

anarchist weekly Freedom

Vol. 35 No. 46

16 NOVEMBER 1974

FIVE PENCE

CONQUEST OF BREAD

THE SPECTRE of famine is once more stalking the earth, the people of Bangladesh, of Ethiopia, of Africa, of India, of South America all display in our periodicals their jutting ribs, spindly legs and bulging oedema stomachs for our information. The statesmen of the world call a conference at which platitudes are mouthed and suggestions are made that 'other' nations (meaning the oil-rich Arabs) should help by financing shipments of food or set up a world food bank - the only question is: who would be

Liberty under the Law

HOLGER MEINS, one of the Baader-Meinhof group claimed by some to be anarchist, has died in prison on hunger strike. Whatever one may feel about the aims, methods and philosophy of this group one can feel nothing but contempt for the West German Social Democratic State which by delays over two years has driven its 'remand' (and judicially innocent) prisoners to this desperate state.

THE NCCL is fighting to get statutory procedures laid down so that the police (English) are required to tell close relatives when they hold people for questioning. For example, a man was seized by armed police outside Tooting (London) police station and held by the 'serious crimes squad' incommunicado for two days. No charge was brought.

A 31-year old South Londoner was taken from his flat by three detectives on the receipt of an emergency call from his home after a domestic quarrel. The man was involved in a fight with the detectives. Police revisited the flat to investigate a 'battered baby' charge -- no such assault had taken place although it was on the charge sheet. The wife and brother-in-law went to the police station to sign the necessary bail papers. While they were waiting for the man's release, he was carried out on a stretcher. He was taken to hospital and remained unconscious. He died the next day - as the hospital put it, from 'cardiac arrest'. A post-mortem revealed 39 bruises on his body. An inquest will be held on January 8th, 1975.

the bankers? The English depress themselves with their own home-made self induced famine of beef and sugar - and rebuke those awful staring eyes and jutting ribs with a homily on the sugar scarcity and the price of beef.

It is not the first time famine has happened. Bangladesh, before its happy liberation suffered hunger equally under Pakistani tyranny; the Ethiopians have rid themselves of a feudal king but there is no more food thereby; India is an old story - even the departure of the British did not fill bellies - however it gave them an atom bomb of their own (a Malthusian answer to over-population?); even the Russian peasant starved under forced collectivization in the thirties: now information on food resources is 'classified'. Litvinoff once said, "Food is a weapon", now information on food is top secret. China, secure in her secrecy, claims to have solved her food-population problem.

In a world of increasing expertise, the specialist confers with specialists and the continuing World Food Conference in Rome is no exception. A previous conference on World Population suffered from the same defect. In an issue of New Scientist (7.11.74) which deals excellently in depth with the Conference, Jon Tinker writes of the malaise of such conferences being "Catch 22 - any problem we can solve is part of a larger problem which we cannot".

The major powers have no longer the food supplies, the money, or the will to feed the hungry. They (Dr. Kissinger especially) have the calm effrontery to suggest that the Arabs out of their surplus oil-wealth donate supplies of food to the starving peoples. One cannot recollect the great powers acting so from disinterested motives when they were riding high. It was only to get rid of unwanted surpluses or to avert the threat of Communism (whatever became of that?), and even then very little attempt was made to make the 'undeveloped countries self-sufficient and self-reliant.

The English pseudo food crisis-

OUR DWINDLING CIVIL LIBERTIES

THE DECISION by Mr. Justice Forbes that peaceful picketing in streets is illegal unless done in the course of a trade dispute is another restriction on our dwindling civil liberties. This ruling was granted in answer to an injunction by the partners of Prebble and Co., estate agents of Uppet Street, Islington, London, against nine members of the Islington Tenants' Crusade.

They have been picketing the estate agents' offices because this company have been harassing working-class tenants out of properties so that they can be converted into high-rented accommodation for middle-class families.

This ruling means that it is now illegal to demonstrate outside an embassy, shops selling blacked goods, or even the commonplace picket along the entrance to Downing Street.

However, as we have pointed out in FREEDOM before, there are so many laws on the statute book that really anyone forming a picket, even in furtherance of a trade dispute, can be arrested for contravening one of them. But this ruling now makes the job of the police easy and they can now make arrests and break up any demonstration that is taking place outside any premises. This could even include a march and demonstration as the public highway should only, under the law, be used for the public to walk along. As it is, the police are asking that the law be changed so that seven days' notice has to be given before any demonstration takes place.

Even in a 'democracy' our liberties are very fragile and must be defended at all times. The only answer to such laws is to say no and break them. The law has no answer if enough people are willing to defy it.

P. T.

is reveals one of the factors behind the periodic shortages of food. The simple fact that food is a commodity - not to be given away but to be sold at the highest price in the best market: if not it will not, cannot be given away. Somebody must pay. The British having declared themselves in on the great monopoly market of the E.E.C. must abide by the rules and buy in the specified markets. The economic forces of the free market will push the farmer out of business who cannot compete on E.E.C. terms.

Lovers of free enterprise, the

Continued on Back Page

FREEDOM PRESS

84b WHITECHAPEL HIGH STREET
LONDON E1 Phone 01-247 9249

Aldgate East underground station, White-chapel Art Gallery exit, turn right for Angel Alley, next to Wimpy Bar.

BOOKSHOP open Tues.-Fri 2-6 p.m.
(Thursdays until 8 p.m.)
Saturdays 10 a.m. to 4 p.m

FREEDOM PRESS "ANARCHIST CLASSICS"

- ABC of Anarchism, Alexander Berkman 25p (post 5p) USA 75¢ post free
- Anarchy, Errico Malatesta 25p (post 5p) USA 75¢ post free
- Anarchism & Anarcho-Syndicalism, Rudolf Rocker 20p (post 5p) USA 65¢ post free
- The State, Its Historic Role, Peter Kropotkin 20p (post 5p) USA 65¢ post free

Complete list of publications, including the annual volumes of "Selections from Freedom" (1954-64), and the available issues of the first series of ANARCHY (1961-70) will be sent on request.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

When ordering, please add postage as in brackets. Any book not in stock, but in print can be supplied.

