

WILL WAR SAVE BANGLA DESH?

ACCORDING to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute in its study *The Arms Trade with the Third World*, India and Pakistan were among the leading customers of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France for armaments, orders on the sub-continent (India and Pakistan) increasing four and a half times between the first half of the fifties and the second half of the sixties.

In 1954 Pakistan was persuaded by the United States to join the South East Asia Treaty Organization and the Baghdad Pact. This was accepted by Pakistan, not because she wished to defend South East Asia against Communism, but she wished to defend herself from her neighbour (on two sides), India. This was matched by British and French salesmen selling to India Hunters, Canberras and Ouragans to match Pakistan's Sabres and Canberras. Sales for AMX-13 tanks were good after Pakistan received M-41 Bulldogs from the US.

SIPRI reports that up to 1962 India's purchases were more for prestige than for strategic operations. They included jet combat

aircraft and an aircraft-carrier. In 1962 India was defeated in its war with China but its 'neutralism' towards the West failed to qualify it for US F104 Starfighters (known in West Germany as 'Widow-Makers').

In came the Soviet Union (who else?) to supply SAM missiles and MIGs (the latter also to be manufactured in India—under licence). Later India took Soviet frigates, submarines and ground attack fighters. Russia refused to operate an embargo during India's 1965 war with Pakistan.

This war itself was occasioned by the relative 'preparedness' of both sides. After 1965 Pakistan, the loser, was 'Tom Tiddler's Ground' for arms salesmen. The US lifted its embargo, Pakistan signed an arms agreement with the Soviet Union in 1968, possibly (says SIPRI) as an exchange for closing the US base at Peshawar. To augment their stocking-up Pakistan acquired US supplies indirectly from Europe, Mirage jets, and submarines from France. Later they got six Starfighters (Indian rejects?), seven B-57 and 200 armoured personnel carriers from the US.

Since then the Pakistanis have

arrived at an understanding with China, and the Indians an agreement with Russia. China now defends Pakistan at UNO whilst Russia, since at the time of writing India appears to be doing well, refuses to press for a cease-fire.

Now the chickens (or the Sabres, Canberras, Starfighters, MIGs, and Mirages) have come home to roost or rather to lay their deadly eggs on their neighbour's nest.

It is possible, indeed it may be compulsory and official in some

places, to see this war as arising from the need to 'Save Bangla Desh'. It is obvious that Bangla Desh is not the cause of the war; it is unlikely that Bangla Desh will benefit, or even survive the war. India's eyes are turned more towards Kashmir and her age-old feud with Pakistan.

Pakistan, in the same way, is concerned at settling her feud with India. Both in pursuance of their policies have contracted questionable alliances and built up their

armaments to the utter neglect of their hideously impoverished peoples. It could not even be claimed that conquest of I by P (or of P by I) could bring access to markets and raw materials since both nations are lacking in both.

This is a war more pointless than most. Which way the Left in this country, and elsewhere, will fall in line is predictable. The only attitude for anarchists, is, as with every imperialist war: a plague on both their houses. JACK ROBINSON.

Neither Green nor Orange

THE ROOT CAUSE of the communal strife in Northern Ireland is the social discontent generated by fifty years of chronic unemployment and poverty, and the failure of successive Governments to solve the economic problems which afflict this province. Misery generates hatred — and Northern Ireland has had her share of misery. Except for the war years, the unemployment rate has stayed around 10%. Transfer this to Britain and it would mean some two to three millions without work and living on the dole and the NAB. Between the wars the unemployed rate in Northern Ireland was two-and-a-half times that of the rest of Britain. In 1937, for example, it was 26.2% of the working population—and this despite massive emigration. Here, surely, is the basis of the strife.

It affects the Protestant worker as much as the Catholic worker since the pool of unemployed can be used to hold down everyone's wages and depress working conditions. It makes the Orange man jump to it when three men are waiting for his job. It would be very unwise indeed to imagine that this situation is peculiar to Ireland. In Britain today the suicide rate in the North West has gone up three times since mass unemployment developed. If ever the situation reaches the position it has already reached in Northern Ireland there will

be plenty of fuel for the racialists and the Powellites to stoke into flames. So it seems to me that any solution to the problems of Northern Ireland is bound up with an economic and social policy that faces root causes.

