

IRELAND FORGOTTEN

THE WORLD'S weary eyes have turned away from N. Ireland but little has changed. The poor housing and the poverty remain, with the British Army and a repressive police state apparatus to crush anyone who dares to dream of changing this state of affairs. The innocent victims of the Provisionals' lunatic bombing campaign and the British Army's bullets have been forgotten, and the living have been deserted in the ruins of their suffering by the opportunists of the Left who have moved on to the next "issue" capable of exploitation.

The cynicism with which the people of N. Ireland have been deserted is only equalled by the cynical way in which the alleged internationalists of the authoritarian Left supported the nationalism - indeed fascism - of the Provisionals. Not for the first time were workers sacrificed on the altar of nationalism by the self-appointed "vanguard of the working class" in order to comply with the iron law of "anti-imperialist struggle" or some such Leninist clap-trap.

The British Government has taken advantage of the widespread revulsion to the slaughter felt by many people in N. Ireland in order to produce Whitelaw's "solution" which merely promises to share power amongst the rival politicians. William Craig and his "Loyalist" friends realize that they can only maintain their own political support - and justify their existence - as a reaction to IRA violence; hence they oppose the power-sharing which would lead to a more orthodox political power struggle. The Social Democratic Labour Party which has most to gain cannot jump too eagerly without alienating its more militant Catholic supporters. The Official IRA expressing themselves through the now

legal Republican Clubs criticise the Provisionals for their indiscriminate violence (while forgetting their own catastrophic bombing in Aldershot) and also the SDLP for proposing to take office in local government seats won at the forthcoming elections while internment continues. The Official IRA want power and will contest the elections on an "Irish socialist" platform but for obvious reasons have said that they will not take seats until internment ends. The Provos meanwhile have expressed opposition to the elections but there seem to be dissensions amongst the more politically conscious. However, it is clear that they can only justify their continued existence on the basis of a military campaign which they are finding increasingly difficult to sustain.

Whatever the outcome of the wheeling and dealing between the rival politicians we can be sure that the people of N. Ireland, Catholic and Protestant, will still be exploited and manipulated by those in power. "Peace" cannot be imposed by an army and the divided communities of N. Ireland must find their own way of living together. Starting from the basis of autonomous communities a federalist society could be re-created. However, any attempt at local community control is suppressed by the British Army in maintaining the authority of the State.

A pre-requisite to any progress in N. Ireland is the withdrawal of the British Army and it is time we all turned our attention to seriously campaigning on this question. Army recruiting offices must be picketed and leafleted; soldiers must be invited to refuse postings to N. Ireland or to desert.

BRITISH TROOPS OUT OF N. IRELAND NOW!

FASCIST ANGER IN SPAIN

IN A FASCIST regime like Franco's Spain it was ironic to see the Falangists and police marching through Barcelona and Madrid last week calling for "stronger government". The situation arose after a May Day clash between police and demonstrators in which a policeman was allegedly stabbed to death by a Maoist demonstrator.

The police were incensed by restrictions imposed on the use of firearms after a worker was shot dead by riot police outside Barcelona last month. At least eight strikers have been killed by police in the last two years and the regime is obviously worried about its image abroad. However, Franco's Government has yielded to pressure from the police and Falangists and has given its blessing to the use of firearms by police in suppressing any agitation against the regime. In the Basque provinces particularly, armed police have carried out house-to-house searches for suspected members of left-wing movements.

The more politically-conscious capitalists in Spain realize that progress towards a facade of liberal democracy in Spain is necessary for its economic development and closer association with the Common Market. The experience of the rest of Western Europe shows that workers can be exploited by use of a dangling carrot just as easily as by using the big stick. However, in Spain as everywhere else when the people kick against repression the liberal mask falls away to show the brutal face of authority.

Terry Phillips

"Inevitably the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie will give expression to their own ideologies. Inevitably, they will stubbornly express themselves on political and ideological questions by every possible means. You cannot expect them to do otherwise. We should not use methods of suppression and prevent them from expressing themselves, but should allow them to do so and at the same time argue with them and direct appropriate criticism at them. We must undoubtedly criticize wrong ideas of every description. It certainly would not be right to refrain from criticism, look on while wrong ideas spread unchecked and allow them to monopolize the field. Mistakes must be criticized and poisonous weeds fought wherever they crop up. However, such criticism should not be dogmatic, and the metaphysical method should not be used, but efforts should be made to apply the dialectic method. What is needed is a scientific analysis and convincing argument."

(Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-Tung, Foreign Languages Press, Peking 1967 pp. 53-54)

which he holds his liberal beliefs. While working in his department at the Maudsley he granted me every facility I needed to carry out my own research in my own way -- including a research into anarchism in which nearly fifty anarchists participated. In my view he has all the classic faults and the classic virtues of the liberal. But I respect his integrity as an academic and his integrity as a man absolutely. In the academic world (as in the world of art, letters, music, etc.) there is a good deal of bitchery, and at this game Eysenck can hold his own. But let me say this with studied deliberation: those who try to smear Eysenck are scum. The Commie scum we all know; their stock in trade is character assassination as well as assassination by the ice-pick method. There are also scum in quite high academic positions, and minor academic scum currying favour with their superiors by joining in the smear campaign. Such academic scum are very foolish scum indeed. They do not realize that the jolly days of Nuremberg, Munich and Berlin where an academic's right to speak depended on the length of his nose, are not so very far from our tranquil British scene. Some will be shocked (I hope) by a physical attack on a professor invited to speak on an academic platform. Maybe their turn will come next -- for if it is all right to bash

academics who study the interaction between heredity and environment today, tomorrow it will be all right to bash academics who are exclusively concerned with environmental influences.

