

The Presidential Candidate from Quang Tri

DURING THE EARLY North African campaigns of the 1939-45 war, a candidate for an almost-vanished party won an English bye-election on the strength of a British defeat. He became known as the member for Mersa Matruh; Senator McGovern, who succeeded in the Wisconsin US Presidential Primary, is by the same token in danger of being thought of as the President-elect from Quang Tri.

Quang Tri is part of the terrible geography lesson of modern war in Vietnam. The Vietnam war has deliberately been allowed to sink into the background of the American election but the North Vietnamese offensive with its early successes (common to most offensives) has put the war back in the headlines and McGovern's victory in the Wisconsin primary has been credited to his consistent anti-war policy.

The war in Vietnam has been going on so long that it has become habitual; a way of life—and death. For example *The Times* (March 3) opened a report from its correspondent in Saigon, 'More than 1,000 South Vietnamese were killed or wounded last week in the annual North Vietnamese and Vietcong winter-spring campaign.' Robert Shaplen, the *New Yorker's* Vietnam correspondent, wrote in a long speculative article (November 13, 1971—before Nixon's China visit), 'American commanders anticipate stepped-up action across the De-Militarized Zone, aimed at the cities of Hue and Quang Tri, after the first of the year,

when the weather improves, and when the American 101st Division starts pulling out, and it is here that the South Vietnamese (reinforced by a newly formed ARVN division) may face their sternest test. The Vietnamization programme could also be severely tested, and the outcome could be significant for all of Vietnam.'

The cynical new-speak of the word 'Vietnamization' indicates the final betrayal of the Vietnamese people. It is as if a surgeon had opened up a patient's body, severed arteries, lopped off limbs, cauterized and seared flesh and then left the theatre assuring the patient, 'Okay buddy. You're on your own from now on. Patientization is the new idea.'

We shall not know what took place in the meetings between Nixon and Chou. It is obvious that Chiang Kai-Shek was double-crossed and it is possible that both North and South Vietnam were left to their fates. The ostentatious breaking-off of the Paris peace talks was a piece of play-acting in the middle of a charade. Obviously, if Nixon had made any deal about Vietnam when he was talking to Chou, such agreements would not be negotiated in public. According to the *Guardian*, 'the anti-communist alliance that the United States has forged in Indo-China with dollars, weapons and American military power has been violently jarred in the aftermath of the President's visit to Peking' (March 7). The *Guardian* then goes on to examine Thailand's fears of

an American sell-out. At the other end of the scale Prince Sihanouk, exiled Cambodian Head of State (now a co-ally of the NLF), has received assurances from Chou-en-Lai of China's full support 'until total victory'. (*Guardian*, March 10.) Chou met the Prince and the North Vietnamese Prime Minister in Hanoi.

For what it is worth, Andre Malraux, former Communist Indo-China revolutionary and former Minister of Culture in de Gaulle's Government, briefed President Nixon on China before the visit. He told Mr. Nixon (says the Agence France Press report in *The Times*, March 3) that it did not matter whether the Americans pulled out of Vietnam or not. Malraux replied, 'For the Chinese Vietnam represented the policies of Foster Dulles . . . but no one believes any longer that Asia's destiny is being played out in Cochin China.' [Vietnam] 'So, whether you stay or whether you leave, what does it matter? The important thing was a Western illusion of a Chinese communism bent on conquering Asia. No one believes in the Vietnam war any more because no one any longer believes in Chinese imperialism in Asia. All serious-minded people understand that China's objective is China, as the Soviet objective was the Soviet Union.' It is not known whether President Nixon accepted these highly cynical views of a man who has been through the political spectrum and knows the price of everything and the value of nothing. Nixon, like all politicians, is also

a cynic, but he is obviously determined to win the next election, and he realizes the value of being a man of peace to the doves and at the same time a man of war to the hawks, so the policy of ground-troop withdrawal and bombing acceleration would suit his election book nicely.

The North Vietnamese may have been double-crossed by the Chinese but in any case they are able (with Russian help) to carry on their war alone, fortified as they are by revolutionary delusions. It could in fact be North Vietnam's desperate throw and it is possible they may succeed in defeating the ARVN who are untried in the field—without American support, and have already suffered a defeat in Cambodia. Additionally, South Vietnam is rent by internal dissension between Thieu and Ky. The *New Yorker* article of November 13 compared the situation to the overthrow of Ngo Dinh Diem which precipitated America's deeper involvement eight years ago! The internal corruption of South Vietnam would make it an easy prey to the unified, totalitarian and puritanical NLF.

The invasion of Quang Tri province and the rout of ARVN forces has, it is claimed, drawn support for Senator McGovern's 'peace' candidature. The protestations of 'peace' when a war is being lost have some attraction and McGovern's position

seems rather equivocal. In an interview with Henry Brandon in the *Sunday Times* he said 'quizzically', 'The cold war is fading away, don't you think? I feel Americans see the world much less divided now Nixon did a fine job with his China initiative and I also think he handled the Taiwan problem extraordinarily well. We won't need in future as many men, aircraft carriers or the newly-proposed B1 bomber.' These views display an alarming political naivete—or cunning?—and such pragmatic pacifism would not even be rejected by Nixon.

In the extraordinary political brawling that passes for election preliminaries in America (how much better we do these things in England! the stab in the back rather than the messy bludgeonings) anything can happen. Whatever happens in Vietnam—and the defeat of ARVN is only crystal-gazing—may not only lead to an increase in the anti-war vote, but an increase in the vote for a reactionary candidate determined to avenge the stab in the back of defeat. George Wallace is coming along quite nicely—Nixon has already made concessions to him on 'bussing' and if Wallace doesn't make it, even for Vice-President, there's always the odious Edward Kennedy waiting in the wings as the presidential candidate from Quang Tri.

JACK ROBINSON.

Please Teachers, you Forgot the Children

LAST WEEK the two large teachers' unions in Britain, the NUT and the NAS, held separate conferences. NAS condemned school violence and voted to retain canings in school. NUT, a more 'liberal' union, ridiculed such a 'myth' but in turn voted to retain the eleven plus examination. Bad-tempered shouting down was widespread at both conferences, an example of discipline I suppose. More serious, however, was the lack of mention of children. New buildings, more teachers, greater expenditure all became vitally important. When children were mentioned they were either criminal subversives or some new vegetable spaced out 30 or 40 to a classroom. One observer said that 'they were talking about two different lots of kids'. I don't think that they talked about children at all. There was a walkout at the NUT conference, but then only about the administration of education, not about children.

Another conference is worth reporting. Schools Action Union (SAU) and NCCL are going to hold a conference on Children's Rights in School. One major demand is for School Councils to replace 'headmaster dictatorship'. I once

sat on such a body, impotent though it was, and soon found that again issues not people was its food. School Councils accept representational democracy without its cost, administration and the establishment of 'necessary administrators'. NCCL should know better. A state which is about to take away more liberties will never concede one of its strongholds, education. Libertarians can make no concessions to authorities old or new, only one's own authority is valid.

