

## VOTE FOR NECK-BREAKING!

AS WE AWAIT the coming of the General Election of 1970 we are consumed with the perplexing problem not of who to vote for (for this is a minor detail and could well be left to chance), but how to tell Tweedledum (Conservative) and Tweedledee (Labour) apart. Now we are confronted with an Issue which has very little relevance to any of the population but because of its sensational nature and dramatic possibilities on matters of literally life and death, makes a first class Issue in the election. The *Sunday Express* laments that the people have never been allowed to express an opinion on it. The *Sunday Telegraph* wonders if it is right to remove it from the decision of the electorate. One party leader has said it should be taken out of politics and a Committee (that most British of remedies) of three members be set up to discuss the matter; even though two Royal Commissions have fully explored the subject *ad nauseam* and his own party conference passed a resolution in favour of it by 1,117 votes to 958.

What is this Issue which occupies the mind of the electorate to the exclusion of Vietnam, Biafra, Prices and Incomes, Housing, Industrial Unrest, et cetera? It is the good old debating subject: Capital Punishment.

The suspension (good word) of the death penalty (for murder only) has been operating since 1965 and expires in 1970. At that date, unless new proposals come into effect, we shall revert to the rather crude system of nominating certain murders as 'capital', being particularly nasty, and others as non-capital (these included poisoning and the killing of the archtypical old lady with weapons other than firearms).

Murder is the most rare of crimes, and the most untypical. Recidivists are rare and with capital punishment it was rare to remedy miscarriages of justice; not that they didn't happen, but nothing could be done to remedy them. Murder is a family affair and perhaps more could be done to reduce the murder rate by abolishing the family rather than by abolishing the gallows. Statistics are a confusing thing and since all this dis-

## NO QUICK CURE FOR PLAGUE

PRESIDENT Noxin of Meglomania stated that eventually they would start to cure the plague from which the country had been suffering. He is more optimistic about starting to deal with it than he was six months ago and promised eventual treatment on an orderly timetable.

At the same time he had no intention at the moment of doing anything different about the plague and said that the distribution of germs by the government would continue.

To abate the disease too quickly, he said, would be a disaster of unparalleled magnitude and would lead to withdrawal symptoms which would demonstrate to the world that Meglomania had had the plague and would leave them open to the disease again.

This ceasing to have the plague in Meglomania meant that it could break out in other parts of the world. 'It would not bring health but more disease,' said the President.

He refused to draw up a course of treatment because it depended on the progress of the disease and the results of

cussion on death is an emotive thing it is unwise to confuse with facts those whose minds are already made up.

It is improbable that any political party will commit itself upon the question of hanging (one of Mr. Duncan Sandys' supporters deplored the use of this term as being too crude; there were, she hinted, alternative methods) since the Conservatives were evenly divided upon this subject at their conference and the Labour Government insisted on a free vote on this subject which was only brought in on the persistence of the late Sydney Silverman. No party wishes to have the responsibility of going against 'public opinion'. If it were left to 'public opinion', slavery, punishment for witchcraft and hanging for theft would still be with us.

The most we can hope for is a Labour Party in favour of a new technological revolution in capital punishment by electrocution or gassing, a Conservative Government in favour of the restoration of the neck-breaking method or even backwoodsmen in favour of the axe (Enoch Powell is in fact opposed to capital punishment). The Liberals would no doubt favour sterilization for mur-

Continued on page 2

## A VOICE FROM THE CELL

IN BRIXTON Prison Diarmuid Breach is making a silent protest at being refused bail while awaiting trial. Having been five weeks in custody, he commenced hunger-strike on Thursday, November 6.

In a letter to a friend he expresses his sense of injustice at the treatment of himself and four of his five co-squatters in the following comparison:

'I read with avid interest of Quartermain's (That Man Again) appearance in Barking Court\* (the memories, the memories) charged with threatening behaviour and riotous assembly. Also charged with him was Brian Morley. They were both remanded on £25 found bail in their own recognizance. Someone should have noticed the disparity between his treatment by a court and mine (ours). Numerous witnesses have sworn on statements alleging his being the cause of a wo-

a medical conference being held in Paris (it has been pointed out that the Paris doctors are not qualified to discuss the plague and have very little interest in the outbreak, they are merely interested in discussions on protocol and etiquette).

He said he had been in touch with one of the carriers of the plague but the man had not been very helpful, he had in fact died three days after President Noxin got in touch with him.

In his speech, the President thought they might get rid of the plague quicker by demonstrating 'strength and health' rather than a weakness which made them combat the disease.

The President concluded, 'An admission that Meglomania had caught plague in the swamps would be the first time they had been ill and result in a collapse of confidence in Meglomania leadership, not only in the swamps, but around the world.'

'A nation cannot remain great if it gets sick.'

JACK SPRATT.

THERE ARE 123 nations which subscribe to the international requirements necessary to take part in the Olympic Games. Of these South Africa is the only one which avowedly selects its teams on a racialist basis and Britain and France are the only ones who play games with South Africa. The rest don't want to know.

Perhaps it is because South Africa is a bastard offspring of the British Empire that right-wing opinion in this country holds such affection for it. Bigots, racialists and conservatives in general always take unquestioned the attitudes of the ruling class, and to its credit the British ruling class has always treated its bastards kindly—not allowing them actually to inherit a title, perhaps, but certainly seeing they are financially provided for and even allowing them a certain ambiguous place in between stairs. The existence of a few bastards around the estate was, after all, a sign of the master's virility, and a certain amount of bad behaviour was allowed to them on account of the unfortunate circumstances of their coming into the world. They could act as a kind of Mr. Hyde to the master's Dr. Jekyll—from their position of irresponsibility doing all the rotten things he would like to do but mustn't because of his social responsibilities and being a pillar of the church and all that.

Within the world community the British family of nations exists very much like an impoverished aristocrat striving to keep up appearances (even maintaining a monarchy that we can't really afford, dammit) and being very respectable in a middle-

class kind of way now that the rest of the world is worth knowing.

Nevertheless we do have our bastard offspring and they do perform a very useful function, besides being a reminder of those more virile days when we ruled the waves and a fifth of the world's surface was under the British flag and we didn't give a tinker's cuss for anyone.

Nowadays we have to kow-tow to the Yankees and the Reds while the Yids have got their own State (and very successful, too—always were a clever lot!) and the wogs in general thumb their noses at us and even the bloody Irish, whom we thought we had dealt with for good in 1916, have started their tricks again. On top of all that the necessity for trading with all sorts of black, brown and yellow nations means that we have to mind our P's and Q's and go along with all that liberal nonsense about the equality of man and all that tosh.

Of course your actual British working man, when he is not on strike for a bigger slice of our profits, knows his place—and knows the wog's place as well. But to go along with world opinion, and in view of the unhappy fact that we have to export or die, we must suppress any racialism inside this country, so we have the Race Relations Act to show the world that we really are decent respectable chaps.