In a so-called "libertarian" publication (*Rat, Myth and Magic*) there appeared the following choice instigation to a lynch mob:

"There will be a 'battle' at the British Psychological Society this April between Broadbent, Jahoda and Sedgwick: 'Psychology and Society'. This symposium has been arranged to pacify the anger discovered at last April's Ethics Symposium. Shall we disrupt it?" (italics added)

When howling "Two legs bad, four legs good!" and other such brilliant slogans, and physically bashing the intending speakers in case they actually speak, becomes de rigueur in academic circles, then presumably the publishers of this so-called "libertarian" publication will feel they have done their bit in liberating the academic scene. But by this time other people besides Professor Eysenck will have to be concerned about the length, size, shape and consistency of their noses before they venture on an academic platform. And fashions in noses can change very rapidly.

To those accustomed to the propaganda rough and tumble of the streets, all this may appear as something of a storm in a teacup. When we speak on a soap-box about anarchism we expect to be asked by hecklers such questions as "Who's going to clean out the sewers then, mate?" and we develop tricks of repartee to deal with such interruptions. I maintain that the verbal debate of the street corner with its wit, emotional appeal and preposterous exaggeration is a valuable and essential feature of a community struggling to live in freedom. But the freedom of debate of academics is not to be despised. Once that goes either at the hands of politically motivated thugs, or dictates of the Central Committee of the Party, much else in society alters too. Once all knowledge becomes vested in a church, theocratic or secular, and free scientific debate and publication is repressed as heresy, then even the limited freedom of the streets which we enjoy today is withdrawn.

Tony Gibson.

Published by Freedom Press, London, E. 1. Printed by Vineyard Press, Colchester.

Professor Eysenck's Nose

THE BEATING UP of a Jewish professor is quite like old times again - old times in Munich, Nuremberg and Berlin where an academic's right to speak was measured by the length of his nose. Dr. Goebbels, himself, a brilliant academic, decreed new canons of academic freedom. It is interesting that these canons of academic freedom are now beginning to be applied in the London School of Economics. The L S E boys are now, in public, wringing their hands -- "Oh no, it was not us! How could it be? We are the inheritors of the tradition of Harold Laski, that great master of tolerance. It was outsiders who caused all the trouble; the mob from Birmingham and suchlike outlandish places." It is funny how it is always outsiders who cause all the trouble; Enoch Powell would tell us the same story.

And now Eysenck set upon because he is a Jewish professor, that archetypal target for the bully-boys? To some extent yes, since it is always easier to stir up the mob against a ready-made target, but that was certainly not the prime reason. He was attacked on the pretext of his theories about intelligence and genetics, but that was a pretty thin pretext. Considering the quarter from which the attack came there are rather more potent reasons why the Commie bully-boys should have been nursing their knuckle-dusters. I was myself a student at L S E when Eysenck published his book *The Psychology of Politics* and remember the fury of the Commies at the time. This book is a collection of research findings compiled by a team of research workers, which among other things demonstrated that in rather a large number of ways Communists and Fascists are the same mob with a different coloured sauce. That this finding was rather old hat to all of us who had spoken on soap boxes, sold literature on the streets and had the bastards break up our meetings, made no difference. It was

news to the budding young political economists at the L S E. (It had never occurred to Harold Laski.) "The Party" had at L S E at that time a beastly little propaganda agent who much resembled Squealer in Animal Farm, and for some time he led an anti-Eysenck crusade. But what could they do at that time? If they resorted to their usual hooligan tactics of breaking up meetings at which Eysenck spoke they would merely have drawn attention to the fact that Eysenck was right - that intolerant bullies who try to stop free speech are essentially the same whatever party label they wear.

The Commies have nursed their grudge, seeking occasion for revenge. The present smear campaign against Eysenck has provided a convenient excuse for attack. They do not wish Eysenck to have the opportunity to explain himself; they prefer to spread lies about what he is supposed to maintain. They claim that Eysenck peddles "anti-people and anti-scientific theories of Hitlerite fascism" -- they claim this of a liberal Jew who escaped with his life from the Hitlerite regime. Long, long ago anarchists woke up to the fact that the Leninist-Stalinist tyranny which replaced the short-lived escape from Tsarist tyranny, had some specially hideous features. Violence and murder are much the same as far as the victims are concerned, whoever wields the axe of power. But there is a curiously nightmarish quality about the totalitarian technique of declaring the opposite of the truth so loudly that it takes on a special quality of its own.

Let me declare my personal testament for what it is worth. I have worked in association with Eysenck for years, and during that time I have made no secret of the fact that I am an anarchist who rejects utterly the premises on

THE FLIGHT OF THE RAVEN



The Anarchists in the Russian Revolution. Edited by Paul Avrich. Thames & Hudson. £2.75, paperback £1.35.

Russian Rebels, 1600-1800. By Paul Avrich. New York: Schocken Books. \$10. London: Allen Lane. £4.50.

PAUL AVRICH is well known as an American academic (now Professor of Russian History at Queens College, New York) with libertarian sympathies who has specialised in libertarian aspects of the history of the Russian revolutionary movement. He made his reputation with books on The Russian Anarchists (1967) and Kronstadt 1921 (1970), which are the standard works on their subjects. He has also edited many reprints of anarchist classics - Bakunin's God and the State (1970), Kropotkin's In Russian and French Prisons (1971), The Conquest of Bread (1972) and Mutual Aid (1972), and Berkman's What is Communist Anarchism? (1972) - and he has done much in the university and publishing worlds to advance and assist research into the whole field of libertarian history and literature. With these two books he completes his programme of work on Russia, his current sphere of interest being American anarchism.

The Anarchists in the Russian Revolution is in effect a companion volume to The Russian Anarchists. It is the first contribution to the new "Documents of Revolution" series edited by Heinz Lubasz, and contains the text of 67 primary documents dating from the period 1916-1925. As well as translating the bulk of the documents, Avrich has provided an introduction, a linking commentary, some footnotes, a bibliography, and a chronology. Alla Weaver has provided 44 illustrations, some familiar and some unfamiliar, some good and some bad, to give the book more appeal.

