

anarchist fortnightly Freedom

Vol. 55 No. 5

5 MARCH 1994

FIFTY PENCE

"Anarchists have never claimed that liberty will bring perfection; they simply say that its results are vastly preferable to those that follow authority."

Benjamin Tucker

CAN CAPITALISM BE REFORMED? *anarchists say no!*



DON'T KILL HIM FOR GOD'S SAKE!

A cartoon from *The March to Death* by John Olday, published by Freedom Press in 1943

For the past month well-meaning and not-so-well-intentioned 'experts' – from the perennial octogenarian economist J.K. Galbraith to the ambitious politician who-didn't-make-it-to-the-leadership, Brian Gould, and in between a David Marquand (another politician turned academic) and writers galore: Len Doyal and Ian Gough, authors of *A Theory of Human Need* and this year's Deutscher Memorial lecturers at the LSE, and this writer's 'favourites' Colin Hines and Tim Lang, authors of *The New Protectionism* in a hard-hitting lecture to *The Guardian* (22nd Feb). Needless to say the 'serious' press is full of good advice on how to smooth the rough edges of the capitalist system and in the case of *The Guardian* Will Hutton does not spare his punches, and all are generous with advice to the Labour Party. Indeed, the editorial in *The Independent on Sunday* tells them point blank: "What Labour should do".

What none of them dares to admit is that capitalism is rotten to the core and whatever reforms can be introduced by a change of government are purely cosmetic in the long term. As we write these lines, the Labour Party has issued a 6,000 word programme (*Freedom* is not on the Party's mailing list!) described by Gordon Brown (*The Guardian*, 21st February), the Labour Party's Shadow Chancellor, as "a new public partnership initiative. Labour has transcended the sterile debate about public and private investment, promoted new ideas for financing public services and demonstrated the complete irrelevance of Tory privatisation dogma".

He goes on to explain that he, John Prescott and Robin Cook "will propose a new public-private task force to tackle the problems of our crumbling infrastructure" followed by all kinds of capitalist financial jargon. The New Idea is "the challenge of the
(continued on page 2)

GOD GOES PLC!

The Church of England is up against it both spiritually and financially – and in this ruthless capitalist world you can't have one without the other. There are no less than 11,500 places of worship and God knows how many shepherds for the (dwindling) flock. God is a hard taskmaster. It all has to be paid for not with 'pennies from heaven' but by the pennies of the congregation and the conscience money of the rich as their only passport to heaven (all that talk of 'woe unto the rich' while at the same time accepting the situation of 'the rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate' is all a bit confusing and so to make certain the rich can pay their way 'upstairs'). And they certainly have done their bit. The fact that the Church business managers have by their faulty property speculations lost no less than £800 million, and the Church is still in business, gives one some kind of idea of what is still in the kitty. But fancy God not giving them good advice on their speculations. Someone may remind us that Jesus Christ is said to have chased the moneylenders from the Temple, but even the Church must keep up with the times and the modern shepherd cannot be expected to survive just on prayers and wafers.

Frank Field MP, a practising Christian (who we were glad to see voted for the 16 year olds in the debate on homosexuals), in an open letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury (*The Independent*) declares that the Church of England:

"... now faces a crisis unlike anything since Cromwell's Protectorate ... The reckless use of the Church's historic assets may well lead to less generous increases in clergy pensions, cuts in the already modest clergy stipends, or the employment of fewer clergy."

And he goes on to give practical solutions to the present crisis. No, not more prayers – obviously prayers don't get you anywhere in the battle with Mammon.

(continued on page 2)

CAN CAPITALISM BE REFORMED?

(continued from page 1)

late '90s" and it is of "using resources currently under-used or stagnating" for "pressing needs - in infrastructure, housing and other areas such as the provision of childcare".

Nowhere in his long article does Mr Brown suggest how the unemployed - who we are glad to say are among his "unused resources" waiting for "a change to contribute their skills and energies" - are going to be put back to work under a Labour government when they haven't the courage to declare that if returned to office they would put into effect their stated belief in the "redistribution of wealth" - which can only be attempted in a capitalist society by, as we keep saying in *Freedom* and without apologies, "taxing the rich until the pips squeak" (obviously revolution is too much to suggest to the well-fed Labour front bench!)