The Orange worker is held loyal to Unionism by the prospect of being cast down to the level of people even more miserable than himself. But what on earth has he to gain from all this discrimination against Catholic workers? The privilege of working his balls off? The feeling of being tuppence halfpenny looking down on tuppence?

The IRA (provisionals and official) tell us that all will be well with a United Ireland. But if this were so why in the South is there an unemployed rate as high as in the North but with even lower insurance benefits? More than a million Irish have emigrated from the South since the national solution was achieved.

The only solution, as I see it, is that if workers through no fault of their own are thrown on the scrap-heap they must receive an equal share in the good things of life. Of course, it is useless asking a State for such a solution. People must organise to enforce it. One means of doing that is to demand in the North of Ireland (and here) direct rule from below in the form of referenda—for all the problems to be discussed by the people

themselves. The politicians have failed. Of course, it is hard in the midst of Nationalist and Orange rantings for the sane to be heard, but we would do well to remember Connolly's words: 'It matters little where the green or the orange flag flies over the slum—it's still a slum.'

The wisdom of ordinary people should not be underestimated. Only yesterday I had a good lady tell me that she wished there were sanctuaries for humans as well as for wildlife.

The people in the streets fighting for their lives are fighting more against years of economic slavery than for the right to live under a different flag. It's a pity the IRA didn't aim their guns at the real oppressors of the Irish people—like the builders who employ men to slave their guts out, or the contractors who drive men like cattle. The bosses—both Green and Orange—are our enemies and it is against them that we need to organise. Politicians are no friend to the working man. An old man in Dublin heard that the green flag had been run up on the GPO building. He asked the rich man what difference it would make. 'Ah,' said the rich man, 'it's all the same to you what flag rises. You will be breaking stones tomorrow just the same.'

Direct rule in Northern Ireland? Yes—FROM BELOW.

BRIAN BEHAN.

Rhodesia—Victory for Apartheid

AGAINST THE ODDS, agreement was reached in Salisbury between Ian Smith and Douglas-Home which has concluded the Tories' triple act of Rhodesian sell-out, arms for South Africa and the Immigration Act. The message, so clear and simple, is that the British Government does not like black people and that they have chosen sides in the forthcoming racial war—along with the vast majority of the white British. Chosen sides, to mince no words, with apartheid—that inhuman, irrational doctrine espoused by the Nazi sympathisers in South Africa.

Sold down the Zambesi, the *Daily Mirror* sang across the tube from me, and that's just what has happened to the African people of Zimbabwe, who have no excuse but to take up their own struggle with a determination which can earn them respect. Not so many years ago the African nationalist Joshua Nkomo said that the declaration of UDI was a declaration of war on the African people by the Smith regime. But wars are not fought only with words and the freedom fighters of Southern Africa have not even dented the armour of racist oppression.

This is not to advocate an armed insurrection in Zimbabwe that would lose the lives of many brave and innocent Africans, nor is it in this writer to cast brickbats at guerrillas in other lands who have demonstrated an individual courage that inspires many young people today. The African nationalists of Zimbabwe have, let us face it, an onerous task ahead of them; they have, in the past, spent the greater part of their passions in feuding between two rival groupings which has diverted attention from the real struggle with the Smith regime. To be quite clear, again, this is not the advocacy of authoritarian and imposed 'accord', it is rather an observation from a friendly—but not too friendly—sympathiser with the cause of

liberation in Africa.

One particularly nauseating aspect of the Rhodesian settlement is the position adopted by the Labour Party, who—as with the Common Market—must be internally jealous of the Tory diplomacy but have, for the sake of appearances in a play which gets a smaller and smaller audience, to mouth the predictable noises about principles and selling out. Wilson on two occasions came close to a successful sellout in Rhodesia and it is the tired old word 'hypocrisy' that must be delivered into the guts of Wilson's gang.