The documents are given in nine sections - reactions to the February Revolution which destroyed the Tsarist regime, aspects of Russian anarchism, the campaign for workers' control, the call for social revolution, reactions to the October Revolution which established the Bolshevik regime, involvement in the Civil War, the Makhno movement, the suppression of the anarchist movement, and the Kronstadt rising. Some of them are familiar - thus Petrov's declaration "Why I Am an Anarchist" appeared in Anarchy 2 (March 1971), Kropotkin's two letters to Lenin and his "Message to the Workers of the West" have often appeared in English, and most of the testimonies of the suppression are taken from the well-known books of Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman or from G.P. Maximoff's compilation The Guillotine at Work - but most of them will be unknown to English-speaking readers, coming from anarchist leaflets, periodicals and books produced in Russia during the brief period of freedom between the fall of the old tyranny and the rise of the new one.

In many cases the material does little more than offer documentation for the narrative in The Russian Anarchists, having historical importance but no intrinsic interest. Indeed, despite the skill with which the items have been chosen and arranged, it is difficult not to sympathise with Anna Vladimirova's short article from Golos Truda in September 1917 called "Down with Words!" and ending: "Down with words! Down with resolutions! Long live action! Long live the creative work of the toilers!" Nevertheless the words are significant because they show how the anarchists - or most of them - stuck to their principles throughout that confusing period. They called for the destruction of the Provisional Government immediately after the February Revolution, when virtually all the other revolutionary groups were paralysed by liberal and Marxist dogmas; they appealed for an end to the war, but refused to accept the treaty with the Germans; they joined the October Revolution, but rejected the Bolshevik "Council of People's Commissars"; they fought the Whites in the Civil War, but refused to accept the authoritarian system of "War Communism"; they struggled from beginning to end, and if they lost it was an honourable defeat.

Apart from Vladimirova's attack on verbal resolutionism, which is as apt today as it was then, the documents which are most worth reading half a century later are the reply by the Geneva exiles

to Kropotkin's miserable defence of the war in 1916, the analysis of the degeneration of the Soviets by Maximoff in December 1917, the attacks on intellectual tyranny by the Gordin brothers in 1918, the protest against the Bolshevik suppression by the Bryansk anarchists in July 1918, the analysis of the development of state capitalism by "M. Sergven" (Maximoff) in September 1918, the Anarcho-Futurist manifesto of March 1919, and Kropotkin's moving message of June 1920.

Avrich's editorial comments largely recapitulate the relevant parts of The Russian Anarchists, but they offer a more explicit vindication of the role of the anarchists in the Russian Revolution, insisting that it "seems more impressive than ever". As he says, "the greatest moments of anarchism in action occurred in our own century", in Russia and in Spain, and the Russian Revolution was "the first occasion when anarchists attempted to put their theories into practice on a broad scale". Although they failed, they should not be forgotten:

"When reading the anarchist writings of the revolutionary period, one is struck again and again by how perceptive were their criticisms of authoritarian socialism, how prophetic their warnings of the dangers of centralized power, and how relevant their ideas for the present. With their vision of a decentralized society and their programme of direct action, the anarchists have exerted a lasting influence. In their criticisms of the 'new class', their passionate anti-militarism, their call for women's liberation, their inauguration of 'free universities', and their ecological concern for a balance between town and country, between Man and Nature, not to speak of their terrorist bombings and defiant courtroom behaviour, they sound astonishingly up to date."

And he believes that "all this, indeed, goes a long way to explain the resurgence of interest in anarchism, particularly among the young, in recent years". Certainly he has done more than anyone else to satisfy this interest by providing reliable and readable material on the Russian experience.

Russian Rebels, 1600-1800 goes back to the roots of this experience. It consists of studies of four popular risings - those led by Bolotnikov (1606-1607), Razin (1670-1671), Bulavin (1707-1708), and Pugachov (1773-1774) - with a brief introduction and a postscript on the legacy of the risings in the later revolutionary movement. Avrich modestly says that the book "makes no claim to be definitive", but it will certainly be the standard account in English for a long time. What he has done is to give a narrative account of each episode, synthesizing the vast amount of work done by Russian historians both before and since the Revolution, and suggesting some topics for future discussion.

All the risings followed a similar pattern, starting in the region of the southern steppes which stretch between the Dnieper river in the west and the Ural mountains in the east, and moving northwards towards Moscow before they were suppressed. This was the region of the Cossacks, the free settlers of the borders with the Asiatic peoples who were the ancestral enemies of Russia, and Cossacks provided the backbone of the four risings, and also the leadership - though Ivan Bolotnikov was a Russian slave who ran away to the Cossacks in his youth.

Bolotnikov was not in fact very important, being the most able military leader in a series of confused risings against Moscow during the "Time of Troubles" between the death of the last son of Ivan the Terrible in 1598 and the accession of the first Romanov in 1613; but he was significant for providing the prototype of a rebel who was more than a pretender attempting to replace the ruling Tsar by approaching some kind of genuine feeling of social revolution.

Stenka (Stepan) Razin was a much more formidable example of this type. He was a member of the Cossack establishment, born in Simoveiskaya Stanitsa on the Don, who turned to piracy in the Caspian and then to rebellion against both the Cossack establishment and the Tsarist regime, and who expressed powerful social aspirations and exercised remarkable charismatic qualities. His rising was the largest of another series which may be

seen as the Russian manifestation of the upheaval which shook the whole of Europe during the mid-seventeenth century. His armies moved up the Don and Volga, preaching class war against the rich and gathering support as they went, until they were defeated by superior weaponry, experience and discipline. Razin was captured, taken to Moscow, horribly tortured, and executed, behaving throughout with incredible courage. He has lived on in folk memory as Russia's greatest popular hero, though the suppression of his rising actually led directly to the subordination of the Cossacks to the state.

Risings continued into the reign of Peter the Great (1682-1725), the largest being that of Kondrati Bulavin, another member of the Cossack establishment. This was very much a rural Cossack revolt, being serious mainly because Moscow was in trouble at the same time with the Swedes, the Ukrainians and the Bashkirs.

