the same conformity can be exacted from the child by the substitution of the bloodless 'reward' method. This latter is already being used in the classroom, we were told, but 'could be better exploited than at present'. The transition from Ancient to Modern can, moreover, be effected in a manner that in no way need alter the status quo. In fact 'teachers can train the child in the reward system while still using established punishment patterns'.

This first lecture set the tone for the meeting. The second speaker, while recognising that the ideal was to initiate an authentic relationship between the teacher and the child, stated during the course of his talk about the effects of the classroom situation on different personality types that 'discipline' was best considered in its original meaning of 'a subject to be studied'—'it can't all be fun. A kind of coercion is needed for

which we need not apologise.'

The afternoon was whiled away by means of a 'simulation exercise'—groups of students became 'teacher' to groups of experienced teachers who represented a first-year remedial class. The 'classes' quickly degenerated into total chaos. The order/response notes were later collected and 'analysed' by a group of eight head teachers. The point of this fantasy exercise was difficult to see, unless it was therapy for the guilt-ridden over-dog or to demonstrate the absurdity of the classroom situation current in our schools, but attempts to suggest this were politely ignored by the conference, whose hierarchical structure was at this stage dominated by the eight heads ('who have kindly offered us—and you—their help and experience').

Although the subject of the conference was given as 'Punishment or Persuasion?' it refused even to consider the question of why either is necessary or the possibility that each is equally undesirable. Surely the need for 'control' in the classroom and the teachers' consequent feelings of guilt and betrayal are caused by trying to perpetuate the totally unwarrantable system of interesting/restraining child-prisoners known as compulsory education.

Although STOPP appears to have formulated a radical programme, in fact its title is, sadly, wholly accurate. Physical punishment is unnecessary because children can be controlled more effectively by other means. Persuasion? Propaganda? Indoctrination? Brainwashing? All you need is love—forward Ronnie Laing.

DI & ARTHUR HUMPHREY.

wrong even now. There is no reason why actions of present-day human beings should be morally degraded to the status of means for the sake of other human beings, hypothetical in the best of cases, whose actions, willed by us as ends, would be somehow predetermined and robbed therefore of an element of freedom.

Attitudes and behaviour based on a distinction between ends and means tend to foster the same moral and psychological type of man, whatever his ends may be. That is why alliances are so readily struck between some anarchists and other movements, though their respective principles be incompatible. Moral and psychological differences show up in the choice of means, not of ends. Men who distinguish between ends and means all choose conflict as their psychologically most satisfactory mode of being, and the ends which they profess, all free from conflict, have as one of their functions to stifle the moral conscience and keep guilt at bay.

The socially conscious anarchist is anything but indifferent to what society 'ought' to be, but will never dream of deciding of what it 'must' be. What society is or will be is society's responsibility. He is responsible only for his

own social behaviour. His society is not in the future, but is the one in which he lives, and his anarchism does not consist in the very dubious (thence apocalyptic) future results of his actions, but in the actions themselves, and in the thoughts, moods and feelings which accompany them. My anarchy is now, when I think and dream freely, when I act according to my feelings, when I respect other people's will or resist its pressure on my own. When I do none of these things or, indeed, I do the very opposite, then I am not an anarchist, and I must be honest enough to admit it, and take responsibility for it. Far from me to put the whole blame on society, and make use of the argument that one cannot be an anarchist in a non-anarchist society. When and where shall I be an anarchist, if not now and in the society in which I live? It is in this society, after all, that I conceived the goodness of anarchism. To this goodness I want to hold. Selfishly, no doubt. But with this selfishness there goes a certain integrity which would be lost if I made myself the instrument of a Cause whose authority is not in my conscience, and whose ends lie beyond me and, indeed, any single and real human being.

28.2.70

JOHN GILL.

## Contact

Contact Column is for making contact! Use is free, but donations towards typesetting costs are welcome

**Visitors to Ireland** welcome to the Island, Corner Merrion Road and Nutley Lane, Dublin 4 (5 acre Anarchist Kibbutz).

**Former Fulham Anarchist Group Members** and others will be welcome at Freedom Hall on Wednesdays, 8 p.m. onwards—coffee and discussion—from April 8.