In terms of humanity the Rhodesian settlement is a small step backwards, a further line drawn in the plan of battle. The African people would reject the settlement if they were allowed to vote on it—which is the reason they are not being allowed to! On the credit side we can recognise that the reality behind the facade of British diplomacy has now been recognised for what it is: racialism.

FRANCIS DRAKE.

Anarchist Classics Series

ABC OF ANARCHISM

—Alexander Berkman

20p (2½p)

Reprint of Freedom Press

Edition with a new Introduction by Peter E. Newell,

Biographical Notes and

Historical Background

Be an Industrial Outlaw

CONTRARY TO THE CURRENT of opinion among both Tory supporters and their left-wing opposition (of all varieties), the Industrial Relations Act is not so much of a threat to trade unions as it is to the individual worker. If you are a member of a registered trade union you are protected and privileged. If you are not, you are at least potentially an industrial outlaw.

Take the right not to belong to a union so beloved of the right wing. It has an exception in the case of an agency shop agreement, however much that exception is hedged around by qualifications. Where a trade union is hand in glove with the State (i.e. registered) and has secured an agreement principally because it is of benefit to an employer (agency shop), in other words in one instance where it is an act of social and political rebellion to refuse to join a union or 'play the game', then one is outlawed for doing so.

If a union registers then, within defined limits, it gains most of the rights which have become customary, and will certainly be backed by the State if it chooses to grow at the expense of other unions which have not registered. In the following years many blue-collar unions are likely to follow the white-collar unions in accepting registration as the

best means to protect their narrow bureaucratic interests. Even their right, so little employed, to engage in strike action will be guaranteed. This of course does not apply to the non-registered union, and above all not to the non-union member.

If I, as a member of the teaching profession (FE), choose not to belong to the union which has sole bargaining rights for me (the ATTI, a registered union), yet still choose to go out on strike when they do (since I could never cross a picket line) then I would be in breach of contract, although the union members would not be, providing they adhered to the proper procedure.

I of course would not have gone through the correct procedure—no ballot, no notice to my employer (except perhaps the day before so he knew why I was absent), not even the courtesy of presenting my grievances to the employer. Since, finally I would have issued my personal strike manifesto and distributed it to all and sundry, calling for sympathetic action, I would have broken rather a large number of rules into the bargain.

By comparison with the position of the individual worker, then, the unions are privileged. Even if they don't register—a protest which I feel will not last long—their size and potentially disruptive

influence will be quite a protection. Of course they won't necessarily protect individual members who engage in unapproved action and can disclaim responsibility for their activities. So even in the case of unregistered trade unions it is the bureaucracy who comes out on top.

Since my union is registered and pretty awful anyhow; since it cannot in any sense represent me or my views or complaints; since like Mr. Polly and Mathieu Delarue I have been looking for a jumping off point to begin my own break for freedom; since I'm just downright bloody fed up, the buck starts here. I have resigned from the union, the only way open for me to become an industrial outlaw.

Having just finished reading the *Great Brain Robbery* (Moss Side Press) it is a great consolation to me that this one act of rebellion, should it result in a clash with the authorities, will be a far better education for the students who see it than I could give in forty years of teaching.

If others choose to follow suit, and that's their affair, the anarchist movement is going to be posed with problems of mutual aid for those rebels who fall foul of the system. Have our much vaunted trendy 'communards' got any suggestions? MARTIN BASHFORTH.

ROMANTIC ASSASSINS

JAN MICHELS' volume of lino cuts at £1 a copy should find a place in the gift wrappings of the faithful, for there are only 500 copies of the signed first edition of *Oorlog en Vrede in Grafiek*. An artist of great social awareness, his work is in the tradition of the German expressionists in the use of broad flat masses of black and white. Munch was the Nordic master of this art, and it is a style peculiar to those countries, as Herwarth Walden made plain in his *Der Sturm* in the 1920s, when it became fashionable to catalogue the art styles. Michels has exhibited in many countries, and his first major exhibition was in 1963 in Amsterdam. The art of the wood cut and the lino cut is important, when it is a poor man's art, in that it is a cheap form of reproduction, but when it is unnecessary then the carved block and cut lino is itself the work of art. In this, the English artists with their fine and well-controlled line are the supreme masters, but the German artists have used it to good effect, as Jan Michels does with his large book, to give the feel of a corrupt and doom-infested society. The books are on sale within Freedom Bookshop, and they are worthy of your time and money, for they offer a dark facet into our age that never knew the elegance of Hogarth's mocking brush. It is the limited edition of the silk screen prints of Flavio Constantini, on