The greatest popular insurrection in Russia before the twentieth century - and in Europe before the French Revolution - was that of Yemelka (Yemelian) Pugachov, a wandering Cossack, born in the same place as Razin, who for the first time posed as a Tsar (Peter III, the murdered husband of Catherine the Great) and who raised a vast number of people over a vast area of south-eastern Russia. Pugachov appealed not only to Cossacks but to the Bashkirs and other subject tribes and also to the new "factory serfs" of the recently industrialised Urals, and then to the ordinary peasants.

The fierce storm of the "Pugachovshchina" raged for a year, being eventually doomed by the superior force of the state, but while it lasted shaking the state more profoundly than any previous rising or any subsequent one for nearly a century and a half, and never being forgotten (partly because it was the subject of an excellent history by Pushkin), whether as a warning to the rulers or as an encouragement to the ruled.

Avrich shows that it is really wrong to describe these risings as peasant revolts. The hard core of rebels was not so much agricultural workers as disaffected soldiers and impoverished townsmen - "a kind of pre-industrial lumpenproletariat", as Avrich puts it. (In fact this is probably true of most so-called peasant revolts - thus the 1381 rising in England was led by artisans and intellectuals, and this has usually been the case ever since.) But each rising - especially the last - was accompanied by a rural jacquerie in which the serfs took a terrible revenge on their landlords, and this seems to have stirred the public memory more than anything else.

Other particularly interesting features of the risings are the sophisticated methods of propaganda used by the rebels, including the distribution of written material produced by sympathetic clergy, and the savage methods of repression used by both the rebels and the authorities, especially the latter - whose appalling atrocities reached a psychopathological level far surpassing the banal techniques of mass murder in our century.

In his closing chapter Avrich emphasises the traditional obsession with the "good Tsar". Virtually all the popular risings, not just these four, were in the name of the Tsar, whether real or pretended. This is in fact an almost universal phenomenon; the Decembrist rebellion of 1825, which was led by aristocrats and intellectuals, was in the name of a "good Tsar". The same was true at first of the English and French revolutions, for example, and even after one monarch was killed another one soon took his place. It was a long time before monarchy lost its magic, if it has yet - Avrich notes Lenin's assumption of the role of "good Tsar", and even later Stalin was believed to be ignorant of the excesses of his regime. But Avrich rather overemphasises this phenomenon. More interesting is the universal obsession with authority in general, as expressed indeed in his own treatment - concentrating on the individual leaders of movements which involved thousands of people. The tragedy is not so much that "primitive" rebels need a Tsar as that all rebels need a ruler, and authority does not seem to have lost its magic yet, even among "advanced" revolutionaries.

Most interesting of all is the universal obsession with the peasant rising itself, which Avrich traces through the

Continued on p. 3

BOOKSHOP open Tues - Fri 2-6 p.m.
Thurs to 8.30 p.m.
Saturday 10 a.m. - 4 p.m.
Any book not in stock but in print can be supplied. Please add postage as in brackets.

<u>The Mask of Anarchy</u>	
Percy Bysshe Shelley	£0.20 (2½p)
<u>The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life</u>	
Richard Sennett	£0.35 (5p)
* <u>Apostles of Revolution</u>	
Max Nomad	£0.65 (9p)
<u>The Paris Commune of 1871: The View from the Left</u>	
Edited by Eugene Schulkind	£1.50 (15p)
<u>Against Censorship</u>	
The National Council for Civil Liberties	£0.25 (3½p)
<u>Franco's Prisoner</u>	
Miguel Garcia	£2.25 (10p)
* <u>The Utopian Vision of Charles Fourier</u>	
Edited by Jonathan Beecher and Richard Bienvenu	£1.75 (15p)
<u>Ni Dieu ni Maître (4 vols.)</u>	
Edited by Daniel Guerin (in French)	£3.00 (15p) the set
* <u>Heroic Mexico: The Narrative History of a Twentieth Century Revolution</u>	
William W. Johnson	£2.50 (25p)
<u>Durruti: Le peuple en armes</u>	
Abel Paz	£4.50 (25p)
* <u>The Russian Anarchists</u>	
Paul Avrich	£1.50 (15p)

NOW AVAILABLE
1973 PEACE CALENDAR "50 YEARS OF NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE"
Published by the War Resisters' League (U.S.). Profusely illustrated with photographs. 64pp; with text on the Story of Radical Pacifism in the U.S. from World War I to the Present Day - by Marty Jezer. £0.95 (5p)

<u>Celebration of Awareness</u>	
Ivan D. Illich	£0.95 (8p)
<u>Deschooling Society</u>	
Ivan D. Illich	£0.95 (8p)

* Denotes title published in the United States.

FREEDOM PRESS in Angel Alley
84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 Phone 01-247 9249

(Aldgate East Underground station, Whitechapel Art Gallery exit and turn right - alley next to Wimpy Bar)

WRITE FOR PUBLICATIONS LIST AND BOOKSHOP LIST

SUBSCRIBE TO FREEDOM	
<u>Surface Mail & Inland</u>	
One year	£3.00 (\$7.50)
Six months	£1.50 (\$3.75)
Three months	£0.80 (\$2.00)

<u>Airmail</u>	
Europe & Mid. East 1 year	£4.00
The Americas 1 year	\$12.50
India, Africa &c. 1 year	£4.50
Australasia/Japan 1 year	£5.00
(six months pro rata)	

2 copies £5.60 per year
(6 or 3 months pro rata)

Bulk: 10 copies 40p

SUBSCRIBE to FREEDOM	
<u>Surface Mail & Inland</u>	
One year	£3.00 (\$7.50)
Six months	£1.50 (\$3.75)
Three months	80p (\$2.00)

<u>Airmail</u>	
Europe & Mid. East 1 year	£4.00
The Americas 1 year	\$12.50
India, Africa &c. 1 year	£4.50
(six months pro rata)	

2 copies £5.60 (\$14.00) per year
(6 or three months pro rata)

Bulk: 10 copies 40p (\$1.00)

WE GO TO PRESS ON MONDAY
LATEST DATE FOR RECEIPT OF
MSS. LETTERS, MEETING NOTICES
IS THE MONDAY IN EACH WEEK
OF PUBLICATION.

absence of authority

MOST PEOPLE if asked if they are pushed around would deny it. Although this reply is understandable it would not be true. For, whether we like it or not, we are all subject to one form of authority or another. The whole basis of the State and its institutions, which support the capitalist profit motive system, relies on authority and ultimately on force to back it up.