At the same time, there's our bastard offspring in South Africa, and our bastard kith and kin in Rhodesia, keeping the flag of white supremacy flying. Dammit we made those countries! Wasn't it our very own Cecil Rhodes and our very good friend General Smuts that built up those white countries on the dark continent? Didn't we bring civilisation and Christianity to the blacks and show them, if not a better way of living, at least a better way of dying? Didn't we show them how to build roads and railways for us, and how to dig out their diamonds and copper and gold for us? And then the ungrateful devils throw us out at the first opportunity.

Well thank goodness there's our bastard offspring in South Africa still showing the world what sort of people we used to be, when we would stand no nonsense from the wogs.

Now because of our special place in the world (export or die and all

that) we have to put on the liberal face. When Mr. Macmillan went to Africa and said his piece about 'winds of change' what he meant was that the emerging African nations were jolly good markets for British goods. Eventually, this far-seeing gentleman realised, they would be bigger markets than the white-dominated countries. So we have to be nice to them. For similar reasons we have to be nice to the Federal Government of Nigeria because (a) they control the biggest markets in West Africa and (b) if we don't give them the arms they want they will turn to Russia for all their requirements—and that means our trade gone for a burton.

So South Africa is a bit of an embarrassment, perhaps, but there is an awful lot of British money invested in commercial interests there. In fact you might say that British capitalism has a vested interest in the continuance of the South African way of life, as well as the Nigerian way of life (whatever that is) and the Kenyan way of life (after all they didn't want the Indians either, did they?) and the Indian way of life for that matter, and Pakistani and Arab and Jewish, and we do try our best to maintain good trading relations with Russia and China even.

It's terribly difficult, isn't it, when you want to be friends with everyone? After all, we did give South Africa a slap on the wrist when we refused them £200 million worth of armaments. At least we wouldn't sell them *directly* any more than we are trading *directly* with naughty Rhodesia. We have made our gestures! But secretly, you know, aren't a lot of us rather proud at the way the South Africans are standing up for what they believe? Haven't the Tories (50% of Britain?) already said they will re-vitalise the arms deal if they win the next Election?

The anti-apartheid protesters at rugby matches must realise that what they are up against is not only the openly racialist policies of South Africa, but also the mean, grasping, money-mad and power-hungry sections of British society at the top—and the fearful, servile masses at the bottom. They should think themselves lucky they don't have to demonstrate at soccer matches!

JUSTIN.

## New Brooms Sweep Up

BACK IN April, after the sabotage attempts on power and water installations, the Government waxed angry about these 'IRA attacks' and used them as a justification for the 'B' men and the Special Powers Acts.

On Saturday, October 25, a group of Ulster Volunteer Force men attempted to blow up the Ballyshannon Power Station in the Republic, near the border. They failed, and one of their men burnt himself to ashes in the process.

On November 1 they succeeded in blowing up the grave of Wolfe Tone at Bodenstown, in the Republic.

As soon as the UVF had openly claimed credit for this the police acted. Four men were charged with blowing up the Dunadry water supply in April and five men with attempting to sabotage the electricity pylon at Kilmore, Co. Armagh in April—one of the men was also connected with the Castlereagh Power Station explosion. Not one of the men is in the IRA. There's not a Sean or a Seamus amongst them. They are in the UVF/allied organizations. As yet inquiries have not elicited how many of them are 'B'-Specials.

Why have the police decided to act at last? They have obviously had these

names for months, so why now? Either Sir Arthur Young, everyone's friendly copper, is really a 'new broom', or the mad major's Government, trembling at the seditious threats of Adolf Craig and the disgruntled 'B' men, is making a last desperate attempt to curb the loonies in their clique, for if the UVF carry out a concerted campaign in the South as they are promising, the time when Westminster will step in draws even closer.

On Wednesday, November 5, appropriately enough, an explosion rocked the gas works in Belfast. The saboteurs have not as yet been apprehended, to use pig parlance.

Meanwhile the judiciary continues to hand out absurd sentences—Cosgrave of PD getting six months for 'calling an illegal public meeting' and Comrade Valley of Armagh PD about to be sent down on a dozen charges. The main CR martyr of course, as yet to appear in court until next month when 'wee red Bernie' faces 13 charges relating to helping to defend the Bogside against the invasion of the gun-toting, club-wielding, gas-hurling police and their 'civilian aides'. 'Another martyr for old Ireland' prepares to step on stage.

GILLIE.

\*A private prosecution was brought against Barry Quartermain and Brian Morley by Ron Bailey of East London Squatters. No reminder will be necessary that this relates to illegal evictions carried out or attempted by Quartermain's private detective army on the instructions of Redbridge Council.

ALTHOUGH PRIVATE detective agencies in America were striking back in the '20s their counterparts in Britain have, until recently, occupied themselves with simply finding out who is sleeping with who's wife. Brought to a head with the actions of Barrie Quartermain against the Ilford squatters, the private eyes of Britain are moving into a new phase of action—action against strikers and political groups. The private detectives are so politically involved themselves that they are rapidly becoming the right-wing institution that their American fellows have been for over 50 years. When Quartermain attacked Woodlands Road, an Ilford Pictorial reporter noticed that two of his bailiffs were wearing National Front badges.

On the industrial front things started warming up in 1964. At the BMC Bathgate (West Lothian) factory the ex-police security officer hired and planted a spy in the works to prevent pilfering. The whole thing ended with the spy going to prison for planting machinery on the lorries of innocent employees.

A year before Walthamstow Trades Council condemned a letter being circulated to local firms offering to supply 'undercover agents' in the works to provide 'a complete appraisal of all unauthorised happenings' which included the following of company vehicles and 'reporting on any persons found causing dissension or inviting employees to de-

# The Private Eyes

fect'. The firm offering this service was Security Services Ltd., one of the Securicor Group.

With the increasing use of computers Management Investigations (River House, Lea Bridge Road, E.5), announced that they were compiling a Records Research Index available to employers listing everything from criminal record, debts, mental health to local reputation of job applicants.

The list goes on, so we decided that it was time we did some investigating. We had some fake letterheads printed and found some friendly addresses and began sending out requests for help against political agitators in our 'firms'. Half way through the word got around and nobody replied to our letters any more—but we already had an interesting file by then.

Initially, we complained of political activists causing trouble in the 'firm' and for facilities for screening future employees.