- Sabate : 'Guerilla Extraordinary', Antonio Tellez (trans. Stuart Christie) £ 2 35 (15p)
- *Thoreau : The Complete Individualist, Bob Dickens £ 3 00 (15p)
- *The Law of Love & the Law of Violence, Leo Tolstoy £ 2.25 (15p)
- Violence, Colin Ward £ 0 30 (7p)
- Utopia, Colin Ward £ 0 60 (9p)

* BOOK OF THE WEEK *
* *The Unknown Revolution by Voline *
* 717 pages. Paperback. Includes a bio- *
* graphical note by Rudolf Rocker This is *
* the true history of the Russian Revolution *
* told by an Anarchist. The first complete *
* English translation, by Holley Cantine & *
* Fredy Perlman. It contains all the mater- *
* ial originally published in English by the *
* Freedom Press under the titles "1917" and *
* "The Unknown Revolution", and much *
* new material translated into English for *
* the first time. £ 2.95 (32p) *

After Deschooling, What?, Ivan Illich £ 0 25 (4p)

Some New Magazines:

- Ecologist/Resurgence. Special Joint Issue November, 1974 £ 0.40 (5p)
- Anarchy (2nd series) No. 14 £ 0.20 (5p)
- Wildcat, November 1974 £ 0.15 (4p)

- The Slavery of our Times, Tolstoy £ 0.25 (7p)
- The Life and Death of Mary Wollstonecraft, Claire Tomalin £ 4.75 (23p)

*Instead of a Book, Benj. R. Tucker £ 10.00 (32p)

Daughter of a Revolutionary: Natalie Herzen and the Bakunin/Nechaev Circle, ed. by Michael Confino £ 4.50 (23p)

*The Works of Gerrard Winstanley, ed. by George H. Sabine £ 8.00 (32p)

* These works are published in the USA.

BAKUNIN SPEAKS

ON SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Human Justice Versus Legal Justice. When we speak of justice we mean not the justice contained in the legal codes and in Roman jurisprudence, based largely upon deeds of violence achieved by force, violence consecrated by time and by the benedictions of some church - Christian or pagan - and as such accepted as the absolute principles from which all law is to be deduced by a process of logical reasoning. We speak of justice that is based solely upon human conscience, the justice found in the conscience of every man, and even in that of children, and which can be expressed in the words equal rights.

The universal justice, which, owing to conquests by force and influences of religion, has never yet prevailed in the political, juridical, or economic world, is to serve as the basis of the new world. Without this justice there can be neither liberty nor republic nor prosperity nor peace. It must, then, govern all our decisions, so that we may work together effectively for the establishment of peace.

Moral Law in Action

What we ask is the proclaiming anew of the great principle of the French Revolution: that every man should have the material and moral means to develop his whole humanity, a principle which must be translated into the following problem:

To organize society in such a manner that every individual, man or woman, should, at birth, find almost equal means for the development of his or her various faculties and the full utilization of his or her work. To organize society in such a fash-

ion that exploitation of the labour of others should be made impossible and that every individual should be enabled to enjoy the social wealth, which in reality is produced only by collective labour -- only in so far as he contributes directly towards the creation of this wealth.

The moral law, the existence of which we, materialists and atheists, recognize in a more real manner than the idealists of any school, is indeed an actual law, which will triumph over all the conspiracies of all the idealists of the world, because it emanates from the very nature of human society, the root basis of which is to be sought not in God but in animality. The primitive, natural man becomes a free man, becomes humanized, and rises to the status of a moral being -- in a word, he becomes conscious of, and realizes within himself and for himself, his own human form and his rights -- only to the degree that he becomes aware of this form and these rights in all his fellow-beings. It follows that in the interests of his own humanity, his own morality and personal freedom, man must aspire towards the freedom, morality, and humanity of all other men.

Social solidarity is the first human law; freedom is the second law. Both laws interpenetrate each other and, being inseparable, constitute the essence of humanity. Thus freedom is not the negation of solidarity; on the contrary, it represents the development and, so to speak, the humanizing of it. Thus respect for the freedom of someone else constitutes the highest duty of men. The only virtue is to love this freedom and serve it. This is the basis of all morality, and there is no other basis.

--These extracts are taken from "The Political Philosophy of Bakunin", compiled & edited by G. P. Maximoff. (Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1953)

To be continued in our next issue

subscribe

THE MOST CONVENIENT WAY OF OBTAINING FREEDOM IS BY DIRECT SUBSCRIPTION. USE THE COUPON TO ORDER, THEN COPIES WILL ARRIVE EACH WEEK BY POST. PLEASE SEND PAYMENT WITH ORDER CHEQUES AND P.O.'s PAYABLE TO FREEDOM PRESS.

	1 year	6 months	3 months
INLAND, and OVERSEAS SURFACE MAIL	<input type="checkbox"/> £4.00	<input type="checkbox"/> £2.00	<input type="checkbox"/> £1.00
AIRMAIL EUROPE	<input type="checkbox"/> \$9.60	<input type="checkbox"/> \$4.80	<input type="checkbox"/> \$2.40
AIRMAIL THE AMERICAS	<input type="checkbox"/> £4.60	<input type="checkbox"/> £2.30	<input type="checkbox"/> £1.20
AIRMAIL THE AMERICAS	<input type="checkbox"/> \$14.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$7.25	<input type="checkbox"/> \$4.00
AIRMAIL AUSTRALASIA, JAPAN &c	<input type="checkbox"/> £5.85	<input type="checkbox"/> £2.95	<input type="checkbox"/> £1.50

PLEASE ENTER MY SUBSCRIPTION AS TICKED. I ENCLOSE/HAVE REMITTED BY INTERNATIONAL MONEY ORDER PAYMENT OF

NAME

ADDRESS

STUDENT OCCUPATION AT SWANSEA

AT A General Body meeting of over 1,200 people on Thursday, 7 November at University College, Swansea a motion was passed to occupy the administrative offices on campus. This action came at the end of a long dispute involving the Philosophy Department and the question of examinations.