In denying that we are pushed around we try to show that we are in control of our lives. Naturally people like to cling to this myth and it serves the interests of those who really control our lives if the people continue to think so. Democracy also fosters this myth that ordinary people are in control.

People at work also do not like to admit that they are being robbed. Rather than admit this a worker might say he is doing a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. However there is nothing fair about working for a boss, whether it is a small firm or a giant state corporation. For the contents of the pay packet received at the end of a week's work represent only a part of the real value that has been produced. If anyone objects to this he doesn't have to work, but can simply starve.

The same is true about the basic need of a shelter over one's head. Massive rent increases are being imposed under the Housing and Finance Act. As with the place of work, the landlords, whether private or council, have the weight of the law behind them. The law sanctions the "legal" robbery at work and at home. At the moment this robbery is being intensified since while wages are being held down by law, this same law allows increases in rents and prices. The law, the police and the armed forces exist to protect the property and the wealth which has been made possible by the hard work and skills of others. The legalised force is there to maintain a minority in power.

Unlike the different varieties of communists and socialists, anarchists do not want power. The idea of anarchism means an absence of authority. We believe that people can create their own organisations to run industry and produce the necessary goods and services to serve the needs of everybody. Production and the organisation of society should be in the hands of ordinary people. Instead of workers being made redundant we want the managers and management made redundant. If people governed themselves, then governments and their authority would collapse like a pack of cards.

P.T.

Only unsigned material is unanimous editorial viewpoint. Publication of articles does not necessarily mean editorial agreement with the views expressed. Written contributions welcomed. Any items from FREEDOM may be reprinted but the courtesy of acknowledgement of source is welcomed.

SOLIDARITY FOR THE FIVE

THE FIRST DEMONSTRATION organised by the new Stoke Newington 5 Solidarity Committee took place last Saturday, May 12. A march was held in the afternoon from Speakers Corner, Hyde Park, to Lincoln's Inn Fields, and a public meeting was held in the evening at Conway Hall. The chief demand of the Committee is the release of the five people imprisoned for ten or fifteen years after the two Angry Brigade trials of 1971 and 1972; the main characteristic of the march and meeting was the large number of left-wing organisations associated with this position; and the constant theme of the speeches at the meeting was that the treatment of the Stoke Newington group is a symptom of a growing repression of the working-class movement in general.

The speakers in the evening were introduced by Angela Weir (one of those acquitted in the second Angry Brigade trial). There were Paul Foot (from the International Socialist paper *Socialist Worker*), Peter Hain (the star of the Stop the Seventies Tour campaign), Robin Blackburn (from the International Marxist Group paper *Red Weekly*), Beatrix Campbell (from the Communist Party paper *Morning Star*), Mrs. Tina Mendelson (mother of Anna Mendelson, one of those imprisoned for ten years in the second Angry Brigade trial), Kate Truscott (from the old Stoke Newington 7 Defence Group and the new Up Against the Law group), Eamonn McCann (from the People's Democracy), and Angela LaCointe (from the Black Panther Movement).

Most of the speeches were rather predictable, but the more notable ones were Peter Hain on the experience of facing conspiracy charges, Tina Mendelson on the experience of being harassed by the authorities during a conspiracy trial, and Angela LaCointe on the more general struggle faced by more seriously oppressed people; by far the best speech was by Eamonn McCann, the only person present who had any idea that public speaking demands some kind of technique and effort. The contributions from the floor were very poor.

The most cogent point made during the evening was that the violence of the Angry Brigade was actually very minor and that the sentences on the Stoke Newington 5 were disproportionately savage. The more general points about state repression and the working-class movement were not argued well enough to get beyond rhetoric. There was far too little hard information offered -- for example about the appeals of the five inside -- and far too little attempt to take the large number of people who are being asked to help into the confidence of those who are asking. Nevertheless a strong feeling of solidarity was expressed for the Stoke Newington 5, and a fair amount of money was raised by the collection.

MEANWHILE, there has been an interesting example of the way the media regard the problems posed and

THE HOSTILITY GAME

THE FREEDOM of release from prison has affected me in a number of ways I never thought possible, I see everything now with new eyes certainly more critical eyes. Hitching around the country this past few weeks I have met some marvelous people, old friends and some new ones, all of them working towards their ideal of an alternative society. There may be a reasoned argument put forward that the three years I spent in prison has increased the cynicism that was always a part of my makeup - I may even go as far as to agree with such an argument! The ideal of love and peace is wearing a bit thin though with all these people paying lip service to it but only just remembering to love a little more than hate and the dividing line is very thin. The police are still 'pigs', non-dope smokers remain 'straights', as opposed to bents I wonder, and there seems to be droves of 'uncool' people about.

Well okay I'm not advocating kissing your local bobby - the results of that kind of action would be swift, disastrous and possibly most painful, on the other hand I fail to see how we as anarchists can justify sticking any kind of class labels on any sections of society, whether they be hostile to our ideas or not. There seems to be very little point in erecting these puerile and prejudiced class and social barriers and then going on incessantly about the tyranny etc. of the ruling classes.

(continued from prev. col.)

the opportunities offered by the tendency to resort to bombing as a revolutionary technique. On May 9 Thames Television broadcast a film in the 'Special Branch' series by Peter Hill called *Red Herring* which depicted a terrorist episode obviously modelled on the case of the Angry Brigade. A series of car-bombs is directed against political and military targets in London by a group from the libertarian underground which is penetrated and captured by the brave boys in blue. The plot and characterisation were as banal as one would expect from commercial television, but some details were interesting.