In an otherwise dark week of education a new book has been published that should give us all hope. George Dennison, fellow student of Paul Goodman, has written *The Lives of Children* about a free school in New York during 1964 and 1965. This school, the First Street School, was a small private school for the rejected children of state schools. Five teachers and 30 children soon developed from their distinct positions into a real community school. Self-consciously at first, the five teachers, who had read extensively about libertarian education from Tolstoy to A. S. Neill, applied their theories and gained corresponding successes, both academically and socially. The family school structure seemed

chaotic to many parents of children but their anxiety was unfounded.

Dennison applies his two years of experience to revalue his previous theoretical work. He used Tolstoy's reading-teaching method and found so much similarity between Tolstoy's account of school that he uses large passages to describe his own findings. Goodman's *Compulsory Miseducation* is surprisingly not mentioned, calling as it does for small schools with four teachers and 28 children, but a later speech is used to complete Dennison's account. First Street School seems to be an answer to Goodman's hopes, a cheap school using the city as a classroom and allowing free play of the children to develop into real freedom to educate. The cheapness of the scheme costing almost the same as state schooling, with no free lunches or excursions and with only one fifth the number of teachers, really does show how promising free schools are.

I feel that there is more use in Dennison's book than in all the conferences I have mentioned. It would however be dangerous to become too hopeful until state control of resources for education is ended. DAVID BROWN.

US 'Aid' in Latin America

RECENT HEARINGS were held by the US House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee on the Government's request for the ceiling to be raised on military 'aid' to various Latin American dictatorships. The usual excuses for imperialism were trotted out with rather revealing statements by Secretary of State Rogers and Defence Secretary Laird in their appeal for total foreign military aid of 2,151 million dollars.

Rogers told the committee that the US would gain important economic and political advantages if US military 'assistance' sales to Latin America of 100 million dollars could be raised to 150 million dollars. He defended sales to the dictatorships, saying that assistance did not imply agreement with the regimes but only a recognition of 'the facts of life'. These facts being that most of them are entirely dependent on US arms and aid and that several of them, e.g. Bolivia and Brazil, were put in power by the US.

It appeared from Rogers' testimony

that the US is still providing 800,000 dollars of military aid to the Allende Government in Chile, because it did not want to 'break completely' with them. Presumably they hope that even if a direct assault on the government fails, the Chilean bourgeoisie will stay in the country as a permanent base for overthrowing the Popular Unity government. Despite the disclosures by Anderson about the plans of the CIA and the International Telephone and Telegraph Company to institute 'economic repression' against Allende coming to power, it seems the US were scared of international opinion to act directly. Perhaps they've learnt something from the handling of Cuba. The fact that the Chilean armed forces show no signs of wanting to emulate their counterparts elsewhere in the continent must make them wonder, though, about the cost-effectiveness of this particular military assistance.

According to Congress spokesmen the original aim of the imposition in 1966

Continued on page 2

Women Take Over Factory

AN OLD Congregational Church in Fakenham, Norfolk, is an unusual place for an occupation by workers. According to the owners, this church, turned factory, is of no use. However, the women workers there thought otherwise. When their employer, Sexton, Son and Everard, a Norwich firm of shoemakers, went broke and closed down, the women occupied and barricaded the factory to stop redundancies plans.

The firm has now been taken over by a new owner, Mr. Jack Taubman, whose business interests include lingerie and perambulators. While he has reinstated 423 out of a total of 698 workers employed by the bankrupt firm, he

has no plans to employ the women at Fakenham because the machinery there is 'too heavy for flimsy things'.

The women at Fakenham have not just been content with occupying the factory but have switched from shoemaking to producing leather and suede goods. They have managed to buy materials and have sold their finished products in the local market.

Attempts to cut off the electricity were stopped. When asked if he was 'a good trade union man' he proved it by leaving without carrying out his instructions.

It is true that these women have

Continued on page 3

BAKUNIN IN ENGLISH

BAKUNIN ON ANARCHY. Edited by Sam Dolgoff. Knopf, \$10.

BAKUNIN'S WORKS are almost unknown in English, although he has been well known for a century as the main founder of the anarchist movement. Collected editions of his writings in several volumes have appeared in French, Russian, German, Spanish and Italian, but never in English. Translations of some of his writings have occasionally appeared in anarchist periodicals or as pamphlets on both sides of the Atlantic, and have also very occasionally appeared as booklets—*God and the State*, Benjamin Tucker's translation of a fragment edited by Carlo Cafiero and Elisée Reclus, published in the United States originally in 1883 and most recently in 1970 (with an introduction by Paul Avrich); *Bakunin's Writings*, a brief study and anthology of items on the labour movement edited by Guy Aldred (marred by bad translation, presentation, and production), published in India in 1948; and *Marxism, Freedom and the State*, a brief digest of anti-Marxist writings edited by K. J. Kenafick, published by the Freedom Press in 1950.

Then came *The Political Philosophy of Michael Bakunin*, edited by G. P. Maximoff, posthumously published in the United States in 1953 (and available in paperback since 1964). This was the first full-length collection of Bakunin's writings in English, and as such it is valuable; but it has two serious defects—Maximoff attempted to force Bakunin's unsystematic ideas into the mould of what he called 'scientific anarchism', which falsified Bakunin, science, and anarchism, and in the attempt he broke up Bakunin's characteristically diffuse writings into short extracts and then put the extracts together in schematic categories without indicating their contexts and without providing sufficient editorial assistance. As a result the book is useful mainly as a source of quotations and references; nevertheless it was not superseded for nearly twenty years.

Knocking Nock

THE SUPERFLUOUS ANARCHIST: ALBERT JAY NOCK by Michael Wreszin (Brown University Press, 1972, \$8.50).

THE REVIVAL OF INTEREST in anarchism and individualism in the USA has brought with it a revival of interest in the writings of Albert Jay Nock (1870-1945), and this assessment of his life and ideas by Michael Wreszin no doubt presages more academic and popular studies.

Nock left the ministry of the Episcopalian Church to become firstly a 'muck-raking' journalist, then co-editor of the *Freeman*, and finally a writer of fine-prosed books. He wrote biographies of Jefferson, Rabelais and Henry George, several collections of essays, a critique of statism called *Our Enemy The State*, and an autobiography, *Memoirs of a Superfluous Man*, which many consider his best work.

Wreszin has written a critical account of Nock's evolution from a 'humanitarian' social reformer to a pessimistic anti-statist. He knocks Nock for what he terms 'anarchist élitism'.

Like most professors of 'social conscience', however, Wreszin fails to understand the position of someone like Nock who, while opposed to the *status quo*, cannot see any hope of any fundamental change for the better. For this reason, he denounces Nock's conclusion that all that can be done is to 'reform oneself' as 'misanthropic élitism'. This kind of *ad hominem* attack is the usual response of those who cannot answer what is sometimes called 'permanent protest'.

There are pertinent criticisms that can be made of Nock's ideas (was he, in fact, an anarchist?), but Wreszin does not make them. Instead, he indulges in 'that . . . but' acrobatics. For instance: that Nock's *Our Enemy The State* can be described as a symptom of the 'paranoid style' is 'tempting', but, at the same time, it 'poses some of the most important questions of this century' (hastily glossed over with a couple of quotes from a socialist and a liberal).

Nock deserves a better critique than this. Until one appears, the curious reader is recommended to the earlier exposition of his philosophy by Robert M. Crunden: *The Mind and Art of Albert Jay Nock* (Henry Regnery Co., 1964).