Leach's Security Service were unable to help but passed us on to Peter Chorley Ltd., Park Mansions Arcade, 14 Brompton Park, S.W.1 (Directors: Lt.-Col. L. E. O. T. Hart, O.B.E. and

A. C. Duncan) who they described as 'specialising in this type of cover'. A few days later a note arrived from Duncan saying that he would contact us in seven days. He was obviously checking us out and we expected to hear no more as the address we used in this case had, at one time, been in the AFB list for over a year. Happily, on top of being a freak he was also an inefficient freak, and a week later we received his 'professional advice'. He suggested that we collect as much information on our 'troublemakers' as possible and report it to our local CID and added, chillingly, 'They will know what to do then'. He identified our 'troublemakers' as 'Trots or Anarchists (anarchists sometimes call themselves International Socialists)'. Oh, yeh? He ended his letter by saying 'try and give CID all the information you can'.

We had a strange unheaded type-written note from PO Box 41, Carshalton, Surrey, which suggested that we could find help if we contacted telephone 01-372 5262, ext. 233. The phantom letterwriter turned out to be Christopher Robert & Co., the firm that investigated the anti-apartheid movement for the

South African Government. They were very keen to help and it is worth remembering the number if you ever want to get something out of your system.

Inevitably we came to your friend and mine, Barrie (I'm a karate expert) Quartermain. Quartermain's Southern Provincial Investigations and Kingston Detective Agency are at 45 Brighton Road, Surbiton and that highly squat-able residence Suite Eight, 93-97 Regent Street, W.1.

Peter H. French, who replied to our letter, said that Barrie was 'extremely interested in our requirements'. I bet he was! Apart from his anti-squatter activities he has been trying to sort out strikers at the Ivy Bridge site in Hounslow. Politically Quartermain is

past his earholes in fascism. Apart from his National Front playmates, Quartermain is not exactly a stranger to Oswald Mosley's Lowndes Square flat. It is there that Walter Hesketh, ex-Northern organiser of Mosley's Union Movement, first met Quartermain.

No longer the tools of the Right, the private eyes are now part of the Right. The Quartermain's of this country are not loath to hiring private armies to achieve their ends, as we have learned from bitter experience. It is the Anarchist groups themselves that must take a look at their new enemy. The heat is on the politicians, or soon will be, as for the factory floor... well I've never met a worker that didn't know what to do with a company spy.

JOHN AND LARRY.

## 'TOWARDS LIBERTARIAN REVOLUTION'

THE MUCH-PUBLICISED (at least until three weeks beforehand) Libertarian Left Conference turned out to be a gigantic flop—about 60 people turned up (not bad considering late notice) but a majority had no real idea of why they were there or what the purpose of the conference. It basically was a Solidarity conference and a few assorted anarchists, libertarians and Soc. Soc. members.

We led off with Education and Jim Kaplan gave his views on the student movement that had developed in the last 18 months from sit-ins to occupation and confrontations—see a dual pattern of repression of militants and integrating in a fake 'participation' for the rest, he was concerned about the break-up of, as he termed it, 'liberal justice'. From a personal view, I think there is little point in complaining about injustice (or as Kropotkin correctly called it, organised vengeance called justice); if you are going to confront the system you must expect to be put down but hard, that is the risk we all run and we must accept it.

The Education session rambled on with local action (not very impressive) and other work, i.e. schools, the most interesting being the street theatre group going round schools and the London Street Commune—it was not very inspiring. Housing was a little brighter due to Moss Side Peoples Association who publish an excellent mag. ('Moss Side News'—Manchester comrades please note), we then went on to Squatters and Tenants—why does everyone appear to think that the only people in the housing field are Tenants, Squatters and Local Councils,

how about looking at co-operative housing (surely a good example of mutual aid).

Industrial Action had more meat about it, as one would expect with the character of Solidarity but again I didn't think there was any real dialogue. Everyone said their piece and that was it, in fact that was the fault with the whole weekend, no one was trying to learn, only propagate their own views. Cinema Action showed their films, particularly impressive was the one on the Black Panthers, the one which provided the liveliest discussion was the women's liberation but again a lack of communication although for me at least the meaning of women's liberation became clearer.

Sunday was turned over to a discussion of libertarian theory in the revolutionary movement which in some ways was the best thing (some good points on the place of theory in the movement) and the worst—everyone has got a different view of Marx and the purity of some of our revolutionary comrades is going to be sullied by reality very soon.

All in all this was the most semantic-ridden weekend I've ever been on. Nobody was willing to alter their viewpoint. Two bright spots—over £4-worth of anarchist literature sold (*The State*... went very well) and the second was Moss Side Peoples Association, who seem to have the right idea about working in their community—incidentally the new in-word is 'de-mystify', you figure it out.

DAVE CRONIN,  
Sunic/Leveller.

## OPEN FORUM VOTE FOR NECK-BREAKING

Continued from page 1

derers, whilst the Communists would stand by a bullet in the back of the neck for their political opponents.

It is indeed impossible to approach the political exploitation of such an issue without a healthy cynicism, but we are confronted with the question of what has it to do with anarchism. Anarchists, believing as they do in the value of the human person and opposed as they are to the State, must necessarily oppose capital punishment. We shall be met by the usual taunt of our more 'revolutionary' comrades that this is mere 'reformism'. Added to this there is possibly a feeling among some that to go against 'public opinion' is courting political disaster.

Capital punishment is not a political issue any more than the size of prison cells is, but both questions involve the subject of human respect and dignity. Capital punishment was abolished (until the Nazis came and thereafter retained for war criminals) in Holland in 1870. The technical issue as to whether capital punishment was useful for deterring or preventing murder must have been decided even then and there. A reactionary and backward country like Britain would doubtless take time to reach the same conclusions, even without the help of the sensationalist and alarmist press which works on the fears and hates of the public (the results it calls 'public opinion').

As for the question of reform—had this reform come earlier, Derek Bentley, Timothy Evans and James Hanratty who were undoubtedly innocent would be alive and could be released. The reform is only part of the climate of opinion and scientific and specialist research but one must have the imagination and the emotional appeal to push it through despite the innate conservatism of States, Home Secretaries, and 'public opinion'. All Home Secretaries are opposed to capital punishment—when they are out of office!

All reforms are the reluctant admission of the correctness of an obvious truth. When these truths come to be accepted it is time to pass on to the less obvious truths. Anarchists should be preaching the need for the abolition of prisons. This is a truth which is partly on the road to acceptance.

Reforms should be pressed to the point where their acceptance would be revolution. Capital punishment (for any offence) must never return.

JACK ROBINSON.

## THE CRITICS BOWLED OUT

ROYAL COURT, SLO. 1745. A flawless production by Lindsay Anderson of a play by David Storey. **THE CONTRACTOR**. "Superb Theatrically... Mr. Storey emerges as the nearest equivalent to Chekhov the English Theatre has yet produced. This moment will be long remembered." Ian Hamilton, Times Ed. Supp. Nightly 7.30. No Mats.

rises  
the curtain  
the curtain  
falls  
a disgruntled critic  
shouted "balls?"