The bomb squad operated from a hippy commune called Freedom House, which would make the necessary security rather difficult. Of its three members, one was a working-class man expelled from the Communist Party for anarchist activities, one was an upper-middle-class woman also described as an anarchist (her background and appearance were suspiciously similar to those of the two women imprisoned in the Stoke Newington trial), and one was a Special Branch agent. It was therefore pretty easy for the police to catch them, the tension of the film being drawn from the defusing of the last car-bomb. It was implied that the bombers were connected with the Russian Embassy, two of whose staff were trying in vain to catch the Special Branch agent. A nice touch was provided when Chief-Inspector Craven, the hero of the series, told the two arrested bombers to say nothing until they got a lawyer!

But the most interesting detail of all was that the bombers were being manipulated by a man who was specifically described as the manager of Compendium Books and who was clearly shown being arrested in Bookshop 85 -- both being well-known left-wing bookshops in the Camden Town area, and Compendium Books actually being the address for the Stoke Newington 8 Defence Group last year. This astonishing libel can't possibly have got into the film by chance, since the scriptwriter must have known what he was saying; on the other hand, it must have stayed in the film by chance, since the lawyers for Thames Television and the Independent Broadcasting Authority couldn't possibly have left it in if they had known about it -- or could they?

It will be revealing to see what the legal system makes of this event if, say, the real managers of Compendium Books sue the television company for libel. At least they should be able to get some money in settlement, which would serve the rich bastards who run television right.

Whilst in prison I met all kinds of 'socially unacceptable' people bank robbers, thieves, rapists, child molesters, in fact the whole spectrum of the criminal classes, ordinary working class people dumped into these filthy institutions for what is laughingly called rehabilitation. Among these rejected and despised elements I found more tolerance and consideration than I've ever seen among the 'respectable' members of our society. Of course the courts that sent these guys to prison were only made aware of the most unpleasant parts of their characters. In the same way we are only prepared to meet hostility with hostility and we find ourselves caught in the same trap as the police, politicians, screws, judges etc.: surely we can come up with better tactics than that?!

Someone said that it was possible to love 'them' to death, I'm not as convinced about that philosophy as I was a few years ago but I believe that it is possible to laugh them to death - well into a stupor anyway. It is very easy to laugh at the system for basically it is a sort of comic opera, where else but within the hallowed portals of the DHSS would you find a notice printed in three inch high letters informing you that THE NEAREST CONVENIENCE IS TEN MINUTES WALK AWAY AT CLAPHAM COMMON STATION. Yes it is possible to laugh them to death - the whole idea is so daft it's just got to work.

John Nightingale

...Continued from p. 2

nineteenth century and beyond. The authorities feared a repetition of the past right to the end, never seeing that the decisive battle would be fought not in the countryside but in the cities. Revolutionaries always raised the spectre of Razin and Pugachov, and sometimes tried to bring the past to life. Thus at the time of centennial studies of the two risings, in the early 1870s, Kropotkin argued for a peasant rising in the south - where the great movement of young propagandists "to the people" was indeed directed in 1874. In 1876 a handful of Bakuninist rebels in the Ukraine actually put the idea into practice in the extraordinary movement known as the "Chigirin conspiracy", forming a secret organisation of hundreds of peasants against their oppressors in the name of the Tsar (and under a Council of Commissars), which survived for a year. Avrich does not mention that Bakunin, together with most of the populist leaders, was actually opposed to this technique of raising rebellion by deceiving the people. Nor does he sufficiently stress the point that all the four risings he describes were in fact based on the practice of popular deception.

The final deception came in 1917, when the Bolsheviks pretended to combine the proletarian revolution with a peasant rising, and then subjected the peasants (and the proletarians) to a greater tyranny than ever. Avrich refers too briefly to the popular resistance to the Bolsheviks in the south, under such leaders as the anarchist Makhno and the social-revolutionary Antonov, who used similar insurrectionary techniques and acquired a similar legendary status to those of their predecessors. But they too were destroyed. A century after Pugachov, two centuries after Razin, a new popular rising seemed possible in Russia; a century later, nothing seems more impossible - all the subject peoples and classes of the Russian empire have been tamed, and the Russian experience has come to an end.

But who knows? In history the unexpected always happens. When Pugachov was interrogated by his captors he said, playing on the words *vor* (bandit) and *voron* (raven), "I am not the real raven, only a little one; the real raven is still flying." Perhaps it is still flying, and perhaps it will come in some form other than the mass rising using the old methods of violence under the old system of authority. If anarchism is ever going to come to anything, it must learn the lessons of experience. Avrich's great strength has been in describing the experience; he is weaker - like most historians - in drawing the lessons. That is our job.

N.W.



ON THE 'STOKE NEWINGTON FIVE' MARCH, Saturday 9th May.

Photo by courtesy of Time Out

Correspondent



(Continued)

IN RUSSIA, the Bolsheviks took power. But it had nothing in common with a "proletarian revolution", even in the form advocated by Marx and Engels. The so-called October Revolution in Petrograd was a coup d'état pure and simple. And the Bolsheviks were little more than latter-day Blanquistes.

Almost immediately after taking power, the Bolshevik Government began to nationalise, first, the Joint Stock banks, which were merged with the State Bank, then, in December, various individual enterprises, in February, 1918, grain elevators and warehouses, and in May, the entire sugar industry. And, as time went by, Lenin's government nationalised the rest of Russian industry. The State owned and controlled the means of production and distribution.

Lenin admitted, as early as May, 1918, that his government was establishing State Capitalism, but argued that - for a country such as Russia - it was "a step forward". In his pamphlet, The Chief Tasks of Our Times, he writes:-

"Reality says that State Capitalism would be a step forward for us; if we were to bring about State Capitalism in a short time it would be a victory for us. How could they* be so blind as not to see that our enemy is the small capitalist, the small owner? How could they see the chief enemy in State Capitalism?"