Secondly they must stop talking about 'competition' and cultivate instead among the people of this country the idea that *cooperation* is not only more efficient in the long run but also produces a happier relaxed community. And this is a topical reflection seeing that the government has just upped the prescription charges. From an anarchist point of view surely as important as the current row about the new charges and of having doctors prescribe cheaper and less efficient drugs to keep down the drugs bill is *why* is it so huge, bearing in mind that the NHS prescriptions are only a small part of it. Alcohol, tobacco and all the 'illegal' drugs that are drunk, smoked, sniffed, etc., surely must represent Western nations' largest industry. Is it because we are so pressurised in the prosperous, competitive bugger-your-neighbour Western world that we need all these surrogates?

Thirdly it must be obvious to everybody other than the multinationals and transnationals (for whom it is very profitable) that there is nothing free about 'free trade' any more. The capitalist industrialists of all countries transfer their capital to where labour is cheapest. As Colin Hines and Tim Lang point out in their *Guardian* letter ('Levies on Lifestyles', 22nd February):

"In Germany, for example, a recent survey of 10,000 large and medium sized companies revealed that one in three of them will resite part of their operations to Asia and Eastern Europe in the next three years. The reasons given were to take advantage of cheaper labour costs and laxer environmental standards."

But Hines and Lang have to admit that so far as environmental levies are concerned:

"... attempts at meaningful raising of energy taxes in the European Union, the US and Japan have failed. All the industries concerned have had to do is say that this would threaten their international competitiveness, and the proposals are dropped."

In other words, they are agreeing with the anarchists that governments may *propose* but the multinational mafia *dispose!*

However, unlike the anarchists who have no faith either in multinationals nor 'good' governments, Hines and Lang have their capitalist alternative which sounds very plausible:

"Europe is a powerful and organised bloc that could break the power of the TNCs and international speculators by insisting to the former that 'if you don't site here, you don't sell here', and to the latter 'if you don't reinvest here, you don't profit here'. Once they are effectively stripped of the power to relocate, they are more under the control of host countries."

Such an example could spread like wildfire worldwide. It will provide all regions with the possibility of protecting and building up their own local economies. This will allow unemployment to be tackled at last.

The alternative is more of what we have at present - the further sacrificing of economies to the job destroying imperative of being ever more internationally competitive."

But they make one big assumption, and a big mistake: namely that governments can give orders to the multinationals, the TNCs (transnational corporations).

In a non-capitalist society it would be obvious to all concerned to *build up the local economies*, but under capitalism such common-sense arguments are not considered. After all, examples are topically at hand. The coal industry could well be completely destroyed in the next five years, though it is said that we have in this country reserves of coal for at least 200 years. Yet we are importing coal from Australia and Colombia, oil and gas offshore supplies have a limited life and the nuclear power programme is political rather than economic. We import large quantities of milling wheat (which could well be grown here if our prairie farmers were less greedy for yields and subsidies rather than the quality of cereals needed); we import large quantities of cheaper maize from the USA for animal compound feeds and either export the *subsidised* feed wheat at *subsidised* rates - failing that it goes into so-called intervention. A *thirty million ton mountain going rotten in the European Union!*

And let us not forget that at present *one million acres* of good arable land in this country is 'set aside' - that is taken out of cultivation - a weed bonanza, for which British farmers have received more than £800 million this year. 18% of arable land throughout the European Union has been set aside, by order. But even now there are not quotas limiting production of cereals. So our 'environmentally' conscious farmers simply put more fertilisers, more herbicides and pesticides on the rest of the land and the cereal mountains get bigger - as well as the farmers' bank balances, from the subsidies alone.

In their Deutscher lecture at the LSE Doyal and Gough contribute some interesting thoughts. For instance, when they criticise *orthodox* economists for usually equating "welfare with subjective wants, not objective needs". And they add:

"But the hard-pressed adjust their wants downwards to cope with life; the affluent have new wants created for them. Want satisfaction cannot provide a metric to compare the welfare of different societies."

Unfortunately they do not *condemn* capitalism and seek solutions elsewhere. Indeed they recognise that "mixed systems can operate with private or public ownership of the means of production" but add that "only capitalist forms are considered here" - that is in their lecture.