S. E. PARKER.

Further translations have continued to appear in this country as pamphlets—*A Criticism of State Socialism*, a digest of items on the labour movement, published by the Coptic Press in 1968; *Essays on Revolution*, a selection of items on the labour movement, published by the Organisation of Revolutionary Anarchists in 1971; and *The Paris Commune and the Idea of the State*, the first complete English edition of Bakunin's main essay on the Commune, published by CIRA in 1971. And 'The Reaction in Germany', Bakunin's first important work, was included in the first volume of *Russian Philosophy*, a three-volume compilation by James M. Edie, James P. Scanlan, and Mary-Barbara Zeldin, published in the United States in 1965 (and available in paperback since 1969).

Now, a hundred years after Bakunin was expelled from the First International, we have *Bakunin on Anarchy*, edited by Sam Dolgoff, the veteran American anarcho-syndicalist who has been better known for many years as Sam Weiner of the Libertarian League. This is the first proper full-length anthology of Bakunin's writings in English, and as such it is immensely valuable; every English-speaking reader interested in the theoretical and historical background of the anarchist movement will want to study it closely—so it is a pity that it is so expensive, and it is to be hoped that it will soon be available in paperback.

No single volume could contain all Bakunin's important writings (let alone everything he wrote—the *Archives Bakounine* being produced by Arthur Lehning in Amsterdam will run to at least fifteen volumes, of which only five have appeared in ten years), and Dolgoff has had to select rigorously from the hundred or so important items of Bakunin's work. The book contains material from the following items, in chronological order: *Reaction in Germany* (1842), *Speech on the Polish Question* (1847), *Appeal to the Slavs* (1848), *Confession* (1851), *Revolutionary Catechism*—not to be confused with Nechayev's *Catechism of the Revolutionist*—(1866), *National Catechism* (1866), *Federalism, Socialism, Anti-Theologism*

(1867), *Programme of the International Brotherhood* (1869), *Policy of the International* (1869), *Letter to Albert Richard* (1870), *Letters to a Frenchman* (1870), *Bears of Berne* (1870), *God and the State* (1871), *Programme of the Alliance* (1871), *Paris Commune* (1871), *Letter to 'La Liberté'* (1872), continuation of *Knouto-German Empire* (1872), *Statism and Anarchy* (1873), *Letter to the Jura Federation* (1873), and *Letter to Elisée Reclus* (1875).

Dolgoff has also had to abridge, sometimes severely, the items included, so that many are reduced to a few paragraphs, and hardly any remain complete (incidentally, omissions are not always made clear—thus the last 1,000 words of the Paris Commune essay have disappeared without trace). The result is that the individual flavour of Bakunin's style is considerably reduced, but this is probably inevitable in the circumstances. However, at the same time, three extra items have been included—a preface by Paul Avrich, which first appeared in the *Russian Review* in 1970; a biographical sketch of Bakunin by James Guillaume, which appeared in the second volume of the French edition of Bakunin's works in 1907; and a description of post-revolutionary society, also by James Guillaume, which appeared in 1876.

These extra items are all interesting, but it is doubtful whether they were really worth including. Avrich's preface, which began life as a paper delivered to the anarchist session of the American Historical Association in 1969, is an excellent summary of Bakunin's thought, stressing its prophetic tendencies, but it is not really necessary alongside Dolgoff's own longer introduction. Similarly, Guillaume's biographical sketch is a knowledgeable summary of Bakunin's life and was no doubt valuable for French readers 65 years ago, but it has long been superseded and again is not really necessary when any English-speaking reader interested in the subject will go to E. H. Carr's *Michael Bakunin* (first published in 1937 and available in paperback since 1961). As for Guillaume's *Idées sur l'Organisation Sociale*, here rendered as 'On Building the New

Social Order', it is a fascinating summary of Bakuninist ideas about a free society—that is, of anarchist collectivism just after Bakunin's death and just before it was developed into anarchist communism—and well worth having in English, but once more it is not really necessary in a book of Bakunin's writings. I must say I would have preferred another 60 pages of Bakunin—some more letters, perhaps, or more of the writings directed towards Russia, Italy and Spain, or just more of the items included.

Another criticism is of the editorial apparatus. The problem here is that the book sets out to be a scholarly edition but is not quite up to academic standards. There are too many errors in foreign words and proper names, too many confusing notes and references, and too many curious editorial insertions and remarks, for one to have complete confidence in the text. Nor are all the translations as good as they might be—but it is very difficult to get Bakunin into English.

Such minor criticisms do not detract from Dolgoff's fundamental achievement, which is to present more of Bakunin's work in an accessible form to an English-speaking audience than ever before. All Bakunin's major writings, almost all the themes he touched on over a third of a century, are represented here—100,000 words by the man Dolgoff calls 'the Activist-Founder of World Anarchism' are now easily available for the first time. Maximoff is relegated to the role of a dictionary of quotations, and Dolgoff becomes the standard source of Bakunin in English.

It is typical of the way these things happen that, after so long with no such essential book, there will soon be two. For Arthur Lehning, the leading Bakunin scholar, is currently preparing an anthology of Bakunin's writings for the 'Writings of the Left' series published by Jonathan Cape; this will probably not be as long as *Bakunin on Anarchy*, but it will certainly be much more learned and for those who do not know or cannot read *Archives Bakounine* it will come as a revelation of anarchist scholarship at its finest.

Both Dolgoff and Lehning, long-standing members of the anarcho-syndicalist movement, are strongly favourable towards Bakunin. This is refreshing when the overwhelming weight of opinion is still so stubbornly unfavourable—George Lichtheim, for example, recently repeated the old verdict: 'Bakunin was a propagandist, and his muddled thinking never rose above the level of the professional agitator with a few fixed ideas and a stock of ready-made phrases' (*A Short History of Socialism*, 1970)—but such bias does tend to reduce the value of any anthology to some extent. Dolgoff inevitably displays the more attractive and impressive aspects of Bakunin—not those highlighted by E. H. Carr, for example, or by Eugene Pyziur in *The Doctrine of Anarchism of Michael A. Bakunin* (first published in 1955, and available in cheap paperback since 1968).

It is here that Avrich's preface has a welcome corrective function, by raising the problem of the dark side of Bakunin's thought which Dolgoff rather plays down; Dolgoff points out that they differ over Bakunin's attitude to conspiracy, secrecy, dictatorship, violence, and so on, and comments: 'After discussing our differences at some length, we decided, in the true anarchist spirit, simply to exercise mutual tolerance'—which, incidentally, is something that would not have been done by Bakunin! In general, indeed, Dolgoff seems too defensive about Bakunin, and spends too much time comparing him to and rescuing him from the Marxists, instead of taking him as he is and trying to indicate his position in the various traditions of Left Hegelianism, Slav nationalism, Russian populism, libertarian socialism, European insurrectionism, and the South-West European labour movement.

But *Bakunin on Anarchy* does at last make it possible for English readers to discuss these and other questions about Bakunin, and until there is a proper collected edition of his writings in English—based on the *Archives Bakounine* if possible, or just a translation of the old six-volume French edition—Sam Dolgoff's volume will be an indispensable item on the bookshelf of every anarchist and everyone else who is seriously interested in anarchism. It is undoubtedly one of the best books published during the current revival of interest in libertarian theory and practice, and it should contribute to a further increase in that interest.