And later, in August 1921, he returns to the subject. He says:-

"But this is a new form of capitalism - State Capitalism. But State Capitalism in a capitalist society, and State Capitalism in a proletarian society, are two entirely different things. In the first case, it means that capitalism is controlled and recognised in the interests of the bourgeoisie and against the proletariat. In the second case, it is promoting the interests of the proletariat..." (Speech to the International Communist Conference, printed in Communist Review, August, 1921)

Russian anarchists and libertarian socialists, however, did not "appreciate" the difference! They did not consider Russia to be a "proletarian society" merely because the government called itself (from 1918 onwards) Communist. To them, State Capitalism administered by Bolsheviks was just as bad as - or worse than - State Capitalism administered by avowedly capitalist politicians or governments. And they soon said so!

IN his The Russian Anarchists, Paul Avrich notes that in 1918 State Capitalism became a major theme in anarchist criticism of the Soviet regime. He says that the most penetrating anarchist critique of State Capitalism appeared in the anarcho-syndicalist journal, Volnyi Golos Truda (The Free Voice of Labour), in its September issue. The first attack was in a lengthy article, "Paths of Revolution" by "M. Sergven", a non-de-plume of Grigori Maksimov. The Bolshevik Revolution, the author asserts, had merely resulted in the substitution of State Capitalism for private capitalism - one big owner had taken the place of many small ones. Quoting and paraphrasing "Sergven", Avrich writes:-

"By means of 'a whole bureaucratic system and a new statized morality' the Soviet government had enserfed the working masses all over again. The peasants and factory workers now found themselves under the heel of 'a new class of administrators - a new class largely born from the womb of the intelligentsia'. What had taken place in Russia, the article went on, resembled the earlier revolutions in Western Europe; no sooner had the oppressed farmers and craftsmen of England and France removed the landed aristocracy from power than the ambitious middle class stepped into the breach and erected a new class structure with itself at the top; in a similar manner, the privileges and authority once shared by the Russian nobility and bourgeoisie had passed into the hands of a new ruling class, composed of Party officials, government bureaucrats and technical specialists."

Under the centralised rule of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, the article concluded, Russia had entered a period of State Capitalism - "the new dam before the waves of social revolution".

Avrich remarks that the expression "State Capitalism" was used by the Russian anarchists to designate the pernicious concentration of political, as well as economic, power in the hands of the Bolshevik government; moreover, the State had become the boss and exploiter in place of a multiplicity of private entrepreneurs. The term "State Capitalism" was used, to describe the Soviet system, for many years by such writers as Maksimov. In 1926, the Dielo Trouda Group, in their Organisational Platform of the Libertarian Communists, accused the Bolsheviks of reconstituting a "Bourgeois State" and "Capitalist Authority". And in 1928, Berkman, in his What Is Communist Anarchism?, wrote: "Today, Russia is partly State Capitalistic and partly privately capitalistic".

It should be noted, however, that some Russian anarchists were not particularly clear as to the nature of Russian society. It took Alexander Berkman a number of years to realise the true nature of the Soviet regime; and except that she knew it was a tyranny, Emma Goldman never really understood the socio-economic basis of the Bolshevik system. Voline was not all that clear at times. In some passages of his monumental work, La Révolution Inconnue, he writes of "State Socialism"; yet he also says:-

"The Bolshevik Party seeks to build Socialism by means of the State, of a government, and of political action, centralised and authoritarian. But it can only lead to a monstrous and murderous State Capitalism, based on the odious exploitation of the 'mechanised', blind, unconscious masses. ...Any attempt to achieve the Social Revolution with the help of a State, a government, and political action - even though that attempt is very sincere, very energetic, favoured by circumstances, and supported by the masses - will lead inevitably to State Capitalism, the worst form of capitalism, which has absolutely nothing to do with the march of humanity toward a Socialist society".

OF COURSE, anarchists are not the only ones who have, at various times, or over the years, referred to the USSR as State Capitalist. In 1920, the old SPGB began to use the term - and have used it ever since. They consider themselves to be Marxists, but have always been influenced, to some extent, by the "libertarian" socialist views of people like Morris, and even Kropotkin. In 1955, "Tony Cliff" wrote a book called Stalinist Russia - A Marxist Analysis, in which he uses the phrase "State Capitalism" to describe Russian society. His analysis is, to say the least, somewhat involved. The Bolsheviks were alright in the beginning; they just went off the rails under Stalin! Hence, the regime degenerated into State Capitalism. On the other hand, the anarchist view is that the Bolsheviks built up the basis for, and developed, State Capitalism right from the start.

Soviet society today is, in essence, no different from any other avowedly capitalist society. The means of production take the form of capital; production is for profit - it is, to use Marxist terminology, commodity production. The workers are exploited - or, again to use a Marxist phrase, they create "surplus values". However, instead of the land and the means of production being owned by individual firms or large corporations, or partly by private capitalists and partly by the State, which serves a rich and powerful class of Party bosses and bureaucrats. Fortunately, more and more people - including some in the Soviet Union - are beginning to realise that capitalism exists there as well. And the form that capitalism has taken in the so-called USSR is State Capitalism, "the worst form of capitalism" (Voline). As elsewhere, it will have to be overthrown.

Peter E. Newell

*the "ultra-left" Communists and anarchists.

THE APPOINTMENT of Mr. Geoffrey Drain to the £8,500 per annum job as NALGO's general secretary is another indication of lack of workers' control within trade unions.

Those on the Left who insist in proclaiming that trade unions are democratic working class organisations should also clearly specify that worker members of these organisations have nothing to say in the running of Union affairs and that the so-called democratic life of the most militant unions depends on average turn ups at Branch meetings of less than 10% of the membership, a percentage usually made up of faithful militants and politically-motivated "leftists" using the trade unions as vehicles to reach the working class comfortably in order to propagate their party's propaganda.