Their conclusions are that:

"Of course, things are grim in many parts of the real world today but it should not be an excuse for despair. Other countries have achieved unprecedented gains in need satisfaction. Our results are clear: it is those socially regulated forms of capitalism which do best."

This reluctance even to suggest that there could be an alternative to the capitalist system is again illustrated in David Marquand's feature article in *The Guardian* ('Two Heads and a Tale'). The subhead sums up his approach: "There is an alternative form of capitalism to the fast-buck opportunism which has produced the sleaze state - if only the Labour Party could see it". Goodness! The Labour Party is falling over backwards to scupper any suggestion that they are anything but supporters of the capitalist system. Why, they are almost embarrassed nowadays to be *Labour* - that is the *labouring*, the *working class* Party. But Marquand, like so many ex-Labour Party intellectuals (he is now director of the Political Economy Research Centre at the University of Sheffield), are more mixed up now than they were when they were in the Party. And no question of socialism. It's now not capitalism *tooth and claw* as they used to say but another 'collaborative' capitalism - which means that the poor can go on living alongside the rich and vice versa and everybody is happy. Well listen to this from Mr Marquand:

"... a different future, capable of mobilising a new constituency, is more difficult. For it will

carry conviction only if it emphasises two things.

One is that fast-buck capitalism is not, in fact, the only kind of capitalism; that there is also a different model, based on a synthesis of competition and collaboration which emphasises productive power in the long term rather than profit maximisation in the short; and that there is still time for Britain to opt for the collaborative model. The second is that opting for the collaborative model will involve a massive increase in investment of all sorts, and a corresponding cut in consumption."

Come off it Marquand! He says that there is a different model of capitalism "based on a synthesis of *competition and collaboration*". What a statement to make just when British Steel has been fined £24 million for having 'collaborated' with fifteen other steel 'competitors' in fixing prices well above what should have been the normal price of steel.

Of course capitalists 'collaborate' and 'compete'. They 'collaborate' when it's a *sellers* market, demand exceeds production, and they 'compete', cut each other's throats, when it is a *buyers* market - that is over-production.

Let some readers may imagine that anarchists are for 'all or nothing' (a few are) we conclude with some wise reflections by Errico Malatesta in 1924 in an article on *Electionist 'Anarchists'* where he pointed out that:

"Our good friends are wasting their time when they tell us that a little freedom is better than a brutal and unbridled tyranny; that a reasonable working day, a wage that allows people to live better than animals, and protection of women and children, are preferable to the exploitation of human labour to the point of human exhaustion; or that the state school, bad as it is, is always better, from the point of view of the child's moral development, than schools run by priests and monks ... for we are in complete agreement."

He went further and maintained that "even if some minor advances were the direct result of an electoral victory, anarchists should not flock to the polling booths or cease to preach their methods of struggle".

And he concluded: "Since no one can do everything in this world, one must choose one's own line of conduct".

GOD GOES PLC!

(continued from page 1)

The answer is a straightforward one: increase the flock. At present it would appear that Sunday attendance at the 11,500 'places of worship' is one million, which is about 87 souls per establishment. Like all averages, it doesn't make allowances for the cathedrals packed with the gentry in their Sunday finery for all to see, and the miserable parish church with its dozen regular OAPs taking their weekly airing and gossip. To increase the flock at a time when those heathens in the House of Commons are about to vote in favour of Sunday opening for supermarkets, street markets, corner shops, the lot, is a challenge to God which obviously cannot be taken lightly by his* earthly representatives. That he never manifests himself is explained by the God professionals who 'know' that God has given us *free will*. So he can't be blamed when his flock go to war, and lots of wars are of a religious nature (in spite of the fact that the belligerents all declare their

belief in the one and only God - as in Bosnia just now).

The answer was provided by the Church of England's communications committee when it announced that there was no ethical bar to advertising. Its chairman, while accepting that some of the faithful believed advertising was tantamount to 'supping with the devil', thought it could be a "creative, effective, appropriate, even amusing" means of putting God on the map. (Note the use of the word 'creative' by the canon. How dare he?)

The committee's 60-page report has the engaging title *Paying the Piper*. But who calls the tune?