N.W.

FOLK MUSIC & ANARCHISM

folk songs of all varieties, and in return they have contributed not an insignificant quantity of songs through the medium of such song writers as Joe Hill, Woody Guthrie, Ewan MacColl, Pete Seeger, etc. Syndicalists and anarchists have contributed as writers, particularly the above-mentioned Joe Hill and many others associated with the Wobblies, and as subject matter for Woody Guthrie's *Sacco and Vanzetti* cycle of songs.

Given the characteristics of folk music mentioned above, it is a musical field which ought to be of interest to the anarchist, with its sense of directness and spontaneity, and its popular roots, surviving for many decades underground in society until discovered by a clapped out middle class seeking new sources of inspiration (or treasures to plunder and exploit). In addition the generally libertarian, egalitarian tendencies evi-

denced by the greatest part of folk music have their appeal, though there is much in addition which is characterised by chauvinism, religious and moral intolerance, racial and nationalistic hostility and journalistic sensationalism.

When all is said and done, folk music springs from a broad social base which contains most that is admirable in human behaviour and outlook. However it is a field open to many to use as they wish, whether they be of our political kindred or not. Above all, it has been produced by centuries of life and experiences of class-divided society, and, as with all products of the social systems we hold in abhorrence, we must simply seek from it that which is of lasting value and discard the rest—that will be no crime to the folk tradition since that is what has always happened naturally anyhow. We must beware of falling into the trap of folk worship, since that would be

to worship uncritically all the attitudes of people corrupted by the oppressions of class society. Rather we must hope for a time, work for a time, when we can sing not of disasters at Trimdon Grange Colliery, not of long-dead and best forgotten heroes, not, like Joni Mitchell, of Californian trees gasping for life in a polluted atmosphere, but sing of life where living is for itself, not for a principle, a cause, or some other man's profit, or no reason at all. Perhaps then folk music will not be the fossil that it at present largely is, and, indeed, the compartmentalisation of it under that label will be a thing of the past.

Meanwhile, for those uninitiated in the nature of traditional folk music, *Folk Song in England* by A. L. Lloyd (Panther) is a good introduction.

MARTIN BASHFORTH.

US 'Aid' in S. America

Continued from page 1
of a ceiling on arms aid was to persuade the ruling class in each country to divert money from military expenditure into spending on social needs. It seems however that the South American regimes preferred to follow the example of their masters and ignore this worthy objective. Despite the chronic poverty in all Latin America (or rather, because of it), they spent 800 million dollars in recent years in buying arms from Britain, France and the Soviet Union. These countries presumably do not have qualms of conscience about being imperialists.

Although the Vietnam war is flaring up again, the US want to be out and its arms economy would be hard hit if it couldn't flog its arms somewhere. Guerrilla movements are growing in strength all over Latin America and the continent's regimes attempt to channel popular discontent into nationalist, anti-US courses. Venezuela, Peru, Ecuador (and pre-Banzer Bolivia) use this tactic to keep power. All

this happening in what is traditionally the US's backyard necessitates further arms spending to keep the profit from investments flowing back to the United States.

This was admitted by Laird who threatened that if Congress did not provide enough money, the US might have to 'return towards the role of the world's policeman'. The other alternative would be a gap in 'free-world security' and a 'possible return to the unstable conditions preceding the Second World War'.

Roughly translated this means that if enough support were not given directly to the Latin American oligarchies, then counter-guerrilla training and military intervention would have to be increased in order to save the continent being further penetrated by 'Communism'.

The US cannot forever subjugate a whole continent determined to throw it out and resistance is increasing all the time.

STEVE KIBBLE.

PRESS FUND

Contributions

March 30-April 5 inc.

Wolverhampton: J.L. 40p; J.K.W. 10p; Montreuil, France: L.P. £2.15; London, W.1: P.L. 36p; Anon 20p; Ramsgate: P.F. £1.

Total: £4.21

(1) INCOME FROM POSTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND SALES (Target for 1972—£4,500)

Amount received to April 5 £1,282.08

(2) PRESS FUND CONTRIBUTIONS (Target for 1972—£1,500)

Amount received March 30-April 5 inc. £4.21
Previously acknowledged £456.35

TOTAL TO DATE £460.56

EVERY WORKER A CHARLIE?

CHARLIE RIVERS was everything that an Establishment could want from a workman. A member of the uniformed Fascist movement between the wars when the movement had mass middle-class support, a workman distrusted by his fellow workmen, a minor official who would and could play off one group of workmen against another by using the distribution of overtime as a bait. A man who openly accepted bribes in the matter of overtime workings, a coward who fled London and the bombing, during the late great war, and a man who openly sided with the employer during the long strike. And everyone liked Ol' Charlie but no one trusted him.

Ol' Charlie's leg went wonky and, even though Charlie long and loudly protested every penny he paid in tax towards the National Health Service, he eagerly and willingly sought its service and they examined Charlie's leg and then informed him that the specialist would be seeing him at eleven sharp the following Friday morning.

As a pale and limping Charlie told it to us those many months later, he, Ol' Charlie, entered the office of the hospital specialist and was told to take a seat. Charlie sat down while the specialist ruffled through a mass of papers. The specialist found Charlie's official form and without bothering to look at Ol' Charlie said, 'We shall amputate your leg next Friday' and the interview was at an end and Charlie staggered white faced and half fainting from that bloody office.

They sliced off Charlie's leg and he returned to his job as a minor official, quiet and subdued, a limping creature with a false leg and a stick and an Establishment that no longer had a need of him and a working group that pitied him where once they had feared, hated, despised or fawned on him.

The point, my little comrades, of that story is that the treatment of Charlie (and I have changed the names to protect the guilty) is the behaviour of every corporate Establishment towards the labouring working class, be it government, employer or official union. Decisions affecting our daily lives and our problematic future are taken in our name and we are never considered worth consulting. These decisions may be in our moral, material or venal interests, but, like Charlie, we are regarded as no more than work animals not worth the bother of consultation or explanation.

The London bus men and women bought their particular national newspaper and read that they had agreed to accept a wage increase of £1.85 for a conductor and crew driver and £2 a week for one-man operators and, in addition, £1 of the one-man allowance of £3 or £4 was to be consolidated. The new basic rates would now be £25 for conductors; £25.85 for crew drivers and £29 for one-man operators.

One could argue, and honestly, that compared with many outside working-class wage rates these are acceptable, but the basic point is one of human dignity

in that at no time was the mass of the working rank and file allowed to decide. The original offer was for £1.70 and this was accepted by the TGWU executive in our name and all they asked of the employer was an opportunity to negotiate for a few pence more before the award was put into effect on April 8. London Transport, with an old world charm, graciously acceded to this humble petition and in the secret negotiations on our behalf forced 'I' up the pay award from the £1.70 to £1.85.

There are no strings to this pay award, and, with the temper of the time, the mass of the transport workers would have automatically voted to accept the pay award, therefore in the union's own self interest, why, we plead, not ask, did the TGWU Executive not refer that matter back to the branches to be voted on?