The following professional background of "Brother" Drain is another indication of the type of "leadership" that makes its way into the Trade Union movement (The political lobby of the authoritarian Left): Former Labour councillor for Hampstead, acting chairman of his local Labour Party, former assistant secretary of the Institute of Hospital Administration, Barrister and Secretary of the staff side of the Health Service Whitley Council, negotiator for Administrative and Technical Staffs in the Health Service, and now inheritor of a seat on the General Council of the TUC. (This sort of bureaucratic leech, who feeds on the blood, sweat and earnings of the working class, reminds me of a certain Captain Henrique Tenreiro, notorious Portuguese fascist, who in 1965 when I left Portugal, had 42 State and private directorships in the Portuguese fishing industry; his main job was to go around 42 times a month to different offices in town, sign the book and draw his astronomical salary.)

Almost everybody knows that the Unions are the labour exchange for politicians in search of a career. Nevertheless, these Unions are hailed by the "scientific" Left as strongholds of working class power. The dispirited 1973 May Day carnival, the moody ups and downs of workers' militancy, the divisive and sectarian political struggles inside trade unions are optimistically transformed by the Left press into prerequisites for a forthcoming Revolution. Criticisms against Unions are dismissed conveniently as Union-bashing and condemned as a crime against the working class. The class loyalty that the Morning Star, the Workers' Press, the Socialist Worker, the Worker and other organs of authoritarian parties or groups is building up around political opportunism is as dogmatic as the preachings of the Vatican. No one seems to be interested to denounce the reactionary nature of today's trade unions, and the pro-Union paranoia expressed by the Left has developed instead into a blind faith in powerful Unions as generators of working class revolutionary energies. The reality remains that the power supply for these generators is controlled by the established order -- Capitalist order.

The British trade unions have done nothing other than act as efficient lubricants of the capitalist system. Workers' strikes have been scientifically used by the ruling class in the same way that medical research has developed vaccines using weak microbes in order to produce antidotes to dangerous epidemics.

The Labour Party, Labour and Trade Union leaders and authoritarian Marxists are the main political obstacle to working class emancipation. By asking the workers to vote or to digest the remains of the Bolshevik and Cultural Revolutionists, Socialists, Marxists and Maoists want to ride to power on the back of the working class. Unless the workers shake these "free riders" off their backs they will never learn by themselves how to make a revolution.

C.

Dance & Social in support of FINE TUBES STRIKERS, Fulham Town Hall, Saturday June 2nd 7.30 p.m. Tickets 75p from E. P. Nielson, 11 Challoner Court, Challoner St., W.Kensington, W.14. tel.FUL 1004

THURSDAYS 2 p.m. onwards. Help fold and despatch FREEDOM at Freedom Press

CORBY ANARCHISTS. Discussion meetings first Friday in every month at 7 Cresswell Walk 7.30 p.m. Phone Terry at Corby 66781 for details of other activities.

HEMEL HEMPSTEAD area - anarchists/libertarians interested in forming group please contact Roderick Parkes, 90 Queensway, Hemel Hempstead, Herts.

BELFAST 10 DEFENCE COMMITTEE Support the Rally and March, Sunday, 20th May meeting at 2 p.m. Clapham Common, going to Brixton jail. Picket outside the prison each Saturday 2p.m. Further information from Defence Committee 88 Roslyn Road, N.15

STOP THE FRENCH TESTS. Regular Picket. London-Paris walk 14 May-3 June. Information from GREENPEACE, 3 Caledonian Road, London N.1. Tel. 01-837 3860.

MENTAL PATIENTS UNION research group needs written evidence on the effects of electro-convulsive therapy, brain surgery and psychiatric drugs. All information will be treated confidentially. Send details to M.P.U., 97 Prince of Wales Road, N.W.5. 01-267-2770.

S.E. LONDON MENTAL PATIENTS UNION meets every Tuesday 8 p.m. at (new venue) The Albany Community Centre, Creek Road, Deptford, S.E.8.

LIVERPOOL ASA contact May Stone, C.32 Summerfield, Tower Hill, Kirkby, near Liverpool.

LONDON ASA meetings - for details phone 226-0817. Black & Red Outlook always available, by post 5p + 2p from 3 Grange House, Highbury Grange, London, N.5.

CARDIFF DWARFS are starting an anti-pollution campaign against the local steelworks, planning a street theatre and other activities and need help. Contact Ian Matheson, 45 Corporation Road, Grangetown, Cardiff.

MICHAEL TOBIN DEFENCE COMMITTEE 265 Dale Street, Chatham, Kent

STOKE NEWINGTON FIVE SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE, 54 Harcombe Road, London, N.16

GEORGE FOULSER is at present in St. Pancras Hospital and would like comrades to visit him. Ward 3. Visiting 2.30 - 8 p.m. every day. Telephone 347-4411

Young man requires job - not everyday boring grind. Committed to non-violent revolution and would like to work towards this. Contact John Nightingale, 14 Northside, Clapham Common, S.W.4. (tel. 01-720 3827 any time

LIBERTARIAN STRUGGLE. Paper of ORA, monthly. May issue 5p + 2p post from 29 Cardigan Road, Leeds or from Freedom Bookshop.

SUBSCRIBERS change of address: Please notify us if you can at least a week before operative date.

We welcome news, articles letters. We go to press Monday so last date for receipt of MSS & notices etc. is Monday of the week of publication, earlier receipt appreciated.

BANNER BRIGHT, exhibition of Trade Union banners at Whitechapel Art Gallery, Aldgate East (nr. Freedom Press) is on until 23rd APRIL (not Apl. 11 as we said in review), Tues.-Sats. 11 a.m. - 6 p.m.

LIBERTARIAN BOOK CLUB, New York. May 26. RUDOLPH ROCKER CENTENARY Luncheon 1 p.m. at Regency Room, Hotel George Washington, 23 Lex 23 Lexington Ave & East 23 Street N.Y.C. \$7.00 all found. Contact Sarah Taback 5700 Arlington Ave., Riverdale N.Y. 10471. Tele. 212 884-6566.

Commemorative address by Irving Levitas. Dr. Terry M. Perlin will speak on attitudes of Emma Goldman and Wilhelm Reich to "Love in Freedom": Anarchism and Sexual Freedom"