show at the Prudhoe Gallery at 79 Duke Street, W.1, that is the greatest find of the week, for Constantini has produced a magnificent and limited edition of silk screens at only £20 each. Run off in thirteen colours they are truly a collectors' item, not only for the brilliance of the drawing but for the use that the artist has made of the café and street lettering, for it is a magnificent example of the difficult art of incorporating typography into a drawing, without throwing the drawing off balance. The subject matter should have the faithful leaping in the aisles for it concerns the acts and the executions of a small group of anarchists. They range from Giovanni Passanante who stabbed King Umberto in the arm, to Ravachol who was strangely mixed up in his murders, between private gain and the public cause. From grave robbing to blowing up five inoffensive people, and a death on the scaffold, gives Ravachol three silk screens, while Emile Henry, who tossed a home-made bomb into a crowded café gets two. We can applaud a man such as Nestor Makhno, the anarchist guerrilla, for here is a man forced by his time to take a stand in an area of violence. In areas of physical repression men are called upon, against their will or desire, to make a stand, and we can admire or despise the stand that they or we might have taken, but to applaud some witless youth

for a stupid act of killing, simply because he parrots a particular slogan, is to use the death of innocence for unworthy ends. As works of art these silk screens are worthy to grace any wall by virtue of the talent of the artist, but never let us romanticise violence at a distance, and claim that it is done in the name of humanity, for in the wreckage lies the dead and bleeding humanity. This day 16 men, women and children lay dead in an Irish public house, and all arms of romantic militant violence hasten to publicly wash their hands of this mass murder. One killing is romantic, sixteen is carnage, and who draws the line, little comrade? When will some flag-waving nationalist Irish artist pick up his pencil to romanticise this bloody and evil act? Not in our lifetime, little comrade.

Here is Flavio Constantini's mixed bag of anarchists, and those who claimed the movement's protection for their own simple-minded acts of violence. Accept it as art, for this it truly is, but have the courage to reject its morality, not only in the romantic past, but on this day in 1971 when sixteen people were slaughtered, men, women and children, by a nameless fool for a cause that cannot reject his actions quick enough for the news media of the day.

ARTHUR MOYSE.



Help Fold and Despatch 'Freedom', Thursdays from 2 p.m.

Revolutionary Workers Forum meets at 170a Deptford High Street, S.E.8, 7.30 p.m. every Monday.

Anarchist and Nihilist Group is being formed in Derby and anyone interested should contact: Gavin P. Lawrence, 63 Uttoxeter New Road, Derby, DE3 3NP.

Southern Anarchist Groups Conference, Reading, December 11 & 12. Main topic for agenda: Community Action. Further suggestions and details contact Reading Group, 9 London Road, Reading, Berks.

Any Spare Furniture? Falls Road family squatting in Burrell House, London, E., now have electric stove and some bedding but still need items of furniture. Please write George Foulser, c/o Freedom Press.

Black and Red Outlook No. 4. Paper of Anarchist Syndicalist Alliance 5p plus postage. Subscription: £1 per 10 issues. In bulk 10 at 40p a time. Orders and monies to T. Anthony, 29 Eskridge Street, Salford.

International Human Rights Day, Dec. 10, 11 & 12. World-Wide Protest over Russian Political Prisoners. Soviet Embassy, Notting Hill. Hunger Strike, 24-hour Picket starting noon Friday 10, and Rally. Information phone Miss Pinhas, day 01-254 1626, evening 01-254 8071.