Students studying philosophy must pursue a four year course under the rigid regime of Prof. D. Z. Phillips. For some three years the validity of examinations in the second year of the course has been in dispute by both staff and students. Active debate on the question arose in the autumn term of the year 1972/3. A staff-student working party set up to look at the question of these exams reported unanimously that they should go. Although alternative methods of assessment were suggested Prof. Phillips saw fit to ignore the findings of the working party.

Angered by this show of authoritarianism, the then second year students threatened to boycott the forthcoming exams. Prof. Phillips counterattacked with threats of resignation, expulsion, or at least withdrawal of grants. Under such pressure the students capitulated.

The debate continued into the next year, and followed similar lines to previous attempts at a reasonable solution. Phillips consistently sat on the opinions of both staff and students, until finally the new second year students did boycott the exams.

Phillips' first reaction was to reiterate the threats he had thrown up in face of previous opposition. However, this time the seven students stood firm and finished their second year in defiance.

During the summer vacation new aspects of the case emerged when two of the lecturers in the department were victimised, and the resit exams arranged for the students were boycotted as well. When the term began again those involved in the dispute were summoned to meet the new principal, Prof. Steel. He said that if the students were to sit their exams then they would be allowed to continue their studies in the third year (despite the fact that the majority of staff had voted to allow this anyway). Steel confirmed that he would be investigating the department and would like the help of the students if reinstated.

The philosophy students saw through these flimsy noises of conciliation, but despite warnings of future victimisation

the moderate executive and even more reactionary General Body recommended the students to sit their exams.

The students complied but were still victimised, two being told to resit the year (which in a four year course amounts to expulsion). This staggered the moderates who had been taken in by Steel's attempts at spreading "sweetness and light", and produced a split in the executive, which widened at the subsequent G.B. meeting. At this meeting the students and their allies prepared immediate occupation as a follow-on from the minority occupation of the Philosophy Department, which had served to build such a large meeting. The opposition to this (apart from denouncing the students as "pawns of left-wing maniacs") could present no viable alternative in their defence. Knowing this the authorities shifted their tactics in an attempt to undermine the obviously watertight case, but all to no avail. The largest G.B. for years voted to occupy the Registry building, and did.

The justification for the action is obvious when looking at the blatant victimisations

in the care of the Philosophy Department. It is perhaps less obvious in its wider implications. Attempts by the College authorities to neutralise Union-effectiveness are most beneficial to them in the context of recent governmental cut-backs in education and their repercussion on every campus. Again the kind of slave-mentality of the moderate and reactionary elements in the student body can only be advantageous to the authorities, for these people may be fooled with the ridiculous concept of the "Academic Community" ("remember, kiddies, we are like one big happy family") into paying for a cash-crisis that is not of their making.

The ramifications of this dispute point to a fight for survival for the students and all unionists and other activists against the onslaughts of a disintegrating and decadent system.

--Graham Allum (victimised philosophy student) & Keith Sowerby.

WE WELCOME NEWS, ARTICLES, LETTERS. WE GO TO PRESS ON MONDAY EACH WEEK.

STATEMENT

STATEMENT FROM THE BRITISH WITHDRAWAL FROM NORTHERN IRELAND Campaign (BWNIC)

THE ARREST and charging of 14 supporters of this Campaign under the Incitement to Disaffection Act and under the conspiracy laws has not stopped the distribution of the leaflet "Some Information for Discontented Soldiers". Other supporters of this Campaign in many parts of Britain are continuing to pass on the leaflet which gives information about the various ways they can leave the forces. The attitude of the Campaign is that freedom of communication - albeit between two minority groups such as anti-militarists and soldiers - is a FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHT. The Campaign emphasises that this help to soldiers wishing not to take part in the killing in Northern Ireland is given from a basis of opposition to all militarism in Northern Ireland.

Also, working on the premise that prevention is better than cure, the Campaign has started regular anti-recruitment picket. Campaign suppor-

ters are picketing the Army recruiting shop in London's Strand (just by Trafalgar Square) every Saturday morning, using the Campaign's anti-recruiting leaflet and placards. This needs only a few people to be effective. Could anyone prepared to join in this work please come along on Saturday mornings between 9 and 12? Or write to BWNIC (Anti-recruiting), c/o 5 Caledonian Road, London N.1. When we have enough people the picket will be extended to other days and other recruiting offices. Anyone not able to come to the London picket, but able to co-ordinate a regular picket in their own area, should write to the same address.

The Campaign welcomes any offers of support - practical or financial - which should all be sent c/o 5 Caledonian Road, London N.1.

The BWNIC Defence Group has a permanent address now - it has been forced by the arrests to get itself together in substance as well as name - it can be contacted at: Box 69, c/o 197 Kings Cross Road, London W.C.1. It will be circulating details itself soon of the help it is asking for. It can be contacted by 'phone on 01-837 9795 on Tuesday to Friday afternoons.

This article (we believe published here for the first time) was sent to us recently because it carries further the dialogue between Monatte and Malatesta at the 1907 Anarchist Congress, excerpts from which debate we published in our issues of 26 October and 2 November this year. Chomsky's introduction to Guérin's *Anarchism* was published separately in the *New York Review of Books* (21.5. 1970), in *Anarchy* 116 (October 1970), in *The Spokesman* 6 (October 1970) and in *Our Generation* Vol. 8 No. 2 (Winter 1971-1972).