Arthur Moyses.

[The Royal Court Theatre banned the critic of 'The Spectator' because of an apparently adverse review. Other critics stayed away in solidarity.]

# Anarchism without Tears

THE OXFORD English Dictionary defines an anarchist as 'one who admits of no ruling power'. That means, I take it, that an anarchist is one who acknowledges no ruling power as necessary or justifiable. Anarchists may comply with the edicts of ruling powers. They may abide by the laws of the land. But they deny that any ruling power has the right to enforce laws. Certain rules and regulations may be necessary in any community, but ruling powers, according to anarchists, are not. A certain amount of organization is obviously essential, but power, no less obviously, corrupts.

Power is the domination of any individual, group, class, people, or race over others. It is the forceful influence of man over man, in any sphere—church or state, factory or office, school or family. It consists, essentially, in the use of bribes and threats to ensure obedience. Its appeal is to acquisitiveness and fear. This appeal may be open and unashamed, or subtly concealed and cloaked in respectability, but in either case power is disastrous for all concerned.

To say that some ruling power is essential to maintain law and order is obviously wrong. There can be no law and order, in any worthwhile sense, as long as acquisitiveness and fear are systematically cultivated by ruling powers. In any community power is a disruptive, not a cohesive factor. Real co-operation is impossible between those in power and those subject to power. Real co-operation means acting together without calculation, without a motive, for the sheer fun of being together and doing things together. Such spontaneous co-operation is the only sound basis for any community. But power, by introducing the motives of acquisitiveness and fear, destroys all spontaneity, all fun, all affection and sympathy. Those who justify power only want it for themselves, or for some group or organization with which they identify themselves. They are not deeply concerned about law and order, and their activities perpetuate injustice, chaos, and misery.

In view of these obvious facts, I think any intelligent man must be an anarchist in the dictionary sense. But whether he must be an anarchist in any other sense is another question. Some say that an anarchist, historically, is one who has some ideal of a society without ruling

powers, and struggles, by some means, to translate that ideal into reality. Now, I would not (as 'permanent protesters' do) exclude the possibility that ruling powers may eventually disappear. On the contrary, I greatly hope that they will. But I do not believe in having, or struggling for, ideals. This is where I differ from 'historical' anarchists. The only well-known anarchist who did not believe in ideals was Max Stirner—and he is not generally understood.

To have ideals and struggle for them is to destroy spontaneity—this was Stirner's point. That spontaneous co-operation which is the only sound basis for any community cannot be cultivated. Fun, sympathy, affection, human understanding—these cannot be propagated or organized. They must happen naturally. Idealistic opposition to existing ruling powers can be cultivated—but such opposition is essentially negative and destructive. It is an attempt to get rid of power by means of power, which is clearly self-defeating. Any form of militancy, it seems to me, is a terrible mistake. Idealistic opposition to ruling powers (even 'non-violent' opposition) only adds to the already existing mess.

'Historical' anarchists will object that to abandon idealistic opposition to ruling powers is to condemn oneself to slavery. To regard ruling powers as unnecessary and unjustifiable, they will say, is all very well, but it will hardly overthrow them. For that, an idealistic struggle is essential. Or, if not, what are we to do? Nothing?

The answer, briefly, is that truth is its own action. Most of us—let's face it—want power in some form. We shall stop wanting it only when we see the truth that all power is evil. Idealism is unnecessary: once you see that something is a deadly poison you naturally avoid it. Thus, when mankind realizes the truth about power, it will naturally evolve a radically new way of life. That is the only way the anarchist revolution can happen. Truth, not idealism, is the liberating factor. All we have to 'do' is to see clearly. We shall then be able to help others to see... and the revolution will follow.

FRANCIS ELLINGHAM.

(More articles on Anarchism needed for this column.—EDS.)

## Anarchist Federation of Britain

The AFB information office will produce an internal bulletin. Comrades interested in its production are to meet in Birmingham on the first weekend of each month, from November onwards. All groups will be informed in detail. Address all letters to:

Peter Le Mare, 22 Hallowell Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, 16. Material that cannot wait for the bulletin to be sent to R. Atkins, Vanbrugh College, Heslington, York.

The Contact Column in 'Freedom' is also available for urgent information.

Groups should send latest addresses to Birmingham. New inquirers should

write direct to them or to the AFB information office in Birmingham.

### AFB REGIONAL GROUPS

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

Cornwall: A. Jacobs, 13 Ledrah Road, St. Austell. (M. Ma. 19.)

Essex & E. Merits: P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (OM, FL.)

North-West: P. Hill, 7 Trinity Square, Preston. (M.)

Surrey: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.

Sussex: E. Poole, 5 Tilsbury, Findon Road, Whitehawk, Brighton.

Yorkshire: M. Watkins, 6 Eberston Terrace, Leeds. 6.

Scotland: B. Lynn, 12 Ross Street, Glasgow.

Wales: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).

N. Ireland: c/o Freedom Press.

S. Ireland: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).

University and Student Groups: c/o P. L. Mare. (Abbreviations: M—meeting; Ma—magazine; B—badges; Q—Quarterly; FL—free leaflets.)

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

# OUR APPEAL

## PRICE ADJUSTMENTS NECESSARY

WE ARE SURE that we don't have to tell our readers about how the cost of living has gone up in the past two years. Needless to say the cost of printing has also.

It is always the policy of Freedom Press to hold down the price of our publications, partly to ensure that nobody goes without our paper because they can't afford them (we even offer them free to the really needy enthusiast) and partly because we don't run our anarchist publishing activity as a capitalist, profit-making venture. Anybody who chose anarchist publishing as a means of making money would want his head examined anyway.

Nevertheless, prices must have some relationship to costs, and so we do fix a minimum price. Some anarchist journals throughout the world prefer to rely entirely on voluntary contributions—we prefer to be sure of some income at least, and hope for our losses to be made up by donations. The sale of the paper, through shops (only a few of these), by groups to members and by street-selling (never enough of this!) and by subscription, represents the only return we have except donations. We do not accept paid advertising, as so many other papers of the left do, and we do not have any subsidy from a membership paying regular dues, as is the practice in some Trotskyist organisations, for example, nor can our printing press subsidise us by being run as a profit-making capitalist concern apart from anarchist printing.

Money from sales and from voluntary contributions, therefore, represent our only sources of income. We explained three weeks ago how desperate our financial situation has become and this simply means that our sources of income are inadequate.

Having launched an Appeal for £1,000 by the New Year, we have put the ball in your court as readers as far as the donation side is concerned. If you are concerned you will help us as far as your

own finances allow—perhaps even a bit farther.

As far as we are concerned we have to take action to prevent too great a loss in the simple arithmetic of printing both FREEDOM and ANARCHY.