Walnut Cottage, Moorland, Bridgwater, Somerset, houses young people attempting withdrawal from drug dependence and with other problems. High expenditure and low income may cause closure unless coupons (any brands) will be well-funds are forthcoming. Cash donations, trading stamps and/or cigarette comed by Drug Dependence Care Group at above address.

P. D. Roberts. Ghost writer required for libertarian assessment of anarchist possibilities in the Falklands. Contact: 112A Clifton Road, E16 4PS.

Puritanical Union Leaders

THE ADVICE given to young workers by the TUC Assistant General Secretary, Mr. Len Murray, at a recent Industrial Society conference in London, was that they should go back to their bosses and demand that 'one, two or three young people should be taken on now'.

Such a statement is meaningless and is typical of the sort of remarks one expects from trade union leaders. To suggest this to workers, aged between 17 and 22, is an insult. They should be asking what have the trade unionists, like Len Murray, done to prevent the present high level of unemployment at all age levels throughout industry. Precious little in fact!

Len Murray also said that it was time to ban incompetent governments which caused unemployment, but he forgets that he supported such a government when Harold Wilson was in power. It was that government which started the reorganisation of industry, pushed plans for rationalising production methods and 'shook our surplus labour requirements'. Our memories are not that short that we cannot remember the emphasis that was placed on the balance of payments crisis. To Wilson and his economic advisers, nothing else mattered. Once a healthy surplus was achieved all would be well, or so we were told.

Perhaps Len Murray and his ilk really

believed it, but in so doing, they did nothing to prevent growing unemployment during the Labour Party's term of office. That government strengthened the capitalist system and tried, through its own Industrial Relations Bill, to further weaken the resolve of the trade union movement to fight.

MORE OF THIS AND THAT

Even with a Tory government, we have witnessed a pitiful display of opposition to unemployment from the leaderships of the trade unions. The TUC leaders strut around making speeches which bear no relation to what is happening in industry. They visit Mr. Heath and call for a £1,000m. boost to the economy and increased growth. They always want more workers to do more work, to create more of this and more of that, no matter what it is as long as people are employed. There seems to be a puritanical streak running through trade unions which says that their members must work or rather be employed for at least forty hours a week. There is no suggestion of blowing the hooter after only four hours each day as the IWW did in America in order to achieve an eight-hour day. Trade union leaders want more work instead of sharing out what there is to do.

Len Murray should have given his advice to young workers at British Rail

workshops. BR plan to sack 5,500 men at rolling-stock workshops and want to completely close down three of them, at Barassie, near Glasgow, Swindon, Wilts. and Ashford, Kent. These three workshops, involving 2,300 men, are scheduled to close next year, while the rest of the sackings will be at the remaining workshops over the next five years.

SLAUGHTER OF AN INDUSTRY

In reply to this, the men's union, the National Union of Railwaymen, have asked for the sackings to be spread more evenly around the 14 workshops and for as many as possible of the lost jobs to be achieved by natural wastage, early retirement and voluntary redundancy. This is no answer for young unemployed workers, because these solutions only lessen the number of jobs available. It is no good Len Murray telling them to demand that their employers take on more young workers when Mr. Sidney Green, General Secretary of the NUR and another TUC leader, has done very little to stop the loss of thousands of jobs for his members through sackings and natural wastage.

Certainly railway services, both passenger and freight, should be expanded, but over the years, from Beeching to Marsh, Mr. Green and the Executive of the NUR have assisted the government of the day in slaughtering an industry, men's jobs and a public service.

There is a world of difference between useful work and useless toil. Today many men are employed in soul-destroying tedious work and yet the only answer of the trade union leaders is to ask for more of this, not considering why we have to make more of what is mostly useless junk. Isn't it about time that we, the producers, said that we want less work and that we want to produce what is necessary and useful, instead of what is profitable.