HAVING LIVED through the 1940s and 1950s and most of the 1960s as a politically conscious being, when anarchism was a doctrine to be derided by such socialists as did not by some strange mental alchemy identify it as "objectively" reactionary, I cannot help a feeling of churlishness in criticising the essay which Noam Chomsky wrote to introduce the American edition of Daniel Guérin's *Anarchism* (Monthly Review Press, 1970), since Chomsky's effort to understand not only the proposals of the anarchists, but also the libertarian criticism of state socialism (even as defended by Marx and Lenin), is patently sincere. Yet those who sympathise from the outside with a philosophy of living and seek to discover a means of utilising it to support their own somewhat different doctrines, often in the process diminish the scope and potentialities of that philosophy, and likewise of the practice ensuing from it, by seeking to approximate it to their point of view. This Chomsky has done, and so has Guérin in the book Chomsky introduces, and thus they draw our attention once again to a danger which anarchists have been articulately aware at least since the International Congress of 1907, when Errico Malatesta argued the case of the "complete" anarchist against the economically orientated viewpoint represented on that occasion by the anarcho-syndicalist, Pierre Monatte.

I am doing neither Chomsky nor Guérin an injustice in stating that neither is an anarchist by any known criterion; they are both left-wing Marxists. Yet their awareness of the perils of any attempt to equate workers' control of the means of production with a state taken over by the proletariat - as Marx and Engels conceived it - is genuine, and in exploring the possibilities of finding a way out of this essentially Marxist dilemma they are ready to examine once again the possibility that the anarchists may have been right on the question of the "conquest or destruction of state power" which, Chomsky contends, "is what Bakunin regarded as the primary issue dividing him from Marx".

At this point begins my dissent from Chomsky and Guérin. Perhaps the matter of the "conquest or destruction of state power" was the "primary issue" that divided Bakunin from Marx, but there were other issues of almost equal importance, which Bakunin had inherited from Marx's original anarchist opponent, Proudhon; among them were the theory of the utmost decentralisation of control in a completely federalist structure, basic to any vision of a society not governed from above by the state, and the complementary view that that society is multifarious in its manifestations, and that voluntary organisation must extend in many directions other than the economic.

It is on this issue of the protean character of the anarchist approach to social change that Chomsky's argument, I suggest, most clearly fails. He portrays anarchism as in practice a way of struggle on the economic level; more precisely, on an obsolescent nineteenth-century industrial level. It is true that he pays homage to Bakunin's all-dominating passion for freedom; that he begins by echoing Guérin's praise of anarchism as being the opposite of a "fixed, self-enclosed system". Yet the way he argues the anarchist case does in fact enclose it within the very limits of narrow anarcho-syndicalism from which Malatesta sought to keep anarchist aims free more than sixty years ago.

It is of course not with the aim of deliberate distortion, but because of his Marxist orientation, that Chomsky relies - apart from Bakunin - mainly on the syndicalist spokesmen in defining anarchism, but distortion is the result. It is impossible to give any feeling of the richness and variety and depth of anarchist thought when we have copious quotations from syndicalist spokesmen like Rudolf Rocker, Diego Abad de Santillan and Augustin Souchy, as well as from left Marxists like Anton Pannekoek and William Paul, but nothing at all from those who represent the elements in twentieth-century anarchism which - while admitting the value of syndicalist means of struggle - recognised the danger of monolithism and of rule by vested interests implicit in an exclusively syndicalist organisation of society or even merely of its economic functions. There

CHOMSKY'S ANARCHISM

is no reference to Kropotkin or Malatesta, none to Herbert Read or Paul Goodman, none to the determined exploration of the application of anarchist ideas to community organisation, to education, to local administration, to the problems of an automated society, to cultural questions, which was pursued by a numerous and often extremely clear-sighted group of writers in the journal *Anarchy* during the 1960s. Proudhon is mentioned only once, and then in a way which shows that Chomsky does not begin to understand, any more than Marx did, the complexities of what Proudhon meant by "property".

The exclusions in Chomsky's approach are shown not merely in the theoretical company he chooses. They mark also his discussion of the practical achievements of anarchists and of others who have sought to change society by direct action. When he talks of Spain, and the libertarian achievements of the early part of the Civil War, he is thinking - in his own words - of "specifically, industrial Barcelona", and he goes on to talk of industrial proletarians, not of the land workers who were the real masses supporting Spanish anarchism. There is not a word about what was probably the most striking manifestation of anarchist activity in Spain between 1936 and 1938 -- the thousands of agrarian communes in which whole villages would not merely take over the land and work it in common, sharing the produce, but would also set themselves up as communes dedicated to what Malatesta, in his denunciation of the narrowness of anarcho-syndicalist aims, defined as "the complete liberation of all humanity, at present enslaved, from the triple economic, political, and moral point of view".

It is, I would suggest, not merely the anarchist emphasis on workers' control that explains the vastly renewed speed of anarchism during the past decade, for the response to libertarian teachings in any articulate way has in fact been least strong among those who fall into the classic category of the industrial proletariat, in any case a class that will continue to diminish both in numbers and in strength if present technological trends continue (and will change into an artisanate if they do not). The response to anarchism has come rather from those people of all classes who seek a society where the potentialities of existence are varied and liberated, a society to be approached by lifestyle rebellion as well as by economic struggle, a society to be integrated - as Malatesta would put it - "from the triple economic, political, and moral point of view" in a way that Marxists, even the most open-minded of them, seem quite unable to conceive. As Malatesta also pointed out in 1907, to equate the anarchist struggle with a single class, as the anarchists followed the Marxists in attempting, is to abdicate the true anarchist ideal of a revolution seeking "the complete liberation of all humanity at present enslaved".

I find it especially significant that there should be no reference at all in Chomsky's essay to education, in view of the attention which anarchists have paid to this vital aspect of social life and social struggle ever since Herbert Read wrote that classic treatise on non-violent struggle, *Education through Art*, and especially in view of the importance of student rebels - some at least convinced anarchists, even if others may have been badly disguised authoritarians - in the radical movements of the 1960s. At least as important in any strategy of social transformation during the rest of the present century as the struggle for workers' control is the remaking of the system of education, and especially the breaking down of the academic hierarchy not in the direction of students seizing control of existing campuses - already an obsolete concept - but of what we now call "higher education" being diffused in the community so that it is not only physically decentralised and organisationally democratised, but also reorganised in such a way that it becomes a lifelong process, and work and learning in the end become part of a single continuum. It is the inclination - despite all their protestations - to regard work as something special and separate that sets off the Marxists as heirs to the Calvinist and capitalist ethic, and makes it impossible for them to follow Charles Fourier and William Morris in any true attempt to eliminate

PARTY MANIFESTOS, political programmes and national aims make nostalgic reading since they contain more fond hopes than actual performances, more devout wishes than impious deeds. However they may be taken as an indication of intention and they have within them a shadow of the spirit of their prompters. They are the product of the collective consciousness of the party, they also represent the collective unconscious of that same party.