The advertising boys are raring to go. For instance:

"Paul Slaymaker, managing director of DFSD Bozell, said: 'What is needed is a catchy phrase to carry the C of E into the third millennium and stem the loss of market share to other brands.'"

"It needs a slogan and I have no doubt what it should be: 'Back to Basics' - it's a useful phrase going begging at the moment, and we know that the Church of England can be more tolerant of naughty vicars than the Government can be about its naughty ministers'."

What a pathetic business it all is. When will mankind grow up? *Ni Dieu ni Maitre!*

* While recognising that 'God' may be 'he' or 'she', to save space we have used the 'he', but no disrespect to those who think God is *she*. We have no time for 'him' or 'her'. It's all in the head, comrade!



Hymns and hers ... Grey London Ltd promising the experience of a lifetime, every week

Our previous article under the same title dealt with Russia, and appeared on 8th January 1994.

Northern Minorities is the official term given to the 26 small tribal groups who live in the area of Northern Russia which stretches from the Bering Straits to the borders of Norway and Finland. Although the terrain is rough and the climate extremely cold, the region is rich in natural resources – timber, oil, coal and gold – and the great rivers are seen as a potential source of hydro-electricity. Thus the land of the Northern Minorities became the object of exploration by giant state companies. According to the 1989 Census of the USSR

Focus on the ex-USSR

Peoples of the Far North

there were 187,000 members of the Northern Minorities – only 0.06% of the then Soviet population. Almost everywhere they are in a small minority, outnumbered by Russian and other settlers. For many years they were hidden from the outside world. Today they are making contact with other indigenous peoples in Alaska, Canada and elsewhere.

For centuries the native peoples live in small-scale societies as hunters, reindeer

hunters and fishermen. Each group has its own language, customs and way of life. From the seventeenth century Russian explorers, traders and colonists entered their lands and gradually brought the area under Russian administration. Some of the native peoples suffered severely under Russian rule, others fled to the tundra, while a few tribes flourished.

Industrialisation

In 1929 a forced rapid industrialisation campaign began. Land, herds and property were collectivised (i.e. made state property). Those who dared protest were killed or deported to vast prison camps. The Communist Party under Stalin became all-powerful. The Tribal Soviets were abolished and the way was open to unfettered industrialisation.

Gradually, the real power leaked away from the local administration and state-owned companies or government ministries became the dominant power, taking over native land or resources. The lands and herds were collectivised. In 1934, while only 12% of the deer herds were in collective ownership, by 1934 it was 89%. Russian and other settlers poured into the region, in state farms and labour camps. The Northern Minorities became a powerless minority in their own land.

This process accelerated after 1955. First came the timber companies; in a few years the far east region lost 30% of its forests. Then came the oil and gas extraction companies.

Together they reduced once-forested areas full of fur animals to barren deserts.

Parallel to industrialisation was a process of Russification. The Soviet State promoted Russian languages and culture above all others. Native peoples were pressured to become as Russian as possible. In the Northern schools native language teaching was reduced and replaced by Russian and from an early age children were placed in boarding schools where they lost their language, culture and traditional skills.

Glasnost and beyond

After 1985 the situation slowly began to change as glasnost allowed once-defenceless peoples, such as the Northern Minorities, to find a voice. At first they took their cases to the administration and the courts but after these proved ineffective they turned to public protest and press campaigns. The Northern Minority languages were reinstated into the school curriculum. Independent native organisations were founded. The First Congress of Northern Minorities in 1990 demanded greater political autonomy, including the return of Tribal Soviets, guaranteed land rights in reserved territories and special measures to preserve their languages and cultures.

Like the other peoples of the ex-USSR, Northern Minorities were victims of totalitarian communism. As a small and fragile people, the pressures almost succeeded in destroying them. Today they face new pressures – to regain their traditional lands, to repair past damage, to cope with a free-market economy, to achieve human rights in the new Russian State. Their voices deserve to be heard in the international community.