The answer lies in two books published this month that seek to give a white-washing job to two men. One is My Lord Robens' book *Ten Years Stint* (Cassell, £3.55) and the other *Leader Lost* (Frewin, £3.15), the life of Hugh Gaitskell. Like the work and life of the clown My Lord George-Brown, neither book is worth the space of reviewing. These men protest too much either personally or through some mouthpiece of the dead, and what they cannot and will not accept is that they must be judged by their actions not by their selfish or noble intentions.

Robens is the continual whine of the self-elected bureaucrat that everyone let old Alf down, but the records state that under his administration half the coal mines closed, half the miners were sacked, the miners' wages dropped lower and lower each year, and that this man had so little understanding of the people upon whose backs he lived so well that when their children lay dying and dead beneath the slime of the Aberfan sludge he was parading as the Chancellor of the University of Surrey. The dead and the dispossessed of the Welsh valleys had no need for My Lord Robens, and every ill judgement that his administration committed he excused in their name.

So too with poor ol' Hugh Gaitskell, who, like so many radical liberals, moved into a mass working-class movement to, in all honesty and with the best of intentions, turn that particular movement into one of simple-minded social reform, and in the end became no more than a huge dumb creature of the Establishment.

And they are rejected by the militant working-class groups, and they cry treason, but their condemnation lies in the result of their own pathetic, stupid or selfish actions, and the trail of disasters that these men left behind them in relation to the working class. But My Lord Robens and My Lord George with a hyphen Brown are now living high on the hog, complete with their House of Lords drag and sadly, sadly, Hugh is plucking an indifferent harp in some middle-class heaven, and we, the rank and file of London's transport workers, have received a pay award of £1.85

without the bother of the rank and file or our branch secretaries being informed.

This is company unionism that we rightly condemn when practised in America or Russia yet we have sold out because the price suited us. It concerns you all, little comrades, have no illusions, for London Transport and the Greater London Council who are responsible for the transport workers' pay settlement at the same time gave out a brief dismissal of the matter of FREE TRAVEL for the people of London. They dismiss the 9-day experiment with the following few words, 'Observers found it difficult to ascertain the basis of the decision to carry out the experiment (free public

transport). Some saw it as little more than a gesture while others looked upon it as the sudden and dramatic action of a long frustrated body which had been under pressure from all sides "to do something to relieve the deteriorating on-street traffic situation".'

The Establishment has spoken against moneyless public transport, so easy, so simple, so economical, so much in the interests of the people of London. No one asked the transport rank and file what they thought of the pay award offer. No one asked the miners if they wanted worsening wage conditions and the sack. No one asked the socialists within the Labour Party if they wanted socialism and that anti-middle-class clause four in its constitution, and no one asked poor old Charlie if he wanted his leg sliced off even though everything is in our own self-interest in this Voltairian world of working-class Candides.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

One Good Man & True

ONE OF THE PROBLEMS of maintaining integrity in a complex official-ridden society is what to do when called up for jury service. A juror at Chelmsford Crown Court (Essex) found his own answer when during a tyre-stealing case he protested at police methods. The defendant claimed that he made a confession of the offence because he was frightened by the police and did not want to be kept in the police station. The man said the statement he made was untrue and he said he broke down and cried while the police were interviewing him.

The juror intervened and said that he had similar experience of Colchester police methods and he asked to be excused from jury service.

The judge adjourned the case for a quarter of an hour and returned to say, 'One never ceases to learn about life. I have never had to face a situation such as this.' One wonders where the judge has been all these years. One feels that he, like all other judges, seems to have been stored away in some cellar, like a wine to mature undisturbed. Unlike wine, judges do not improve with age or storage.

He went on, 'It seems to me that in order that justice is done, and is seen

to be done, and so that the remainder of the jury are not to be affected by matters which are not evidence in this case, the proper course is to discharge the jury.' He thereupon excused Mr. Jacobs from future jury service.

It is reported that changes are to be made in the law so that the police have a freer hand (so it is reported) to deal with the rising crime rate since, it is alleged, present laws give unfair advantage to the criminal. One change to be made is that any offender's previous record shall be made known in court—this will obviously prejudice the judge and jury despite any attempt they may make to be fair. This record is known in such cases to the police already and one knows how they react to such information.

The concept of 'innocent until proved guilty' is already largely a fiction. Any change in the law in respect of previous convictions, and the proposed dispensing with formal cautioning on arrest, will make 'guilty until proved innocent' an accepted position.

Might it not be a good idea for the previous records of the police concerned to be revealed to the judge by the defence? He may then learn more about life as lived in police stations.

J.R.

The Night Assemblies Bill

THE MEETING to discuss and oppose the Night Assemblies Bill got off to a rather rocky start. It became immediately apparent that there were two radically different points of view on the matter. The first was the ordinary civil libertarian point of view; this bill must be opposed because it is a threat to freedom. The second was quite different; the bill should be opposed because the campaign to block it will of itself generate so much militancy among the young that a social revolution will be brought about.

The discussion between the two parties was lively, stimulating and at times somewhat personal. A great many home truths were ventilated. But once the steam had been let off the meeting got down to serious plans, and we very soon came to the conclusion that the thing to do was to organise a massive open-air festival in which everything would

be free.

It was decided unanimously:

1. To hold a People's Festival in the park that extends for six miles from Windsor Castle to Virginia Water, commencing on Saturday, August 26, 1972. No termination date was fixed.
 2. To invite all those artists (e.g. the Rolling Stones, Jefferson Airplane, Hawkwind, Edgar Broughton, Joan Baez, Pete Seeger, etc., etc.) who have played a part in establishing what some present referred to as 'our civilisation of love and freedom'.
 3. To proceed energetically with the Petition, with a target of 1,000,000 signatures. The total so far is 13,088.
- The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 3, 1972, at 7.30 p.m., at 40E Holland Road, basement entrance in Napier Road. Petition forms are available from Bill Dwyer at the above address.

M.H.

Women take Over

Continued from page 1

received some help from a managing director who sold them some materials cheaply. The criticism that they are only continuing with their own form of private enterprise is valid. But in a town of only about 3,000 inhabitants the closing of even a small factory is a disaster to that community. Being a small factory it was obviously much easier to take over and re-start production. This is important in any occupation. Since by their example these women have shown that they can organise production and are capable of running their factory without the bosses.

NO SUPPORT FROM UNION

Occupation as a method of struggle is now being widely used. Engineers in the Manchester area have adopted it to force employers to bargain at factory level. While the unions involved in this struggle are giving their blessing, the National Union of Footwear, Leather and Allied Trades don't want to know about the Fakenham occupation. Such an attitude is not surprising. But this same union has gone out of its way to prevent those in occupation receiving money from shop floor collections and

asked the local trades council not to organise or give financial support.

One is entitled to ask what exactly is the union doing to get these jobs back? Unions are essentially bureaucratic and undemocratic organisations. Occupations by their very nature are just the opposite. They give everyone involved a sense of responsibility, control and purpose. The unions do not want their members to take the initiative. They form an elite who want only to control members who pay their wages. Their attitude is that they know best and that they will think and act for you.

The trade unions have not put up any effective opposition to unemployment. Rhetoric from platforms and in union journals has not stopped the employers from sacking workers and closing down factories. Action from those directly involved has made employers think again.

