

# The Burden of Monarchy

IN 1649 the execution of Charles I heralded the end of a centuries old system of absolute monarchical power; an era involving the brutal oppression and ruthless exploitation of the people by a highly privileged family, who, considering themselves to be vastly superior to other beings, indulged in lives of decadence and

British people, and who still personify the class system.

Why must the people bear this burden? In the present situation monarchical power is symbolic only, it has no authority in its own right. Monarchical decisions are a repetition of government policy—whatever senseless measures the ruling bureaucrats decide upon, monarchy will repeat it like a parrot. Clearly the existence of this national parasite, together with its symbolic power, is helpful to these ruling factions, due to the use they can make of many people's misguided loyalty to this family.

1. It provides an essential stable element in this society (continually changing because of its capitalist nature).

2. Loyalty to 'Queen and Country' is often quoted in the call for increased productivity, i.e. increased profits for the employers.

3. Monarchy is a tool of imperialism—the loyalty of many foreign peoples to the monarchy is used in the covering up or healing of differences caused by British im-

perialism, for example in Wales and the Commonwealth (witness Biafra).

4. The loyalty of British people to the monarchy is used to persuade them to fight in British imperialist wars (Malaya, Borneo, etc.).

The monarchy is retained at great expense to the British people in a situation where there are many unemployed, vast housing shortages, falling standards of living, inadequate hospitals and a grossly degenerate education system, etc., etc. Huge amounts of money are squandered in supporting this parasite whose only real function is involved in the trickery of the people.

It is 300 years since the axe fell on Charles' head; monarchy survived. Let the axe fall again—LET MONARCHY DIE!

NO CLASS SYSTEM  
NO MONARCHY  
NO CAPITALISM  
NO BUREAUCRACY  
FREEDOM AND ANARCHY!!!!  
ABERYSTWYTH ANARCHISTS.



luxury at the expense of their impoverished subjects, and whose policies were based entirely on self-interest and the suppression of liberty.

The falling of the axe onto Charles' head was indeed a great blow in the cause of freedom. However, in spite of this we now have a situation where vast power has fallen into the hands of comparatively few bureaucrats whose policies are no less based on self-interest, and whose methods, although now highly disguised and devious, involve the oppression and exploitation in no less ruthless a manner than that of the old system. And to emphasise the matter further we still have remnants of this archaic institution who insist on parading about flaunting their wealth and privilege, who still indulge in luxury and decadence at the expense of the

REVEREND AUGUSTUS BERKES.

## CONFUSION AT THE LSE

LSE STUDENTS are at present fighting a losing battle. What is this battle, who is fighting and, more importantly, what has gone wrong? The socialist society here believe it is a revolutionary struggle involving continuous confrontation with the school authorities, breaking down the fabric of the school and thereby (somehow) uniting students and workers against the common enemy of capitalism. Fair enough, but where are the bases for these glorious expectations?

The majority of students at LSE are liberal, they are not revolutionary students at all. How, therefore, can a revolutionary struggle be waged through majority decisions at union meetings? Either the meeting has been packed out with soc-soc members and the 'majority' is meaningless and fail to back up subsequent action, or the resolution is at best a liberal act of conscience. Only when people are involved in direct action to change their lot (be it a decent house or honest course of study), bypassing LSE authorities, the state or the boss, when people take power and responsibility in their own hands, will an honest revolutionary struggle develop. The Marxists in fact blame the Anarchist minority for any direct action (*Observer*, 4.5.69)! They deal in empty majority paper resolutions that don't and can't involve the mass of students in anything except mere acquiescence to a nice 'naughty, naughty Wally Adams' sort of resolution.

Last week we were on strike. The analogy is of course ridiculous. So what if we 'withdraw our labour', so what if

it is even an 'official strike'—it is hardly going to have the foundations of

### LSE: Revolutionary logic

LAST week's protests against the dismissal of two members of the teaching staff of the School of Economics show once again, that much greater sympathy is accorded by any student body to those guilty of 'revolutionary' conduct than to those who are dismissed for 'academic' reasons. The tradition of 'academic' conduct at LSE is to be strictly according to the rules. It is still important to set up its promised review of the curriculum. It is a well-known fact that the authorities are always ready to remove from the curriculum any subject which is considered to be 'controversial' or 'unpleasant'.



## University as a Slum Landlord

STUDENTS AT Liverpool University voted last week to support local tenants in picketing the official opening of a new Senate House. Their protest was against the University as a slum landlord.