The selling price of FREEDOM has been held at sixpence long after it ceased to bear any relationship to costs. Similarly the present price of ANARCHY—two shillings—is no longer viable.

Reluctantly, therefore, we are going to have to increase the price of both. From the first of January, FREEDOM will go up to ninepence and ANARCHY to three shillings.

Even at these increased prices (and this is the first increase in the price of FREEDOM for nearly five years), we shall not be able to introduce the enlarged paper we were hoping to produce—at least not regularly and not without continued and increased support from our readership and from the anarchist movement in general.

We had two possibilities before us: to go up to one shilling and produce at least six pages every issue, or to go up to ninepence and produce six-page issues as often as we can afford to. Since ninepence means that we are just about going to meet our costs, the increased size of the paper depends entirely upon the amount of extra support we get. If we had gone up to one shilling, we should have had a small surplus which would have enabled us to press on regardless.

We decided on ninepence but we must realise that we shall almost certainly have to go up to 1s. in a year. We shall probably switch to 5 New Pence with decimalisation, but for now a 50% increase will keep us going and even this might upset some readers. More important however is the fact that we can now improve and enlarge the paper only in accordance with the support we get from you. If you show by selling more and getting more subscriptions for us and by supporting the Press Fund at least to the extent that we go into 1970 with-

out that terrible hangover of debt that faces us now, then we shall have that amount of encouragement to press on. We are determined not to get into any large amount of debt again, so from now on, every month's production of FREEDOM will depend upon the amount of support you gave us the previous month. Four pages every issue we shall manage, come hell or high water. Six pages or eight pages or special supplements depend entirely on you.

### £108—IS THIS ENOUGH?

As we go to press the response to our Appeal for £1,000 by Christmas is not exactly electrifying. Some comrades, as usual, have responded promptly and generously, but the total is little more than £100—and only about six weeks to go to Christmas!

In view of the foregoing announcement, we hope that our movement—which is supposed to be large and lively—will realise that it cannot have a weekly paper without supporting it properly.

It really is serious—please send all you can now. And again next month!! All donations please to: Graham Moss, Freedom Press, 84b Whitechapel High Street, London, E.1.

### NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES

From January 1, 1970, the Subscription Rate for 'FREEDOM' will be:  
Six months (20 issues) £1 1s. 8d.  
One year (40 issues) £2 3s. 4d.

From the same date, Subscription Rate for 'ANARCHY' will be:  
One year (12 issues) £1 16s. 0d.

Joint Subscription Rate for 'FREEDOM' and 'ANARCHY' will be:  
One year (40 'Freedom',  
12 'Anarchy') £3 19s. 4d.

Readers will note that the new price for 'ANARCHY' of 3s. includes postage for subscribers.

### PRESS FUND

November 3-10

Hove: H.C. £2; Leybourne: L.B. £2/5/-;  
Cambridge: S.W. 5/8; Bangor: J.T. £5;  
Leicester: D. & A.H. £1; Cambridge:  
C.M. £5; Beloit: M.B. 8/-; Ferrydun:  
D.C. 5/-; Eggertsville: V.C. £1; New-  
castle, N.S.W.: B.C. £3.

TOTAL: £20 3 8

B/F: £87 17 10

£108 1 6

## LETTERS

### Enter or not to Enter?

Dear Editors,

R.B.'s comments on the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation in the last issue show a complete lack of realism. The arguments for entering the RSSF are very clear.

First of all, joining the RSSF does not mean we lose our anarchist identity. Since we are so few in the student scene, we need to expand. Where the RSSF is a genuine multi-tendency group, it gives us an arena in which to put our arguments and win over recruits.

Secondly, abstention means handing over the initiative to the Leninists. R.B. says we can radicalise actions and demonstrations. But who call the demonstrations and initiate the actions in the first place? By following this policy we are reduced to the role of revolutionary passengers. While our initiating the squatters movement shows us what is possible, the student scene is quite a different matter. We are not in a position to initiate actions ourselves. The only solution is the broad front policy which will enable us to participate in the initiation of actions and then if necessary seize the initiative.

Thirdly, while the universities are largely politicised, this is not the case with Art Schools, Colleges of Technology, Colleges of Further Education, and Teachers Training Colleges. These are virtually virgin territory. We have one of each in Kingston. A year ago I was the only anarchist in the four colleges. Obviously I could not call myself a group and initiate independent action. Through using the broad front policy we now have groups in the College of Technology and the College of Further Education. We also have a contact in the Teachers Training College and with luck will soon have a group there. Nothing I have heard from other areas would contradict my conclusions.

If the anarchist movement is to offer a viable alternative to Blue Fascism and Red Fascism then we have to get up off our backsides and plunge into the conflict with the Leninists. Sitting back and contemplating the purity of our doctrines will get us nowhere. I support the LSF but I feel that a sectarian approach is doomed to failure.

G. WRIGHT.

### Viewpoint on Ireland

Dear Comrade,

IRELAND! The thought of it alone depresses me. I see no solution other than a purely military one for a long time to come. I can see no purely political solution, i.e., without military backing—which will be acceptable to all parties—ever. This is a sweeping statement to make, I know; but remember that the 700-odd years of military occupation and repression which is Britain's record in Ireland, still colours not only attitudes but, more important, actual social relations. By social relations I don't mean just those differences between people, of class, income, education, housing, hobbies, etc. There are these differences between Protestant and Catholic; between Catholic and Catholic. Although there is also reflected the general subordination of Catholic to Protestant in all these relations.

There is a far greater set of differences between the two peoples of Northern Ireland. There are two cultures, or rather sub-cultures, and the fact that they both draw on the same historical material,

though in polarised directions, does not make them any less different: nor less opposed either.

The two cultures mirror each other in almost everything, and are totally opposed.

Play an old air on accordion, violin or flute and every Irish, or part-Irish for that matter, foot will begin to tap; but the memories that the gay tune invokes will, in two skulls of the same shape, supporting features of the same cast, be different and opposed.

In Belfast children are brought up under two separate educational systems, under both of which they study the same subjects and end up with opposite ideas. If they play with each other, it is as terriers play with rats; if they speak at all, it is to hurl obscenities at each other, wrapped around bricks. This rivalry (euphemism) merely reinforces the inherited prejudices of each side. The fact that this prejudice intensifies the economic oppression of Catholic by Protestant is not to say that if all economic and social injustices were halted then prejudice would disappear. It would, one hopes, cease to matter, and in a century, perhaps, more likely perhaps not, inter-marriage between the two groups might produce a synthesized image in which the Pope would be seen as a defender of the Loyal Orange Lodge.

In the immediate future, so far as I can see, the best that can be hoped for is a recognition by each side of the other's rights, based upon actual physical possession AND viability.

It is obvious that this will entail exchanges of population and also perhaps defined spheres of influence both economic and social, and will lay the groundwork for a future federated state, which would appear to be the best to be hoped for—in our time, that is.