Nikolai Vahhtin

from *Fourth World Review* nos 58 and 59, 1993

— THE CAUCASUS —

The Racist Face of the Yeltsin Regime

As one can easily imagine, whilst the police are on the lookout for 'potential criminals' in the street nothing has interfered with the calm business activities of the Russian Mafia. Unfortunately, Russian society seems happy to swallow the stories of criminal elements from the Caucasus, who are represented as those responsible for the ills of the population. Racist articles appear in the papers, with no protest from the Human Rights organisations, and the whole of society seems to use the term 'person of Caucasian nationality' which comes straight from racist language used by the police. It's the same old story of divide and rule.

Here are a few extracts from an article in the *Moscow Tribune* which, contrary to the attempts by the western media to convince their readers that Yeltsin is the strongest (and only) democrat there, demonstrate that the activities of the forces of law and order have nothing to do with real anti-crime activity.

A written order, demanding the ID control of people coming from the nations and republics of the Caucasus with a view to possible deportation, was sent to all officers concerned with movement (the GAI) stationed at control points around Moscow. The text orders the inspectors to stop vehicles driven by 'people of Caucasian nationality' and to verify their Moscow residence permits. If the drivers or passengers do not have such a permit, they are refused access to the town or, having had their vehicles searched, they are sent to the police station for identification and then deported. "The aim of these measures is to free the city of illegal residents, the majority of whom come from the Caucasus" declared Andrei Chtchavlev, spokesman for the GAI.

This order gives concrete proof that Muscovite police action during the current state of emergency is to target anyone with a skin dark enough to pass for a Caucasian, without looking for any criminal record. According to Chtchavlev, the order puts those from the Caucasus in one group because unlike other nationalities "they are easily identifiable by the physiological and facial appearance". He confirms that this crude policy was introduced to Moscow with the state of emergency, and he doubts that it will leave with it. "The majority of Caucasians are thieves and bandits, they commit two-thirds of crime in the city ... We have enough problems with our own criminals."

Anyone who cannot prove their right to be in Moscow is sent to their place of residence as indicated on their passport, explained Chtchavlev.

Igor Tsiroinikov, police spokesperson, said that on Tuesday 1,185 illegal residents had been expelled from Moscow during the previous 24 hours, and that more than 3,450 foreigners had been sent home since the start of the curfew. The police have made these

statements in the face of protestations from the Caucasian ambassadors.

Last week reports showed that members of OMON have beaten up Caucasian market traders and taken their money and personal effects.

Many Caucasian citizens in Moscow are refugees having fled from war zones in Georgia or Azerbaijan. Others work here and have nothing to do with the crime which is used to justify their expulsion.

Mikhail Tsovma (KAS International Co-ordinator)
from *Le Monde Liberaire*, 27th October 1993

Aral. The sea of Aral. An inland sea somewhere over there in the Asian part of the former Soviet Union.

Geography: some revision for the examinations season. Fourth biggest inland sea after the Caspian, Lake Superior and Lake Victoria, fed by two rivers, to the north the Syr Daria and to the south the Amour Daria. Recorded surface in 1960: 67,000 sq km and 41,000 sq km today. Now there's a funny thing. We've lost 26,000 sq km (roughly the size of Belgium). Where have they gone? The answer lies in the rest of this article.

History: more revision needed here. In the era of Lenin and the People's Father Stalin, socialism was 'Soviets + Electricity'. The Soviets in the early days had a libertarian aspect, given that the people seemed to be taking control of things themselves; electricity was equivalent to scientific progress, that is to say the future! Unfortunately the Soviets became Bureaucracy & Co., and as for electricity and more generally the industrialisation of the economy, well, we'll see where that has led us.

Having set the background I can get back to the subject in hand: the Aral Sea. 26,000 sq km has gone down the Swanee. Firstly we must note that this represents an average drop in sea level of 14 metres within the framework of a maximum depth of 40 metres. As one can imagine, the boats and harbours on the edges are a long way from the water now. So where's it all gone? Good question. Easy answer. The waters of the Syr Daria and the Amour Daria have been re-routed, for irrigation purposes, mainly via the Karakorum Canal, over some 1,300 km off the Turkmenistan desert to the Caspian.

Grosso modo the combined input is 56 sq km per annum, plus rain at 9 sq km which makes up for some 65 sq km of evaporation per annum.