**Makhno & Durruti Pamphlet**, 9d. Order copies, sale or return, from Freedom Press.

**Easter Weekend**. Floor space available. Laurens Otter, Tel. 653 7546.

**Kettering**. Demonstrate against Enoch Powell's racialist sickness and local capitalist collaboration at Wicksteed Park on April 10 at 6.30 p.m. (He is speaking at Institute of Directors Dinner.)

**South Africa Commission**. Sponsored Walk on Sunday, April 12. Funds raised will go to the Medical Aid Fund for medical supplies for Liberation Movements in Southern Africa. Route starts northern end Tower Bridge, finishing southern side Kew Bridge. Further information: 'Walk', 372 West Barnes Lane, New Malden, Surrey. Tel. 01-398 1354.

**Polyandry Study Group Report**. 'Two Men Sharing One Wife', 60 pages, price 6/6 including postage, from P. Pawlowski, 26 Elmbourne Road, London, S.W.17.

**Now is the time for war tax resistance**. The most powerful acts against war have been those of the young men of the Resistance who have said NO to the draft. Now it is time for those of us who have been paying for the war in Vietnam to say NO to taxes for war. Join us! War Tax Resistance, 339 Lafayette Street, New York, N.Y. 10012. Write and ask for information. Phone (212) 477-2970.

**AFBIB**. See AFB list, page 2, for production of Bulletin.

**Anarchist answer to the CP's 'Ultra Leftism in Britain'** and other pseudo-leftists (pamphlet). Laurens Otter, 35 Natal Road, CR4 8QH.

**Manchester Anti-Election Campaign**. Bill West, 16 Northern Grove, West Didsbury, Manchester 20. Meetings every Wednesday.

**Miguel Garcia Garcia** will speak at meetings and to groups. Expenses required. Contact S. Christie, 10 Gilbert Place, London, W.C.1.

**Tory Five Point Fascism Electioneering**. We must start our work now—preparation for printed leaflets and posters for a nationwide factory gate campaign—money and ideas needed—Interested? Contact L.S.F., c/o Keith Nathan, Vanbrugh College, Heslington, York.

**York Group Need Speakers**. Expenses and accommodation arranged. Write R. Atkins, Vanbrugh College, Heslington, York.

**Every Tuesday Evening at Freedom Hall**. Informal discussion/entertainment/chess evenings. Small musical instruments and pocket chess sets welcomed. Refreshments. From 7 p.m. admission 2/-. Proceeds to Press Fund. All Welcome.

**Urgent**. Help fold and dispatch FREEDOM every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.

**Malatesta Poster Screen Printed**. 7/6 (inc. post) from Freedom Bookshop.

**Schools Anarchist Group in Gloucestershire?** Contact Kate & Joe, 3 Withy Lea, Leonard Stanly, nr. Stonehouse, GL10 3NS, Glos.

## PAMPHLETS

**IN THIS ISSUE** we publish the first of a series of supplement pamphlets. Forthcoming issues will include Kropotkin, Zapata, trade unions, and Tolstoy. We would welcome your comments, criticisms and your suggestions for future issues.

Supplies of the pamphlet for selling separately can be had on a sale or return basis at 9d. each. We feel that this is a worthwhile venture and with your help will prove a success.

EDITORS.



### PRESS FUND

**March 16 to 23 inclusive**  
 Buffalo: A.E. 16/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W. 4/-; K.F. & C.F. 4/-; J.L. 6/-; Woodford Green: 7/8; Sebastapol: C.R.M. 8/-; Hull: E.S. £2; Aberdeen: I.S. 2/-; Uxbridge: T.P. £1; London: A.W.U. 4/-; Tenterden: H.K.H. 9/8; Oxford: Anon 7/-; Cambridge: D.D. £1/14/-; Gainsville: S.D.A. 16/-; Alberta: H.B. £2/8/-; Coleorton: H.V.B.C. 5/-; Sheffield: G.B. 5/-; N.S.W.: B.C. 7/8; Glasgow: A.J. 2/2; London, S.W.2: B.M.T. £1; Frankfurt/M.: £1; London, S.W.17: £2.

Total: £16 5 2  
 B/f.: £96 3 0

March Total to date: £112 8 2