What I am trying to say is this: Recognise the differences between the two peoples, separate them politically, allow them to develop on the basis of a cultural separatism; then surely there would be no more need of rivalry than there is at the moment between the Catholic and Protestant areas of, say, France and Germany.

Many people must be aware of all this, even if they don't agree with my solutions, but there must be lots of people who just don't know how deep the differences are. A Belfast man will know by your name and the address of your school which culture you belong to—he does not need to know your religion.

I need hardly say—comments invited.

WOBBLY.

### Changing Lines

(from the Communist Party of Great Britain)

Freedom Press,  
84b Whitechapel High Street,  
London, E.1.

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter of November 4th.

Unfortunately our space is very limited and we regret that we shall therefore not be able to issue you with a press ticket.

Yours faithfully,  
TONY CHATER,  
6.11.69 Press & Publicity Department.

(We sent for a press ticket so that our correspondent could attend and write us a report. However, we either got the brush-off or the CP should book a larger hall. How about St. Pancras Station?—EDS.)

# books?

## we can supply any book in print

### SECONDHAND

We have a large stock of secondhand books. Try us for what you want. This weeks selection.

- Social and Philosophical Studies  
Paul Lafargue 7/6
- Horae Sabbaticae  
James Stephen (2nd series) 3/-  
On Compromise John Morley 4/-  
Low Notes on a High Level J. B. Priestley 3/-
- Socialism and Positive Science  
Enrico Ferri 8/6
- The Horse's Mouth Joyce Cary 4/-  
Germany T. H. Elkins 5/-
- Le Baiser au Néant  
Artsibatchev (introduced Hem Day) 4/-
- The Faith of an Agnostic  
G. G. Greenwood 4/-
- The Industrial History of England  
H. de B. Gibbins 3/-
- A Land Jacquetta Hawkes 4/-
- Old Men Forget Duff Cooper 4/-
- A Writer's Notebook  
W. Somerset Maugham 4/-
- The Rothschilds Frederic Morton 4/-
- Privileged Spectator Ethel Mannin 5/-
- Invasion 1940 Peter Fleming 4/-
- The Essence of Christianity  
Ludwig Feuerbach 12/6
- Technics and Civilization  
Lewis Mumford 15/-
- The History of the Popes  
Leopold Ranke 6/-
- Africa: A Study in Tropical Development 10/-

POSTAGE EXTRA

## Freedom Bookshop

## HERE WE ARE!

Note new telephone number:  
BIShopsgate 9249

New address:  
84B WHITECHAPEL HIGH STREET,  
(entrance Angel Alley),  
WHITECHAPEL, E.1.  
(Underground: Aldgate East. Exit:  
Whitechapel Art Gallery. Turn right  
on emerging from station.)

### FREEDOM PRESS and Bookshop

Opening times:  
Closed Monday, Sunday.  
Tuesday-Friday, 3-7 p.m.  
Saturday, 10 a.m.-4 p.m.

## FREEDOM PRESS

are the publishers  
of the monthly magazine  
ANARCHY  
and the weekly journal  
FREEDOM  
specimen copies will be  
sent on request.

### Subscription Rates

(Per year)

<b>Inland</b>		
'FREEDOM' ONLY	£1 13s. 4d.	
'ANARCHY' ONLY	£1 7s. 0d.	
COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION		£2 14s. 4d.
<b>Abroad</b>		
'FREEDOM' ONLY		
surface mail	£1 10s. 0d.	
airmail (US\$8.00)	£2 16s. 0d.	
'ANARCHY' ONLY		
surface mail	£1 6s. 0d.	
airmail (US\$7.00)	£2 7s. 0d.	
COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION		
surface mail	£2 10s. 0d.	
Both by airmail	(US\$12.50)	£4 15s. 0d.
'Freedom' by airmail,		
'Anarchy' by surface		
mail (US\$10.50)		£3 17s. 0d.

## PUBLICATIONS include

Berkman's  
ABC of ANARCHISM 2/6 (+5d.)  
Rocker's  
NATIONALISM AND  
CULTURE 21/- (+4/6)  
Richards'  
MALATESTA: His Life and Ideas  
Cloth bound 21/- (+1/3)  
Woodcock's  
THE WRITER & POLITICS 7/6  
Berneri's  
NEITHER EAST or WEST 6/- (+9d.)  
Full list on application.

## PLURAL ANARCHISM

To my English comrades:

ONE OF THE MAIN reasons why anarchism has never succeeded is because libertarians have always bickered among themselves and slung mud at each other rather than exerting all their energies against their (and all people's) real enemy, the State. Probably the most dissension within the ranks of what should be One Movement has always been between so-called individualist anarchists on the one hand, and communist, syndicalist, and collectivist anarchists on the other. Just as Benjamin R. Tucker in *Liberty* and Johann Most in *Freiheit* decades ago attacked and refused to ally with each other, today we find (to refer to a recent controversy in FREEDOM) S. E. Parker battling it out with Henry Ball, and on the other side of the Atlantic the followers of Murray Rothbard confronting those of Murray Bookchin.

Can it be possible that such dogmatism and sectarianism can exist among those who supposedly have liberated their minds from Statist myths and embraced total freedom? After all, no significant differences really exist between real anarchists, for the truly free society would allow any conduct which is not ipso facto aggressive—which would mean that everything from highly individualistic living to the community of the syndicate and the commune could exist. It is only reasonable to permit different economic systems to be tried, especially since anarchists of the left and right disagree over the best means to the end of material well-being and prosperity. After all, the two factions can quote their masters all they want—the left can quote Kropotkin's *Fields, Factories, and Workshops* and the right the libertarian portions of Ludwig Von Mises' *Human Action* till they lose their voices—yet only by experience can the best system be found. The truly libertarian, and the only tolerant, attitude was expressed well by Malatesta when he queried, 'What forms will production and exchange assume? Will it be the triumph of communism (production in association and free consumption for all) or collectivism (production in common and the distribution of goods on the basis of the work done by each individual), or individualism (to each the individual ownership of the means of production and the enjoyment of the full product of

his labour), or other composite forms that individual interest and social instinct, illuminated by experience, will suggest?'—and replied, 'Probably every possible form of possession and utilisation of the means of production and all ways of distribution of produce will be tried out at the same time in one or many regions, and they will combine and be modified in various ways until experience will indicate which form, or forms, is or are, the most suitable' (*Il Risveglio*, Nov. 30, 1929).