Among the withered nosegays of yesterday's programmes one culls the following.

"All...have the right to work and the duty to occupy themselves in some socially useful activity." "Labour, by virtue of its essentially human condition, cannot be relegated to the material concept of merchandise, nor be the object of any transaction incompatible with the personal dignity of the worker. It is of itself an attribute of honour and merit sufficient to demand the protection and assistance of the State." "The State recognizes the commercial firm as a community contributing technical skill, labour and capital in its various forms, and supports as a consequence, the right of these elements to participate in the benefits. The State shall ensure that relations between these elements be maintained on strictly equitable lines and in a hierarchy that subordinates economic values to human values, to the interests of the nation and to the demands of the common good." "All workers shall be supported by the State in their right to just and adequate wages, at least to enable them and their families to lead a moral and honourable life."

"Work in all its forms - intellectual, technical or manual - whether organization or execution - is a social duty." "The...State considers private enterprise in the domain of production to be the most efficient method and the most advantageous to the interests of the nation. Private enterprise in production, being an activity of national interest, the entrepreneur is

responsible to the State for his organization. A reciprocity of rights and duties follows from the collaboration of the forces of production. The wage-earner, artisan, employee or labourer is an active collaborator in the economic enterprise, the direction of which belongs to the employer who also carries the responsibility." "The State intervenes in economic production only when private enterprise fails or is insufficient or when the political interests of the State are involved. Such intervention may take the form of control, encouragement or direct management. In collective lab-

FASCISM IN CARPET SLIPPERS

our disputes judicial action shall be invoked only when the... organ has first made an attempt at conciliation." "Provident insurance being an important manifestation of the principle of collaboration between the classes, both employers and workers should support it, bearing in proportion the expenses it involves."

"It must be the first duty of every citizen of the State to work with his mind or with his body. The activities of the individual must not clash therefore with the interests of the whole, but must be pursued within the framework of the national activity and must be for the general good. We demand, therefore, the abolition of incomes unearned by work, and emancipation from the slavery of interest charges. We demand the nationalization of all business combines (trusts). We demand that the great industries shall be organized on a profit-sharing basis."

* * *

Certain words in these three paragraphs have been deleted to obscure the source but they have the familiar ring of some of the doctrines of the Labour party - and the left-wing too! Tribunites, I.M.G. members, I.S. members and many other sects would

find it hard to quarrel with all stated in the three paragraphs. The S.P.G.B. in particular would welcome much of these programmes.

These ideas of government have been tried before. Harold Wilson's brand of socialism incorporates many of these ideas and is welcomed as a forward step. In fact it will be obvious to anarchists that the three paragraphs come from totalitarian countries - Spain, Mussolini's Italy and Germany's National Social German Workers' Party -- in that order!

Writers in New Society (10.X.

74) point out that many features of the Benn-Wilson brand of socialism resemble the Corporate state insofar as they try to reconcile a measure of private industry with the nationalization of inefficient industries. The writers in New Society pointed out, before the election, that whatever party is in power we are heading towards increased state control of the economy. The goals to which they see the state advancing are "order, unity, nationalism and success".

The Labour Party with its small majority is combining its aim of making capitalism work with a policy of subsidizing businesses which have failed. This is no policy of libertarian socialism but of a corporate state which, being without liberty is slavery.

Jack Robinson.

THE SWEDISH middle-weight boxing champion is a 23-year-old deserter from the British army who did not wish to fight in Ulster.

CONVICTS IN Florida state prison rioted about being given one roll of toilet paper every two weeks. To clean up the riot all prisoners were issued with another toilet roll. . .at 2 a.m.!

the boundaries between a man's work life and the rest of his existence. Is not, after all, the continuance of the use of the word "worker" in the special connotation used in socialist discussions an oblique admission that Marxists have not yet been able to conceive imaginatively a society in which a "worker" is anything more? Certainly he has not become anything more in any self-styled Marxist society that has yet existed; under Stalin and Brezhnev, and equally under Mao and Castro, his alienation has been undiminished.

The mental imprisonment in nineteenth-century categories appears to affect most modern neo-Marxists, and to give their writings a curiously arid doctrinaire quality. I was impressed by this recently on reading a newly published collection of essays, The Politics of Literature, written by American university teachers of "radical" inclinations, of whom all but one called themselves Marxist. What they were concerned with was the content of courses; the relevance or otherwise of Edmund Spenser to modern conditions, the arguments for teaching "popular" literature, the possibility and justification of using their classes for left-wing propaganda. Nowhere in their essays was there any evident thought of fundamental changes in our attitude

to and our processes of education that would make it part of the work of beginning to change society now, a question to which anarchist writers like Read and the Goodmans have given copious and constructive thought.

I do not suggest that Chomsky is as obtuse as these callow disciples of Christopher Caudwell; obviously he plays a much suppler mind over his subject. Yet when he quotes Guérin as saying that "the constructive idea of anarchism" can "contribute by enriching Marxism", he appears to be reflecting his own outlook which, by regarding Marxism as primary, selects from anarchism those elements that may serve to diminish the contradictions in Marxist doctrines; thus, though they may indeed enrich Marxism, which certainly needs it, both Chomsky and Guérin in fact impoverish the anarchism they portray by abandoning the elements that do not serve their purpose and thus reducing it from a comprehensive philosophy of living, embodying a many-sided strategy of social change, to a mere cluster of tactical concepts, useful to Marxists, but ultimately, no doubt, expendable.