The occupation of the work place is a natural expression of a desire for responsibility. It expresses an unconscious longing in all people to be able to take control of their own lives and to make decisions for themselves. It is a step in the direction to a conscious desire to take over completely and run industry for the benefit of the community.

P.T.



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

- The Radical Tradition in Education in Britain** (includes extracts from William Godwin, Robert Owen, William Morris and others) (ed.) Brian Simon £1.00 (7p)
- The Parts are all around us** Parts 1 & 2 Bob Dickens £0.16 (2½p) (Published by Friends of Malatesta, US)
- How the Student Rising is re-absorbed** Garcia Calvo £0.20 (3½p) (Published by Simian)
- The Hungarian Workers Revolution** Direct Action Pamphlet No. 2 (Published by SWF) £0.05 (2½p)
- An Introduction to revolutionary anarchism** Laurens Otter £0.10 (2½p)
- The Fall of Paris: The Siege and the Commune 1870-71** Alistair Horne £0.62½ (10p)
- The Russian Anarchists** Paul Avrich £4.50 (21p)
- Anarchisme et Marxisme de la Révolution Russe** Arthur Lehning £0.60 (3½p)
- L'Anarchisme Aujourd'hui** Jean Barrau £0.60 (3½p)
- Bakounine et Netchaiev** Jean Barrau £0.60 (3½p)
- The Great French Revolution** Peter Kropotkin £3.75 (21p)

Please send foolscap (9" x 4") S.A.E. if you would like to receive regular booklists.

Freedom Press

publish
FREEDOM weekly
and distribute
ANARCHY monthly

84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 01-247 9249
Entrance Angel Alley,
Whitechapel Art Gallery exit,
Aldgate East Underground Stn.
SPECIMEN COPIES ON REQUEST

Bookshop
Open Afternoons
Tuesday to Friday
2 p.m. to 6 p.m.
Open Evenings
Thursday close at 8.30 p.m.
Saturday 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

ANOTHER RIGHT-WING UNION

MENTION has recently been made in these columns of the secessionist Telecommunications Staff Association (formerly the National Guild of Telephonists) and its associations with the Conservative Central Office. This does not seem to be an isolated occurrence.

Right-wing 'unions' and 'front' organisations are in the offing. A number already exist.

Within local government, NALGO has been very successful in recruiting many grades of staff, particularly the clerical grades. But like the Post Office it has always had trouble with such higher grades as local government solicitors, borough architects and civil engineers. Whilst the majority of engineers do belong to NALGO, a minority have either belonged to, or retained joint membership with, ALGES, or to give it its full title, the Association of Local Government Engineers. It is, unlike the TSA in the Post Office, recognised as a 'union' by the National Joint Negotiating Committee—just! It is political and, at least up to very recently (see the latest *ALGES Bulletin*), anti-strike. It has never recruited more than a thousand or two members within local government.

However, fairly recently another outfit has arrived on the scene. This is UKAPE, the United Kingdom Association of Professional Engineers. This 'union' attempts to recruit engineers in both local government and in private industry. It has, however, been making quite a lot of noise within local government recently, and its members have

written quite a number of letters to *The Surveyor*, the journal of local government engineering. But UKAPE is not apolitical like ALGES. Nor is it a secessionist or breakaway 'union' (like the TSA) as stated recently in the journal *7 Days*. It is a brain-child of the Monday Club—and, perhaps, the Tory Central Office as well. Its industrial policy is extreme right-wing. And one of its members, a little bird tells me, is a certain Dr. David Brown, a civil engineer from Ipswich, who is also leader of the neo-Nazi National Democratic Party.

Another right-wing 'trade union' development is an organisation called TRU-AIM, or Trades Unions Against Immigration. It has set up a 'front' called the British Committee Against Immigration. Almost all the far right groups, including the National Front, the National Democrats, Colin Jordan's British Movement, the almost defunct Mosleyites and the Immigration Control Association of Joy Page, are associated with TRU-AIM. Colin Jordan appears to be the instigator (see *British Tidings*, Oct.-Nov., 1970); but the activists are three members of the TGWU—Danny Harmsdon, a Smithfield meat porter and Union Movement member, Ronald Taylor of the National Front, and S. Cripps of Southall, a member of the Immigration Control Association.

Trade Unionists will obviously have to watch these right-wing activities very carefully indeed.

NALGO MEMBER.

THE MARCH, organised by the Anti-Internment League, was made up mainly by British left-wing groups. The Heath 'initiative' having been successful in at least sowing confusion amongst the Irish Catholics. Estimates of the size of the march range from 4,000 to 7,000.

There was a real shop-window on the left, though many of the goods were not advantageously displayed. There was a big IS contingent exhibiting the usual confusing (confused?) range of friends and acquaintances—from militants worth knowing to people I fought years ago in the Labour Party who are still Labour councillors. The ORA Newsletter sold well there. The CP was minuscule and the SLL were careful not to expose their cadres to infection by marching them to the rally and turned off earlier.

The IMG/Irish Solidarity Campaign was small but vocal. The spectacle of these armchair revolutionaries leading a chorus of middle-class youth in 'Victory to the IRA' sickened many people marching, whether they supported either, both or none of the wings of the IRA. The IMG, still playing the one card that worked for them in the past, were leaf-letting for a Ceylon Solidarity Campaign—purportedly in support of the young JVP guerrillas—but they didn't mention that the Bandaranaike government killing and torturing them is composed not only of Stalinists and liberals but also the LSSP—until recently the 'Ceylonese section' of the Mandel/IMG 4th International (not to be confused with the products of the same name marketed by Messrs. Healy, Pablo, or Posadas, or any of the other five 'trotskyist tendencies' trying to make their own).

The speakers at the meeting made roughly the same points (although Gerry Lawless' long ramble was unintelligible):—there have been many 'solutions' to the 'Irish problem' from Westminster. About one in every generation. None of them recognised that Westminster could never solve the Irish problem—that the problem existed so long as Westminster thought it could.

—the dictatorship of the insipid Whitelaw solved no problems either. It did clarify the point that the enemy was not the Protestants but the British ruling class.

—the fight to end internment and withdraw British troops should be inten-

Ireland & Britain—

sified not relaxed. —that the liberals, social democrats and reformists of all hues were now hastening to get off the hook.

AND NOW

This still leaves British revolutionaries with the question of how to approach the 'Irish problem'. Many sections have predictably jumped on bandwagons (though now the various wagons roll in different directions the spectacle is likely to be more painful than hitherto). Or else plumped for safe, long-term slogans such as 'united workers' republic', etc.

The main contradiction is that although there is a popular desire among the Catholic people for a united Ireland, this IN NO WAY threatens the ruling class in Ulster, Eire or Britain.

Economically the union of not only Ulster and Britain but Ulster, Eire and Britain is an accomplished fact. The more advanced spokesmen for business interests are perfectly happy to countenance a united Ireland (e.g., Wilson). The only reason the Tories are stuck is that they need the support of their own right-wing as they face more and more problems—the eight unionist MPs could prove awkward over the EEC legislation. The attempt to give the appearance of something to everyone may have already lost Heath this support.

With the certainty of the economic situation getting much worse next year as we enter the EEC, and the likelihood of another devaluation, the Tories are desperately trying to cool off as many problems as they can, without however giving any real ground. It is this which unites all the headaches that Heath faces—he could try and handle each of them but the combination is too much.