The University Administration may own up to 130 houses inside the campus. The property is bought up as a prelude to new University developments.

Recently tenants in two streets owned by the University have attacked its failure to keep the property in a fit state for human habitation.

In Vine Street, just bought by the University, the roofs gape and water

pours in quite freely. A house with a habitable top floor is a rarity. Entire families have to live and sleep in the basement.

For over 8 years in Melville Place, the University failed to keep the houses in a fit state of repair, to combat the dangers of damp to children, to alleviate squalid overcrowding, or to fight the problem of rat-infestation. The houses were declared unfit for human habitation by the Corporation.

In at least one instance the University bought a house for £75. Since then the tenant has paid a total of £624 in thirty shillings a week rent.

Pressure on the University and the Corporation intensified last autumn with the formation of a Tenants' Association in the area. In its few months of existence the Tenants' Association has been successful in fighting cases of repair or rehousing against the University and the Corporation.

The picket of the University's new Senate House is a protest by the tenants about the conditions in which they are forced to live, many of them with the University as landlord. Senate House cost £600,000 and the opening ceremony—featuring Princess Alexandra—£500.

The demonstration by tenants and students will question and condemn the distorted spending priorities of both the University and society as a whole. It will embarrass the University on a prestige occasion.

GERRY CORDON.

(For the Tenants' Association, University Soc-Soc, Anarchist and Labour Groups.)

## Freedom Scottish Anarchist Issue

First issue out May 31  
Sellers wanted  
contact: Ian S. Sutherland,  
8 Esslemont Avenue,  
Aberdeen.

Subscribers wanting to receive Scottish Anarchist Edition should inform Freedom Press

## AMNESTY ME ARSE!

THE announcement of the 'amnesty' for all involved in 'political disturbances' since October 5 has been greeted with an incredible farrago of slobber by all concerned, from new parliamentary secretary to the ministry of justice to the green tory John Taylor to green tory McAteer (the racketeer). The CRA's inane statement went to the effect that it seems very good but there must be a catch. The reasons for it are in point-of fact quite obvious.

Firstly it must be seen in the context of the Derry trials which were to come up next week. These had all been adjourned from October 5 and the accused included Hume, Cooper, McAteer, McCann and most of the Derry CR people. 'La Pasionara' Devlin was due to appear soon too as well as two other opposition MPs.

Legally the cases would have been very difficult to prosecute and most would have had to have been acquitted, to the wrath of the Paisleyites who are incensed that their Führer and his corporal have been incarcerated—they of course were also offered the first six month adjournment but refused it for publicity reasons.

Acquittal or light penalties for October 5 would have sent them on the rampage, but conviction or stiff penalties would have been even more disastrous for the new 'liberal' regime of Chichester-Shark, for the people of Derry, eagerly awaiting a chance to repay their countless scores with the police and the corrupt unionist careerists of the city would have gone on the streets to demonstrate their solidarity with CR.

Thus by calling an 'amnesty', dropping the charges against the CR people and freeing Paisley and Bunting, they hope to appease their extremists and at the same time appear to be making a 'magnanimous gesture' to the opposition. This cowardice can be presented as a courageous virtue.

Secondly, by doing so they can make the 'moral equation' of peaceful CR marchers who take part in an unjustly banned march and are viciously attacked by uniformed thugs—armed B Specials arrested in Armagh while trying to prevent a legal CR march and the Burntollet ambushers. This has consistently been government policy.

The day before Burntollet 'Captain' Long met Bunting and Paisley and had a 'congenial chat' (sic). The same day our new PM Chichester-Shark had talked to Bunting during the march at Beragh and the next day when Bunting and his bully boys were smashing up the marchers they were benignly watched by Chichester-Shark's brother Robin, the Westminster MP, along with Anderson, Derry Unionist MP. Next day the 'liberal' O'Neill, the white hope of the intellectual pigmies and middle class, spent three paragraphs denouncing the injured marchers and one the attackers.

Now with his henchman and aristocratic relative at the helm he has been availing himself of the mass media and boring Canadian viewers by telling them that the worst troublemakers are the PD who 'are composed of anarchists and trotskies and have had a bad influence on poor wee Bernadette'. His latest oracular pronouncement being that it is obvious that the civil rights movement has been the work of revolutionary students and is connected with all the ungrateful and revolting students around the world.

Furthermore the 'amnesty' can be seen as an attempt to forestall action over Burntollet when the book of the same name appears in five weeks' time. (Copies can be ordered from Freedom Press.) For as the government knows full well