Invariably the sectarian individualist will condemn leftist anarchism because, he claims, communes and syndicates will evolve through time into a new power structure, that is, a new State. He ignores that these will be voluntary organizations, from which the individual may secede at will, and subject to workers' control. And just as often the bigoted leftist anarchist will lash out against free trade resulting in economic inequality, dogmatically and without foundation assuming that simply because one has a little more wealth than his brother that he will proceed to enslave and plunder that brother (thereby completely missing the whole point of Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid*), and fallaciously assuming that one can repress or prevent the existence of peaceful persons who prefer individualistic modes of production and consumption without establishing a new State.

Really now, can the childlike nature of these silly squabbles be any more obvious? Certainly there is nothing wrong with one predicting how he believes anarchism will function or offering constructive criticism to the predictions of his comrades, but if we ever hope to offer a consistent philosophy (and it is not a consistent philosophy to say I will allow complete 'freedom' only as long as the economic system I prefer exists) and if we ever hope to be numerous enough to really initiate the Social Revolution, we anarchists of every persuasion must co-operate with, not purge, each other.  
Florida, USA STEPHEN HALBROOK.

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

# Work-place Power

AS ANARCHISTS we have consistently drawn attention to the dangers of State intervention and control over our lives. In the last century, the role of the State in economic affairs was very small and workers, living and working under appalling conditions, looked to Parliament to alleviate their plight. Their agitation and protest won national reforms introduced by legislation which were applicable to everyone. By achieving this it was possible also to believe that, with enough representatives of the working class elected to Parliament, they could then legislate for socialism.

There are today many old-fashioned employers who cry 'creeping socialism' at the slightest suggestion of Government intervention in economic affairs and yet call for State intervention into labour relations in order to control unofficial strikes.

According to Sir Reay Geddes,

## Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Translator wanted for German pamphlet. Box No. 01.

American anarchist student in England in January, seeks employment, preferably working with communications media. Write Michael Board, 837 College Street, Beloit, Wisc. 53511, USA, before December 1, 1969.

Prisoners for Peace Day. List available from Freedom Press. Send greeting cards of support and solidarity.

Poster Workshop Calendar. Out Now. One Fighting Poster for each month, in black, red and blue. 7/6 each, at least. Send to Alison Waghorne, 9 Lyme Terrace, N.W.1.

Urgent. Help fold and dispatch FREEDOM every Thursday from 4 p.m. onwards. Tea served.

Workers' Mutual Aid pamphlet 1/- each from Freedom Press.

NCCL Move. The NCCL have moved from 4 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1, to 152 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1. New number GUL-liver 9497/8/9.

Will anyone who thinks police have exceeded their duty (like vindictively objecting to bail, etc.), please contact Jake at 3 Osborn Street, London, E.1. 'Black Pudding', Hornsey's Black Knight Group's Magazine, available from S. Kibble, 65 Cecil Park, N.8.

Visits Please! Three of five squatters remanded in custody do not have family in London, and would welcome visits. Brixton: Diarmuid Breatnach ('Buzz'); Ashford Remand Centre, Middx.: David Griffiths, Michael Ali. For rota please phone Sonia Markham at RENown 2014. (Letters also welcomed.)

British Museum. Comrades may like to know that FREEDOM, from 1886, can be read at the British Museum Newspaper Library, near Colindale Underground Station, open 10 to 5 Monday to Saturday. Apply beforehand for Reader's Ticket for research into old newspapers from the British Museum.

Contact wanted with anarchists in Mid-Wales; Eric S. Hetherington, Corbie Lynn, Llanwrtyd Wells, Breconshire. Bit inf. service 01-229 8219. Urgently requires more crash pads in and around London.

Schools Anarchist Group in Gloucestershire? Contact Kate & Joe, 3 Wither Lea, Leonard Stanly, nr. Stonehouse, GL10 3NS, Glos.

Demonstration on November 16 organised South African Solidarity Committee, 211 Ladbrooke Grove, W.10.

Badges? Contact Pendarves Workshop, 42 Pendarves Street, Beacon, Camborne; tel. Camborne 3061. Red and Black or plain Black, 2/6 each or 10 for 10/-.

Chairman of Dunlop Rubber Company, when he spoke at the annual conference of the Institute of Directors, the Government's job was to create the 'right climate for business'. He thought the present Government, however, was intervening too much, but forgot to mention that under the present climate his company had made record profits in the past few years and had forecast even better things in the future.

### CONCEDED DEFEAT

At the same conference, Barbara Castle finally conceded defeat of her plans to legislate on industrial relations when she admitted the obvious fact that 'whether we like it or not, real power resides in the workshop or on the office floor'. Her message to directors was that they should recognise this fact and management 'must find ways of reaching the man and woman on the shop floor as directly as possible. Management,' she said, 'must plan for this, train people for it, spend money on it, make it a major preoccupation of company policy if the new power on the shop floor is not to degenerate into anarchy.'

She said that this process must go even further and that, 'Information must be shared and decision-making must be shared if we are to ask ordinary men and women to share responsibility.' Barbara Castle is now putting the onus onto the employers to do something about unofficial strikes and to get them to create that feeling of belonging, of sharing in the company for which you work.

Obviously there is something in this, as Mr. Sieff, of Marks and Spencer, was able to point out. However, while it is probably better to work for Marks than for Woolworths, the relationship, or rather the lack of it, is nevertheless one and the same, the employer and the employed. Participation is only an extension of good public relations, but it brings workers no nearer to real control of the work place. Marks and Spencers might have '500 people trained in staff management whose primary responsibility was the well-being of the 30,000 staff', but the status of employer and employed remains and there can be no real relationship unless it is based on equality.

### POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY

The Times in its leaders has commented on Barbara Castle's speech, saying it was a pity that she did not point out that this shop-floor power also 'requires responsibility. It is obviously necessary that unions and employers should take account of what workers think, but they should not necessarily trundle to it. Equally, if workers will no longer delegate proper responsibility to their unions, they must exercise it themselves.'

However, employers do not take account of what workers think and it is only when these thoughts are transmitted into action that the employers take notice. They do not take the responsibility of employing workers unless it is profitable to do so and therefore why shouldn't the workers exercise their own power in order to achieve demands which they think are justified.

In common with Lord Stokes of British Leyland, The Times would like workers to delegate their responsibilities to their unions, but doing this means a loss of control of the situation. Both of them are obviously worried by the power that lies in the workshop. Lord Stokes, in his maiden speech in the House of Lords, claimed that 'managements liked to pay increases'. How-

ever, he thought 'it was becoming common practice for some people to withdraw their labour and to hold to ransom whole groups of people for the sake of piratical pay claims, which, if granted, could only lead to further leap-frogging demands'. But he said that these increases could be self-defeating 'if all they achieve is a rate of inflation and a loss of competitiveness'.

### BIGGER UNIONS?

Although British Leyland has to remain internationally competitive to survive, Lord Stokes is, of course, concerned with profit margins and rather than concede to the present demands of car workers at Standard-Triumph in Liverpool, or negotiate with the strike committee, he is willing to lose production worth £9 million. To negotiate would obviously mean a recognition of the power of the shop floor and of unofficial strikes and Lord Stokes does not want to do this.