The 'giveaway budget' with its illusion of a spending spree (the OAPs' rise will be wiped out by the time they get it in October) is an attempt to take British workers' attention away from factory occupations, growing unemployment, rising rents, etc. The railwaymen's and

engineers' claims are the main threat to the hastily concocted 'mood of optimism' the Tory press has 'discovered'.

Similarly the main efforts of Gauleiter Whitelaw are to 'cool it'. Not to 'solve' anything, just to gain time. Stormont is suspended (on full pay), not abolished. Internment is to be 'reviewed' and 'phased out' if the security situation allows', not ended. More troops are being sent in, with a softer line yes, but an extra 4,000 all the same. Partition will be put to a loaded plebiscite 'later' (even the word plebiscite ought to remind older readers of Central Europe in the 30's).

There will be no attempts to solve unemployment, housing, discrimination. When the Tories feel strong enough, and when Lynch and the reformists in Ireland and the UK have dismantled or disarmed the opposition, it will be back to square one—with more troops.

For this reason the Anti-Internment League is dead right. NOW is the time to demand the release of internees and the withdrawal of troops.

The possibility that the whole situation offers is much more than 'a United Ireland', 'getting the Tories out' or even bigger wages. Whether or not Heath tries to call an election to strengthen his hand this autumn, counting on all the OAPs and Catholics he's won over, the economic situation next year will be

much worse—and the false 'boom' this summer will add to that not solve it. Even if Wilson does win such an election (because the Tories want out, or for other reasons), the miners' strike and the wave of occupations have made workers more bloody-minded, not less.

For this reason libertarians must become more active and more effective in their efforts to support every local and national claim, to expose the hypocrisy of '£1 to the poor, £100s to the rich' and the OAPs 'rise', to fight the Fair Rents Act, and the Industrial Relations Act. In the immediate future to win public sympathy to the railwaymen's and the engineers' claims.

The real solution to 'the Irish problem' and to all the other 'problems' is a society run by the working people—a revolution. The difference today is that this idea, fundamental to be a revolutionary, is going to be a real possibility in the near future. That or fascism. The bosses can no longer graciously hand down the crumbs that the Labour Party and the TUC have stayed in business to 'gain'. Every small fight is magnified in importance. Who knows where the next occupation will lead to? Growing occupations, widespread rent strikes, more people organising and fighting for decent housing, control of the institutions they learn or work in—this is what the word 'revolution' means. The conflicts will spread and grow. The opportunities for libertarians to help, physically and in providing a broader framework of ideas, are immense. They need an equally enormous effort on our part.

KEITH NATHAN.

GUSTAV LANDAUER

Dear Comrades,

In his enjoyable and sympathetic review of the book *CALL TO REVOLUTION, The Mystical Anarchism of Gustav Landauer* (FREEDOM, 18.3.72), Arthur W. Uloth asks what a believer in non-violence and dropping out of authoritarian society was doing in the Munich rising at all. In *Anarchy* No. 54* C.W. brings together some of the fragmentary and contradictory accounts of the Munich Council Republic which give a less dotty impression of it than is gained from some historians ('the embodiment of impractical romantic anarchism'—James Joll; 'the most pathetic revolution ever known . . . violent and authoritarian'—A.W.U.). In tracing the role of Landauer in that revolution, which began in Munich on November 7, 1918, when soldiers and workers deposed the government and proclaimed the Republic of Bavaria, C.W. quoted Willy Fritzenkotter writing in *FREEDOM*, 26.9.53:

'The first action of the two anarchists [Mühsam and Landauer] was to organize the "Revolutionary Workers' Council". This council then took the initiative and formed in every workshop the "Revolutionary Workshop Organisation". These councils were to be organized in every city, and form (in connection with the "Sailors' and Farmers' Council") the administration of every city and village. All these councils in the country were to elect representatives and send them to a "Council Congress" in Munich. According to the plan of Mühsam and Landauer these councils and congress should work on a federative basis, and not be centralised. Against this revolutionary movement Eisner [the Independent Socialist who headed the cabinet of the revolutionary Republic] and Auer worked in conjunction with the reactionary forces. They were for a Parliamentary election. The Parliament they aimed at making the real law-maker in Bavaria, forcing the "Workers' Councils" into insignificance.'

LETTER

Arthur Uloth thinks that Landauer was ahead of his time, and that his philosophy of withdrawing support from the State and contracting other relationships is what is relevant to ours. This is so, but Landauer's precept and example for us is that his withdrawing from the State and political systems was not retiring to Gandalf's Garden and contracting other relationships and a life-style in an exclusive enclave within the surrounding system. In 1893 he was storming the gates of the international socialist congress who were aiming to direct the labour movements of Europe into parliamentary channels and therefore wanted to exclude the anarchist influence, and he was at the succeeding one in 1896 declaring that 'the apparent splendour of the labour movement in Germany is but skin-deep, whilst in reality the number of those who fully and conscientiously go in for a total regeneration of human society, who struggle to realise a free socialist society, is infinitely smaller than the number of Social Democratic voters. . . .'

Perhaps he thought that the Munich rebels were of that smaller number and that he was therefore one of them; in any case his participation was consistent with his style of taking his anarchist belief and his message of contracting other relationships right into the course of those who were attempting to remake the conditions in which we live, and contesting authoritarianism there. Our comparable situations are Ireland, the factory take-overs, the 'let's get the Tories out' politics of varying shades of revolutionary red, and within our own movement the individualism that steps over into *laissez-faire* capitalism and the organisational enthusiasm that leads into Leninist tendencies.

Fraternally,

M.C.

**Anarchy* 54 (August 1965), *Freedom* Press, 15p.

This week in Ireland

WHAT A WEEK TOO. Whitelaw enshrined at Stormont and Craig and Paisley and Faulkner all fulminating in their various ways. The mother of ten caught in crossfire and shot dead by the Provos which led to the women of Andersonstown turning on the Provos and telling them to get out and give the initiative a trial. They were sick of violence. Following this there was a meeting of the women and the group known as 'Women Together' to discuss means of ending violence and starting to live a normal peaceful life once more. This was crudely interrupted by the violent women shouting and screaming led by the fanatic Maire Drumm. They wanted the fight to go on till every British soldier was ousted.

The meeting broke up in disarray and some of the original women left in tears. Later they held another very large meeting without announcing time or venue in advance, and many Andersonstown men are now reported to be anxious to join with them.

The SDLP repeatedly call for a cessation of the IRA campaign as they state if the violence ended it would be a matter of weeks rather than months before all the internees were released. Meanwhile the IRA are split among themselves. The Derry command called for a truce which was cancelled by Dublin. Then Derry announced they were willing to have talks and even take a referendum.

The prisoners on the 'Maidstone' are on hunger strike against lack of exercise and what they declare is the appalling food they get, and the fact only 15 minute visits are allowed. Longer visiting hours and exercise have been conceded, but the official declares he tasted the food and it was excellent, and I have no doubt what he got hot and nicely served in the kitchen was, but my mind goes back to a country hospital in which I was incarcerated at one time. The Inspector always gave notice when he was coming, and we had clean whole sheets, white bedspreads and a delicious dinner, but after he had gone the torn old sheets, dirty pink bedcovers and eternal sago pudding, tepid and lumpy, reappeared. Inspectors of prisons, hospitals or anything else should always arrive unheralded and unsung.