George Woodcock.

ALL ROADS LEAD TO ROME

THE VIEWS expressed in FREEDOM as regards fascist groups like the National Front and in particular the Red Lion Square incident have been attacked as being too complacent. "We must attack the fascists!" we are told. "How would you feel if you had to live with fascist repression?"

Our Italian comrades have suffered greatly at the hands of the neo-fascists. Marini and Valpreda are two of the most obvious of these victims. We would expect, therefore, that our Italian comrades would be strongly in favour of attacks on neo-fascists. Whilst our comrades are not exactly in love with neo-fascists, they do have the sense to see the reality of the situation.

An article in the September issue of Rivista Anarchica (Milan) gave a comprehensive summary of why the fascist bomb outrages serve the purposes of the ruling Christian Democrats. Firstly, in 1968-69 when students and workers were taking strong libertarian action, the bomb outrages (which are now openly recognised as being fascist) were used to discredit extra-parliamentary groups, communist and anarchist.

Secondly, in the same period of time the centre-left coalition was "in danger" of becoming competent and the way was being opened up for the inclusion of the Communists in the Government. This eventuality did not suit the country's American bosses and a strategy of creating tension was instrumental in preventing any success which the centre-left coalition might achieve.

Thirdly, the situation has now changed. The Christian Democrats found through the divorce referendum

that the "bogey" of communism no longer achieved the same results. Also, the serious economic crisis has suggested that maybe coalition with the Communists is the most plausible alternative. Hence it is now convenient to actually blame the fascists for the bomb outrages.

In this manner the Christian Democrat regime hopes to achieve various ends in addition to covering up its own mistakes. It hopes to strengthen its hand in three main ways:

1) To distract the attention of the exploited masses from the high cost of living and unemployment. By diverting the anger of the poor against the fascists, the real instigators of the situation - the bosses and the State - remain safe and sound inside their smug complacency.

2) To conveniently bring into action

new repressive legislation, using the excuse of the fight against terrorism, without the opposition, or even with the blessings of, the left wing.

3) To stimulate and justify a "reasonable" approach on the part of the unions, using the excuse of the need for unity of the nation's constitutional bodies against the danger of "subversive fascism".

If the National Front ever became as large here as the neo-fascist MSI has become in Italy, I hope the comrades here will have the sense to see the function of the fascists and who the real fascists are. Both the Tory and Labour parties could find a situation developing whereby it would be convenient to distract the public's attention toward a "National Front takeover" of the country. Of course, the gullible readers of Workers Press, Socialist Worker, Morning Star and so on will quite easily be led by whoever wants to manipulate them. As our Italian comrades would say: **VIVA L'ANARCHIA!** Francesco.

ANARCHY IN THE OFFICE

WHY SHOULD an anarchist belong to a trade union? They are controlled by bureaucrats who do not share our ideology and are not even revolutionary. We reject the Leninist strategy of getting ourselves elected to positions where we would be able, independent of the wishes of the membership, to pursue our political objectives by directing the resources of the union and using its prestige among the workers. What, then, do trade unions have for us as anarchists?

The Union operates on two fronts. Firstly it negotiates pay and secondly it negotiates conditions of work. The first involves the membership much less than the latter. People we've never met meet other people at times and places which are equally unknown to us and the

result turns up weeks or months later in our pay-packets (in my case, as a white collar worker, in a pay-slip). It's nice to have the extra money but it doesn't seem to have all that much to do with me. In fact, what with pay increases both in basic salary and London allowance, threshold payments and a forthcoming bonus I don't know how much money I'll be getting next month. I know the gross figure but the net is something else. There is no involvement and consequently no sense of achievement when there is a pay increase. The Union is just like an insurance company - you pay your monthly instalments and that's that. It's not as if in my position, with no dependents or mortgage, I need any more money (inflation willing).

Conditions of work are something else. The rules of the game are set by the same people who work out the pay settlements but the rank and file get a chance to play. This, I think, is where anarchism can come in. We reject the idea that managers are entitled to be in positions of authority simply because they are managers. They are entitled to nothing except what their 'subordinates' give them, for example recognition of their competence in a particular field. Every instance of a manager deciding how or whether a thing is to be done on the basis of his position in the hierarchy is an affront to our belief that decisions should be taken by all the parties concerned. I can't speak for manual workers but for white collar workers the anarchist message is to subvert the authority of the managers.

B. H. M.

BRAZIL

THERE ARE almost 100 million Brazilians. Of these, 10 million suffer from an intestinal disease caused by the pollution of the rivers, four million from Chagas disease, which in the swampy regions is due to bacterial infection from mosquito bites, and 10 million Brazilians suffer from mental illness.

Half a million have TB, and 250,000 leprosy. Almost fifty per cent of all Brazilians are infected by such intestinal parasites as tape worms.

All these figures are reported by the Brazilian government's National Food and Nutrition Institute, and published in the

July-August, 1974 edition of Quil (Georgetown, Guyana).

Over forty per cent of the Brazilian population suffer from a deficiency of calories and proteins; and, according to the World Health Organization, infant mortality in the capital, Sao Paulo, is as high as it is in La Paz in poverty-stricken Bolivia.

Brazil receives millions of dollars in "aid" from the United States. Poverty is profitable. As elsewhere, the only solution to the problems confronting the Brazilian workers is to organise for the overthrow of the system that exploits, degrades and starves them, and the replacement by libertarian communism and production for needs instead of profit for the few. In other words, a social revolution.

Jose.

THE REAL GUILTY ONES

THE BOROUGH of Kensington and Chelsea has since the reorganisation and amalgamation of London boroughs been under the control of a Tory council.

Even the original Chelsea borough contained considerable areas or large estates where working class families predominated. But even with the inclusion of North Kensington and Notting Hill, the Tories still walk the local elections. Really what it means is that the Royal Borough is virtually a dictatorship by a class who care little for the welfare of the ordinary people of the Borough. One has only to look at their housing record. When I write record I mean it, for with their fellow-dictators in Westminster they have remained at the bottom of the housing league.