But this canal, in the sand, with no concrete base, swallows up in a quarter of a century about 500 sq km (half that which has gone missing from the Aral Sea). This is titanic in

proportion. It represents about 500,000 billion litres. You can see the waste.

Certainly the irrigation plan has seen the introduction of some orchards, a bit of cotton, some rice ... but with watering techniques totally unsuited to a region that enjoys 26°C in the summer and -13°C in the winter, instead of an underground drip-feed system which would limit loss they water the surface, whose consumption is between 20% and 100% higher. As far as saline content is concerned, we've gone from 10 grams per litre of salt to 27 grams (to give a bench mark, we are talking of oceanic salt levels of about 36 grams per litre).

This engenders many consequences: no more fish. In 1957 we were talking of 48,000 tons of sturgeon, breams, carp ... today we are near the zero mark. The canning industry has fallen on hard times, so the Soviet bureaucrats came up with the splendid idea of bringing in frozen fish from the Arctic and Atlantic. Take a look at the map to see what a cracker that one was.

In the drier zones, the salt surfaces to be blown here and there by the winds ... a casino of some 75,000,000 tons of salted dust. On average we are talking levels of some 5kg per hectare on the edges of the Aral Sea.

The underground water level within a 170km circumference has dropped down 5 metres. Wells and streams have dried up. There is no drinking water. On the other hand there has been a tripling of disease. Infant mortality is 100 in every 1,000 ... it's because the water, apart from the mineral salts, is overloaded with so many shitty chemicals.

And they didn't take any short cuts with the collective and Soviet cotton farms. 100,000 tons of pesticides, in addition to defoliants (as in Vietnam) dispersed into nature.

Apart from the fish, other animals have come

a cropper. Out of the 173 species that were living in the delta, 38 are left.

As for vegetation, there lies another story. Pasture zones have gone down by 80% and those that remain give a severely diminished return.

And to finish on a more Kafkaesque note, a paper pulping factory has been relocated to Siberia.

All this affects the 1.5 million inhabitants of 55 towns and villages. There's been some chat about it on the box, but better information is now coming out of the UNESCO organisation, 'Man and Biosphere' which went over there to take a look around at the invitation of the Kazakhstan Republic which was beginning to shit itself about the situation, as you would think it might.

It amounts to the horror of pure statism. It could well be what you might call an ecological disaster of the first order. If the pace continues we could well only see some 12,000 to 15,000 sq km of water in ten years time.

In the area of ecology state communism fares no better, indeed maybe worse, than capitalism. However, the former Soviet Union can boast some expert climatologists and ecologists as, for example, Mikhail Ivanovitch Boudyko who published in 1980 a fascinating book entitled *Global Ecology*. At the end of the book we read: "In order to prevent undesirable changes in the planetary ecological processes unfavourable to man, it is necessary to develop effective international co-operation. The global ecological system is the lifeline of humanity. It should be protected from any irresponsible action capable of destroying the environment."

We must work in this direction to prevent an irreversible degeneration of our planet.

Jean-Claude Babois

Le Monde Liberaire, 23rd June 1993

— KAZAKHSTAN —

Death of the Aral Sea

— ANARCHIST NOTEBOOK —

Streets of Childhood

I was reminiscing with a veteran anarchist, and he was talking with great animation about his recollections of childhood in Central London in the 1920s. It was evident that while rather strictly reared, he enjoyed a freedom of the street which is quite unimaginable today. And not only that. The street scene itself was full of interest and stimulation. I was reminded of my encounter with a witness from an earlier generation who was granted the freedom of the street at an even younger age. His name was Albert Eide Parr, a Norwegian New Yorker.

I should explain that I used to have a rather spurious reputation as an authority on urban childhood. This arose by chance. In the early 1970s I wrote, with Anthony Fyson, a book called *Streetwork: the exploding school*, addressed to teachers. At that time the climate of primary and secondary education was happier, much less constrained and far more optimistic than it is today. Teachers felt encouraged to experiment, and we were exploring the potentialities and the methods for the use of the urban environment as a resource for schools. Those were the expansive days when in several North American cities projects like the Parkway Project in Philadelphia, Metro High School in Chicago and Métro Éducation Montréal, with the support of their local education authorities, sought to use the facilities that the city itself provided, rather than a school building, as the physical equipment for secondary education.