Meanwhile the killings and explosions go on in the six counties even if slightly abated. A boy of sixteen was shot (not

fatally) from a car when he was standing gossiping at a street corner with other lads. The Official branch of Sinn Fein have claimed 'credit' for shooting two soldiers, not in defence of anybody or anything but just in cold blood. They got their own offices here in Dublin extensively burned last night, the fire starting about 10.30 in the downstairs lavatory, and obviously malicious. Your writer is profoundly thankful she was at a lecture and has at least 15 people to confirm her alibi as she has been attacking them rather viciously in the papers lately. Next week we are threatened with a huge unofficial electricity strike.

The Scarman Tribunal Report is due for publication later today, but it is really too late. The giants of the days it investigated are gone. Chichester-Clark, Porter and other then notable figures have practically faded from the scene altogether, but it may give Whitelaw a leverage in the release of the internees. We just hold our breath and abide the hour.

A little side-light. There begs most days up by the local shops a boy whose legs are very deformed. Having a certain affection for this child of, I suppose, 14 or 15 (though he looks younger), I went about investigating to find if anything could be done. I discovered he has had hospital treatment and no more can be effected. Owing to his long stay in hospital when he was younger he can read and write and the Itinerant Settlement Committee could have got him apprenticed to ANCO. However he earns £14 to £15 a week by begging so his family are not having any. What a sick society that begging should be more profitable than work and preferred.

I forgot to mention a group of the British and Irish Communist Organisation took over the Ministry for Foreign Affairs yesterday chaining themselves to radiators, etc. Nine were arrested under the provision of the Forcible Entry Act. As this particular group are all for going into the EEC and declare the six counties to be a separate nation, God knows what they were bellyaching about.

Since I wrote I have learned four well-known Dublin persons have caused a summons to be served on the Attorney General to show why the third Amendment of the Constitution Act 1971 should not be deemed to be unconstitutional. If they were successful we could not go into the EEC.

H.



Secretary:
Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road,
Rotton Park, Birmingham 16

**ANARCHIST
FEDERATION
of BRITAIN**

AFBIB—To all Groups.

The next AFBIB will be produced in Sheffield at 4 Havelock Square, Sheffield, 10. Send material to Secretary, Peter Le Mare. Also needs offers of help from Groups to bring out further issues.

The Contact Column in 'Freedom' is also available for urgent information. Groups should send latest addresses to Birmingham. New inquirers should write direct to them or to the AFB information office in Birmingham.

AFB REGIONAL GROUPS

There are now anarchist groups in almost every part of the country. To find your nearest group write to:

N.E. England: Mick Renwick, 34 Durham Road, Gateshead, Co. Durham.
Essex & E. Herts.: P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (QM, FL.)
Surrey: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.
Yorkshire: Martin Watkins, Flat D, 90 Clarendon Road, Leeds, LS2 9L.
Manchester: Mat Cunningham, 9 Briar Hill Avenue, Little Hulton, Worsley, Lancs.
Scotland: Secretary, Mike Malet, 1 Lynwood Place, Maryfield, Dundee.
Wales: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).
N. Ireland: c/o Freedom Press.
The American Federation of Anarchists: P.O. Box 9885, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440, USA.
S. Ireland: 20 College Lane, Dublin, 2.
University and Student Groups: c/o P. L. Mare.

Contact

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

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

Iberian Centre, Holy Trinity Church Hall, 125 Kingsway, London, W.C.1. Cycle of Films: Sunday, April 16, 7.30 p.m., 'To Die in Madrid'; Sunday, April 30, 7.30 p.m., 'The Exterminating Angel' (directed by Luis Buñuel, English subtitles); Sunday, May 7, 7.30 p.m., 'The Executioner' (directed by Luis G. Berlanga, English subtitles).

Free School Must Get Started! Need small East London room for office to start ball rolling. Pay reasonable rent. Tel. Joe, Orpington 25223.

Anti-Heroes. A set of cards produced by Marrow and Ginger of Nottingham. Pictures and Words. Ned Ludd, Robin Hood and Scenes of the Burning of Nottingham Castle, Sherwood Forest, General Booth, Feargus O'Connor, Byron and His Lady. 25p per set plus 3p postage or individually at 5p each plus 3p postage. From BOOKS, 84 Woodhouse Lane, Leeds 2.

Read 'Equality.' The international English language Libertarian newspaper for Readers' Control. Subscriptions are free but donations towards postage costs are appreciated. Write to Jim Huggon, c/o Freedom Press.

Individualist Forum. 'Peace Centre' Coffee Bar, 36 Romilly Street, W.1 (off Cambridge Circus). Sunday, April 16 and 30, 8 p.m. 'Communism and the Individualist Alternative' by Ken Knudson. Presented by S. E. Parker. (In Two Parts.)

Harrigay and District Anarchists meet every Thursday from 8 p.m. in the Saloon Bar of the Osborn Tavern, Stroud Green Road, Finsbury Park.

Anarchist Meetings. Wednesdays 7.30 p.m. 271 Commercial Road, E.1 (1st floor).

London Anarchists meet socially at 'The Marquis of Granby', Cambridge Circus, Charing Cross Road, Sundays from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

Anarchist Dwarf Group forming in Enfield area; contact Terry and Val, original poems by Tina Morris. Send 24p for 6 cards (3 different designs) 89 Mapleton Crescent, Enfield, Middlesex.

Oxford. Anarchist meetings every Friday 8 p.m. Clarendon Press Institute, Walton Street, Oxford.

Corby. Public meeting on 'Anarchism and Workers' Control' planned for June 29. Green Room, Civic Centre at 7.30 p.m. Local help with publicity appreciated. Contact Terry Phillips, 70 Blenheim Walk.

Help! Stoke Newington 8 Fund. Comrades now on remand in Brixton and Holloway need financial aid urgently for meals, fruit, papers, books (which must be new) and cigarettes. Please send donations to the Stoke Newington 6 Fund, c/o Compendium Books, 240 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1, a.s.a.p.

Free Valpreda Campaign needs help, not just by way of support, but also involvement in planning and organising. Please contact c/o N. & E. London Group ORA.

'Peace News'—the other anarchist weekly—every Friday 7p from your newsagent or by subscription. FREE with trial sub. of 7 issues for 50p two sample copies which include Illich on Deschooling and Communes Special. 'Peace News' for the theory and practice of nonviolent anarchism, 5 Caledonian Road, London, N.1.

Libertarian Book Club. Spring Lectures Series. Thursday evenings, 7 p.m., 369 Eighth Avenue, New York City. April 13, Irving Levitas: G. B. Shaw and the Anarchists. April 27, Sam Dolgoff: Bakunin and Nechaev. May 11, Murray Bookchin: Marxism and Anarchism.

Would Box 001 please send Freedom Press his address as we have mislaid it. We have a number of replies from your ad.

London School of Non Violence. Series of Lectures—Man and his Environment. April 17, 7 p.m., Alec Wilding-White: 'The Severed Head of Humanity'. The Crypt, St. Martins-in-the-Fields, London, W.C.2.