This borough of private affluence and public squalor shows in its luxury housing and private squares and its rundown council housing estates. But just to rub in the class nature of Tories' rule, if you live in Chelsea Square alongside company directors you will get your dustbins emptied twice a week but if you live around parts of North Kensington you're lucky if it gets emptied at all.

Now dustmen in the borough are involved in industrial action over the arrest of dustmen on charges of demanding money and/or theft. Although all the men are on bail the council have suspended them on half pay until they appear at Marlborough Street Court on March 6 next year. The men's unions, the General & Municipal Workers' Union and the National Union of Public Employees have, because of the long period before their trial, requested that the suspensions be lifted and that they return to work. In reply, the council has offered alternative jobs, at their present rates of pay, as roadsweepers, drivers and handy-men. But the secretary of the Kensington CMWU branch, Tom Sweeney, has said:

"At present the 26 men charged are not refuse collectors and we feel this is rank stupidity on the part of whoever is taking the decision as it seriously affects the collection of refuse."

Suspending the dustmen is prejudging the issue. Even class justice should presume innocence before those charged are found guilty, but the Tory council have already found them so.

We, as anarchists, are not concerned with the dustmen's "innocence" or "guilt". What we do know is that these dustmen carry out a useful and important job for the community. The council has at no time been able to offer the people of the bor-

ough a proper refuse collection service, and black plastic bags at street corners or along the King's Road are an all too familiar sight. But despite the high rates people pay the Royal Borough stinks and it's not just the refuse in the streets.

The Tory council would I'm sure prefer to have private contractors to collect refuse. They have done so during the current dispute and have said they will extend their use if the dustmen continue to take action. Dustmen in other boroughs have said

7
that if this happens they will come out in support. It is this sort of solidarity that can defeat the Kensington and Chelsea Council and the charges laid against the dustmen. The charge of demanding and theft of plastic bags is nothing compared with the suffering of the homeless and other social needs of the people of the borough. Those guilty for this are the Tory council.

But if the council cannot be relied upon to organise services then, we the people should think about solving these problems, with the dustmen, for ourselves.

P. T.

NEWS from BELFAST

Ian Paisley was seen in a different role last week when he turned up at a public hearing in Morecambe and opposed the closure of the Belfast-Heysham ferry service which is due to be axed next February. British Rail are claiming that the service is no longer economically viable because of the decline in the number of passengers carried and have attributed this to the fact that people are unwilling to travel to Belfast nowadays unless their journey is absolutely necessary and big Ian, seizing upon this point, has described the proposed closure as another capitulation to terrorism. In this attitude he has been backed up by the trade union action committee, Paisleyites almost to a man from what one hears, but one suspects another prominent Ulster Unionist, Enoch Powell, with his noted opposition to "lame ducks" would be prepared to let the chopper fall. Aside from the question of whether or not the ferry is retained it might prove an interesting exercise for some of those connected with the Institute for Workers' Control, particularly those of them who claim to have invented work-ins, industrial democracy and workers' control, if they set their minds to the problem, which can be simply stated: without any effective form of industrial organisation or even liaison existent how to run a work-in on a ferry which depends upon supplies of fuel and stores being available at the ports of embarkation and disembarkation. There are other problems attached to a situation which might intrigue those people, absolutely bursting with brains, who set themselves up as our instructors and appear to have unlimited time at their disposal in which to poke and peer and catalogue and comment upon industrial matters.

Back on his native heath Paisley is more concerned with attacking the SDLP which he describes as a republican party bent upon dragging Ulster loyal-

ists into a united Ireland. The truth is that the SDLP, or at least the vast majority of its members, is far removed from being a republican party and would be well content to leave the whole question of a united Ireland on the long finger. But like all political parties it casts as wide a net as possible and is forced now and again to incline its head in the direction of the republican aims in order to avoid the possibility of losing votes from what is known as the nationally-minded section of the population. By this means the SDLP hopes to minimise the effects of intervention by republican candidates in marginal constituencies where a split vote may result in the loss of a seat. There are more university graduates prominent in the SDLP than in any other party in Northern Ireland and from this fact alone there may be inferred a good deal about the composition of the party which embodies the hopes of a growing Catholic middle class seeking its place in the sun. Many of these middle class Catholics were attracted to the original civil rights movement where they were able to make common cause with their Protestant counterparts, many of whom were likewise denied an effective political voice, political patronage being at the disposal of the Unionist party which kept a tight hold on it.

Looking back on those early days one cannot help but reflect upon the swift and almost total decline of political activity within Queen's University since that time. The events of Paris in 1968 were fresh in the memory then and students flocked to the civil rights banner but, lacking any coherent political ideas (a few of them might have read the odd pamphlet by Lenin) they were unable to understand the trend of events and following the violence of Burntollet they folded their tents and withdrew within the walls of the university from whence no sounds of political activity now emanate.

CONQUEST OF BREAD... from P. 1. capitalist system and the profit motive as they are, the small farmers - and Messrs. Tate and Lyle - cannot complain (although they do) if the market forces turn against them. Indeed Tate & Lyle, stout upholders of Mr. Cube and free enterprise, run squealing for government help - and the workers back them - when their substantial business of sugar-refining is menaced by Common Market negotiations on sugar.

There is no food crisis in Britain. There is, as usual, a crisis of profit, which is always prepared to destroy, adulterate and withhold food for the sake of money making.

Jon Tinker (in New Scientist) says there is no food crisis in the world. He lists a complex of problems (or crises) which are linked with the maladministration and maldistribution of world food supplies. Tinker lists: Population, Urbanization, Pollution, Armaments, Oil, Energy, Fertiliser, Resources, Water, Soil, Fish, Technology, Trade. It would be tedious and exhausting to run through the list and relate the anarchist position on each of the items.