After saying that larger companies were essential, he went on: 'We cannot run huge factories without big and efficient trade unions but they must reorganise themselves and review their structures and their multiplicity in order to maintain discipline over their members in order to honour bargains freely entered into. . . . A concentrated effort by managements, unions and the Government working together was necessary.'

This is, in essence, a corporate state with the role of the trade unions being to discipline members who step out of line, which they already do. With the huge companies which Lord Stokes thinks are so essential, it would obviously be in their interests to have firm control over their work force. Huge investments and expensive plant mean long-term planning, so it is essential that production is continuous and not constantly disrupted by unofficial stoppages.

As companies become larger, the sense of being a part of the company will decrease further, and what will become more prevalent will be the feeling that Barbara Castle has issued such grave warnings about. The worker will become an even smaller cog in the machine of capitalist production. The strikes, like those at Standard-Triumph, are just as much for a demand for control as for a wage increase. They are an expression of rebellion against the alien conditions under which the men work and a conscious act of control. They are a means of expressing what the workers feel and demand for themselves, instead of just leaving it to their trade union leaders. These are important expressions of self-confidence and of an increasing awareness and ability to run things for themselves.

P.T.

## Help 'Freedom'

Buy two papers  
this week

Leave one on a train

# Freedom For Workers' Control

NOVEMBER 15 1969 Vol 30 No 35

## WHOSE VIOLENCE?

JOHN DUFFUS was seated within his home watching his television when there was a knock on his door. He opened his front door of his house and a handful of pepper was thrown into his face. He states that he then heard someone say, 'That's the bastard' and he was pulled out of his doorway, beaten to the ground and that his right cheek was slashed. John Duffus now has five stitches in his right cheek and this unfortunate man is marked for life.

In a bare outline of this particular incident taken out of its social background one can rely on the moral nerve ends of a thousand readers quivering like the antennae of outraged mayflies. It was an ugly act that no one would wish to be associated with and the local press and the local Tory establishment understandably made the most use of its propaganda value. Yet this matter raises once more the question of the use and the abuse of violence.

John Duffus is the manager at the Birmingham Sound Reproductions works at East Kilbride in Scotland. For three months 800 men and women have been out on the stones to force the management to recognise their union, the Amalgamated Union of Engineering and Foundry Workers, and the management have handed down a point-blank refusal. Three months is a long time for 800 men and women to be out on strike over union recognition and matters were made worse by the stupid action of John Duffus, the manager, who chose to break the picket line by driving scab labour to and from the factory.

Any worker who has been involved in a protracted strike knows that the relationship between the management, the police and the strikers becomes more bitter each week for within one's own ranks the whines of the weak sisters become louder and louder, so for a manager to openly defy the picket line behind a guard of police, who must bear the brunt of the fist fights, simply to bring in a token force of scab labour, is to demand a showdown with the strikers. John Duffus chose to do this and the violence outside the factory gate mounted until the inevitable explosion occurred. John Duffus scab-carrying mini-bus is said to have knocked down a woman picket. This, for certain unknown people, was the Rubicon and they chose to cross it and in slashing the face of John Duffus in the doorway of his own home they forced into the area of public debate, not the police, not the management, not the strikers, but our attitude to violence.

Those among us who so willingly accept violence in Northern Ireland and give a smile of acceptance at the stupid posings of our own pathetic self-named Hell's Angels should now examine their attitude to industrial violence for it is not an amusing joke for an unoccupied weekend. It is always passively accepted that industrial violence shall be contained to that small area outside the locked gates of the factory and shall always be between the strikers and the police with the clerical staff grinning down from the high windows as the police beat joy into the skulls of the militant workers before hauling them off to the police wagon. And at the end of their workless day the manager and his staff will simper behind their guard of strong-arm police as they are escorted to the safety of the nearest bus stop, but for John Duffus this did not happen.

Men and women on strike cannot contract out merely by going home, for the misery and the uncertainty is with them 24 hours of their day and night and so it is now with the management of any factory in that area of Scotland. I am no pacifist yet I reject out of hand

the attack on John Duffus for it was an action that achieved nothing towards winning the workers' battle against factory management. I have no time for John Duffus for I think that any man who would risk personal injury for the sake of an employers' profit is a fool and if violence must be used against any individual then it must be shown to be the only and the final answer to a particular situation. All that has happened in East Kilbride is that John Duffus has a stronger police guard, that the local right-wing press are now having a ball and that local discontent against the strikers has been crystallised.

Every contract, written or unwritten, between a worker and an employer is by its very nature loaded against the worker for it follows that the man who is able to call the terms is the employer so, despite the moral highmindedness of the right-wing sewer press, no contract is binding on us for at its most brutal it is a slave contract that can never be freely negotiated.

From the moment that a strike is declared every employer automatically informs the police that he is in need of their protection and any worker who has been involved in a strike action knows that the arrival of even a single policeman means that official violence is ready to be used. It is always accepted that the role of the striking worker must be a passive one despite the fact that any employer can shift his outlet of goods to a friendly factory or distributor and can then afford to sit tight and, by sheer economic terror, smash the workers' strike action. It is at this point that decisions must be taken and no one, repeat no one, who is not involved can or should offer any Luddite advice unless they are prepared to put it into practice themselves yet, despite that, no one can deny that there is a place, a time and a need for industrial violence.

When a woman is found to have worked more than 21 hours non-stop and the firm, Bransbys of Estcourt Road, Great Yarmouth, walks out of court simply by paying a fine of £200 for at least ten offences of overworking employees, the law becomes a joke for that fine is now but a minute part of their wage bill. When this follows on from other cases that I have reported one must question what answer is there for the worker who fears to protest for fear of losing a job and so one gives a small and bitter amount of publicity to yet another case of a woman being culled into working 27½ hours in a period of 33½ hours for a pay packet at the end of the week of £16 16s., knowing that nothing more will be done about it and that the firm will shrug the matter off in the same way as a food manufacturer would shrug off a fine for having a dead mouse in a tin of corn beef.

John Duffus chose to drive a car of scab labour through a picket line and for that he has been marked for life and the Law fined the Bransbys' firm for making a woman work 21 hours non-stop and neither the Law nor the men who slashed John Duffus achieved anything. All too often we choose the wrong enemy and the wrong battlefield, for profits and the machines that create it, as the Luddites knew, are the sacred cows of the industrial overlords. The Irish Mollies in the starving coalmine areas of America and rackrented misery of Ireland found that, no matter how many agents and managers you killed off, more would follow on, bringing in their wake the Pinkertons and the Black and Tans for there is a place for violence but never individual violence and never against the individual.

LUMPENPROLETARIAT.