P.T.

anarchistes devant la Police Correctionnelle et le Cour d'Appel de Lyon, a pamphlet published in Lyon in 1883—which mentions the attribution of the article to Kropotkin, but then comments in a footnote: 'This article was by citizen Carlo Cafiero, and not Kropotkin' (p. 132). That would explain the reference to an Italian writer, Pisacane, and the advocacy of extreme methods which were traditional in the Italian republican movement but which have always seemed surprising in Kropotkin even at his most passionate. Presumably he never

LETTERS

publicly denied writing the article because he did not want to cause trouble for Cafiero (1846-1892)—an Italian revolutionary who became an anarchist under the influence of Bakunin in 1871, later took a leading part in practising propaganda by deed with Malatesta and in formulating anarchist communism with Kropotkin, but abandoned anarchism in 1882; he became a social democrat, but then went mad, and died in a lunatic

Anarchist Books

Dear Comrades,

In reviewing the Dover edition of Kropotkin's *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* (November 27), Arthur Uloth quotes a passage from my introduction about Kropotkin's violent and conspiratorial tendencies, but in the process a line seems to have got lost. The sentence in question should read:

... in 1877 he helped to write an article calling for propaganda by deed, and in 1880 he published an article calling for action not only "by speech, by writing" and so on, but also "by dagger, gun and dynamite".

The former article was 'La propagande par la fait', written with Paul Brousse and published in James Guillaume's *Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne* on August 5, 1877; and the latter was 'L'Action', written by Carlo Cafiero and published in Kropotkin's *Le Révolté* on December 25, 1880.

This gives me a good opportunity to

correct a mistake I made more than four years ago. On July 29, 1967, FREEDOM published an article called 'Kropotkin on Action', a translation I had made of 'L'Action', which I attributed to Kropotkin, following many writers on the subject, especially Jean Maitron in his *Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France, 1880-1914*. Since then, however, I have read more of the relevant literature. For a time I was more firmly convinced of Kropotkin's authorship because I found that the accusation that he had written the article was part of the case against him when he was expelled from Switzerland in 1881 and again when he was imprisoned in France in 1883. But then I came across what seems to be a conclusive argument that he did not write the article after all.

This is in the most important contemporary anarchist account of the Lyon trial of January 1883—*Le procès des*

They said it could never happen

ACCORDING TO THE *Evening News* (25.11.71), 'A major earthquake occurred today near the east coast of Amchitka in the Aleutian Islands. It is the third since the United States detonated a massive nuclear underground weapon on November 6.'

These earthquakes have received little publicity, even in the Left-wing press. So blasé have people become to the threat that nuclear weapons pose that they can no longer be stirred to any serious protest. I suppose nothing will

be done until the earthquakes spread further afield. The Aleutians are pretty remote and unreal to most people, except of course to those who live there. But wait a bit. The earthquake zone extends all the way down the western seaboard of the American continent, which includes some big cities, Los Angeles and San Francisco in particular. As Dr. Fu Manchu used to say, 'The world shall hear from me again.' I do not think we are finished with the Amchitka bomb. A.W.U.

asylum.

The attribution of this article to Kropotkin was an important point in the campaign against him during the 1880s, and has been an important point in studies of his thought and of anarchism in general ever since. He certainly published it, but it seems clear from the testimony of people who must have known the truth that he did not write it, and the false attribution should be challenged whenever it is repeated.

NICOLAS WALTER.

BURDENS TO SOCIETY

Dear Friends,

Concerning the article 'Burdens to Society', the sentiments we do agree with, the booklet itself we have had for

some time. It has been plugged and pushed by the author to all the Claimants' Unions. We in Birmingham are of the opinion that it is a simpering, pathetic excuse by one of its more liberal lackeys or ex-lackeys for a system which deliberately starves and freezes and causes misery to thousands of people every year. Also the lists of the Claimants' Unions in Birmingham which are listed in the back of that pamphlet are out of date and we would be grateful if you could publish the correct addresses for us. They are:

Moseley & Sparkhill Claimants' Union, 66 Ivor Road, Sparkhill, Birmingham 11 (Monday nights 7.30 p.m.)
Handsworth Claimants' Union, c/o 40 Hall Road, Handsworth, Birmingham 20 (Monday nights, 7 p.m.)
Newtown Claimants' Union, 19 Rea Towers, Mosborough Crescent, Birmingham 19 (Monday night meetings)

SUE AND TERRY COOPER.