Basically an overwhelming simplification has been made, reverting to the old thesis of Malthus that population tends to grow, outstripping the food resources which, according to Malthus, tended not to grow at the same rate. This, as anarchists have pointed out, fails to take account of measures for birth control and methods of increasing food supply which have in-

HELP fold and despatch FREEDOM on Thursdays from 2 p.m. at Freedom Press, followed by get together with refreshments.

Sat. Nov. 16 WEA Cent. London Branch Sat. School: GEORGE GISSING, in introd. lecture by Gillian Tindall, at 32 Tavistock Sq. W.C.1. 2.45pm. 25p.

USA - SIREN &c. Change of Address: SIREN P.O. Box A-3585, CHICAGO, Ill. 60690. ANARCHO-FEMINIST NETWORK c/o Come/Unity Press, 13 East 17th St., New York, N.Y. 10003.

ANARCHOFFEMINIST ANTHOLOGY: want theoretical essays, biogr. data on anarchist women, critiques, organizing experiences, etc. Send to ARLENE, C/o Siren.

We have a number of requests for speakers to put a case for anarchism. These mainly come from colleges and usually they pay expenses. Will any comrade who is willing to speak at these meetings please contact Freedom Press.

ANARCHIST TV Film. Terry Phillips has a copy of the 10-min film shown on BBC 'Open Door'. Write to him at 7 Cresswell Walk, Corby, Northants if you want to arrange a showing.

creased since Malthus's day. That we have found new ways of destroying, adulterating and limiting food, in addition to destroying, polluting and neutralising soil for growing is a factor for which we and not nature are responsible.

The scientists having failed by their 'green revolution' to avert famine claim that because the earth is getting cooler the weather is changing, hence famines. This simply will not do. The scientists like the Soviets claim that large-scale agriculture with artificial fertilizers (which are getting scarce) is the solution. In pursuit of this aim they have collectivised the individual farmer, raped the soil with monoculture, and in short taken the wrong road.

We are now being permitted to think that animal-rearing is not the best way to use land resources - for second-hand protein. Indeed, vide New Scientist protein has not the value we once were told it had.

It is possible that small-scale agriculture with individual proprietors who knew and cultivated their own land will yet be vindicated.

Jack Robinson.

CONTACT

HARDY PERENNIAL WALT WHITMAN Anarchist Calendar 1975. 13p inc. post from Kropotkin's Lighthouse Pubs. c/o Freedom Press.

CCRBV Anarchists. For activities write 7 Cresswell Walk, Corby, Northants.

COVENTRY. Peter Corne, c/o Union of Students, Warwick University, Coventry CV4 7AL

MANCHESTER SWF weekly mths. enq Sec. c/o Grass Roots, 178 Oxford Road, Manchester 13.

Some London anarchists meet socially at Duke of York pub, 47 Rathbone St. London W1. 7.30 pm

ALTERNATE SUNDAYS Hyde Park Anarchist Forum, Speakers Corner 1 pm. Speakers, listeners and hecklers welcome.

INT. LIB. GEN/CENTRO IBERICO Sat. & Sun from 7.30 pm. Disco &c. 83A Haverstock Hill, NW3 (entrance Steele's Rd. 2nd door). Tube Chalk Fm/Belsize Pk.

AUSTRALIA Anarch. Sydney Libertarian Self-Management Conference Jan 8-12 1975 in Sydney. Agenda, proposals & contacts: Fed. of Australian Anarchists, Box 45 P.O., North Richmond, Victoria 3121, Australia.

NEW YORK: Libertarian Book Club Fall Lectures Thurs. evgs. 7.30 at Workmen's Circle Center, 369 8th Ave. (SW cnr 29 St) admisn free. Dec. 12 Dan Georgakas and Leonard Rubenstein: Art & Anarchy

MARTIN SOSTRE, the black American militant framed on a drugs charge, now faces trial in Clinton County Court, Plattsburg on a charge of beating up a prison officer. The case is listed to take place on November 12, and Amnesty (who have interested themselves in Martin's case) hope to send an observer. The alleged offence took place on an occasion when Martin Sostre was being beaten up by officers.

PRESS FUND

Contributions 31 Oct.-6 Nov.

WESTON, Ont.: A.B. £11.36;
LONDON SE18: F.Y. 75p; GWENT: P.T. £1; DUNDEE: S.H. 16p;
MANCHESTER: B.P. £1.60; GRANT-HAM: J.G. £1; WOLVERHAMPTON: J.L. 50p; J.K.W. 10p; In Shop: P.W. 85p; D.C.W. 25p; J.P. 20p; Sundry Anon: £1.60; LEEDS: G.H.L. 25p; LIVERPOOL: J.G. 50p.

TOTAL: £ 19.58

Previously acknowledged: £1002.32

TOTAL TO DATE: £1021.90

POEMS wanted for Abolish War Encyclopaedia/Anthology: pacifist, anti-militarist, anti-racialist, Also Conscientious Objectors' Tribunal Statements. Any language. Mark Wm. Kramrisch, 55 Camberwell Church St. London S E.5

PORTUGUESE Libertarian Movmt needs book, pamphlets, free copies anarchist pubs, money & ideological support. Movimento Libertario Portugues, Rua Angelina Vidal 17-2^o -E LISBOA 1.

DUBLIN ANARCHISTS Bob Cullen (7 yrs) Des Keane (5 yrs) Columba Longmore (4 yrs). Address for letters & papers: Military Detention Centre, Curragh Camp, Co. Kildare, Eire

STOKE NEWINGTON FIVE Welfare Committee, 54 Harbcombe Road, London N15. Needs donations to provide study books for these long-term prisoners.

GIOVANNI MARINI Defence Committee, Paolo Braschi, C.P. 4263, 2100 MILANO, Italy.

THREE held re kidnapping of Spanish Banker: postcards to Octavio Alberola Sunilach, Prison de Fresnes, 1 Av. de la Division Leclerc, 94261 FRESNES, France, and to Ariane Gransac-Sadori & Jane Helen Weir at Prison de Femmes, 9 av. des Peupliers, 97100 ST. GENEVIEVE DES BOIS, France.

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