At the same time I edited a book on *Vandalism*, an uneasy marriage of the sociological and architectural approaches towards the attrition of the environment. Its conclusion, in the early 1970s, was bleak, for what I wrote was:

"Our conventional and all too plausible picture of the immediate future is that it will be like today only more so: a mobile urban mass society, heavily dependent on the motor car in whose interests huge areas of the inner city are cut up by motorways with acres of sterilised no-man's-land, taken up by traffic intersections, crossed by rat-runs for the remaining pedestrians. The affluent meritocracy commutes to the business district or lives in the expensively renovated inner suburbs, the skilled and semi-skilled workers employed by international companies live in vast estates on the outskirts or in the tower blocks left over from the 1960s, while the permanently unemployed and the fringe drop-outs for whom idleness is less degrading than work, inhabit the transitional districts of run-down municipal or privately-rented housing. Can we seriously imagine that such an environment will be less prone to vandalism than the one we inhabit today? Or that some combination of education, exhortation and more efficient policing will reduce its extent? What is more likely is that the litter-strewn, windswept public spaces of the future metropolis will be more unkempt, battered and bedraggled because of the high cost and low prestige of maintenance work (in spite of unemployment) and that the spin-off of consumer technology will provide facilities for more sophisticated forms of vandalism."

Even in formulating this kind of sober warning, what I had failed to anticipate was that in the next decade, instead of watching public policies which alleviated the degraded surroundings of urban childhood and adolescence, we were to witness a whole series of decisions by central government that seemed calculated to make matters worse, not least by obliging local authorities to curtail their support for a variety of local and voluntary ventures intended to make towns and cities accessible to their young inhabitants. But as a result of that book the same publisher asked me to write another, about the relationship between children and the environment, asking whether something had been lost in that relationship, and speculating about the ways in which the link between city and child could become more fruitful and enjoyable for both the child and the city.

I saw the book that resulted as an attempt to convey the intensity, variety and ingenuity of the experience of urban childhood: a celebration of resourcefulness. But that wasn't always how its readers saw it.



My exploration of the interaction between children and the built environment was gratifyingly well-received, and of course I got recruited to discuss it at conferences of teachers and social workers. There I found that the book was seen as one more catalogue of urban deprivations. And indeed, I often met people who assumed that it was the city, the 'concrete jungle' as they frequently called it, that was responsible for the curtailment of childhood experience, but that I ignored the hidden deprivations of their assumed opposite, rural life. So I was obliged to undertake yet another book, trying to get beyond the sentimental mythology that surrounds our approach to the experience of childhood in the country. Now I found in several countries, while addressing teachers and students on the environment as a learning experience, that they would dig into their bags and briefcases and produce a reprint or translation of an article by Albert Eide Parr about 'The Happy Habitat'. Dr Parr was the former director of the American Museum of Natural History who, in his retirement, became a campaigner for a more diversified and interesting street scene than the one we know, which is a commercial townscape redeveloped for the benefit of the out-of-town, male, middle-aged and middle-class motorist. He did in his nineties in 1991. The passage that we all remembered was his account of the environmental diversity of a small Norwegian port, Stavanger, in his childhood:

"Not as a chore, but as an eagerly desired pleasure, I was often entrusted with the task of buying fish and bringing it home alone. This involved the following: walking to the station in five to ten minutes; buying a ticket; watching train with coal-burning steam locomotive pull in; boarding train; riding across long bridge over shallows separating small-boat harbour (on the right) from ship's harbour (on the left), including small naval base with torpedo boats; continuing through a tunnel; leaving train at terminal, sometimes dawdling to look at railroad equipment; walking by and sometimes entering fisheries museum; passing central town park where military band played during midday break; strolling by central shopping and business district, or, alternatively passing fire station with horses at ease under suspended harnesses, ready to go, and continuing past centuries-old town hall and other ancient buildings; exploration of fish market and fishing fleet; selection of fish; haggling about price; purchase and return home."

The important thing about his story is that Parr was four years old at the time. We all seized upon this tale as anecdotal evidence of the fact that the deformation of cities and towns to

meet the demands of the motorist has *stolen* childhood experience from every subsequent generation of children. The most recent reproduction I have seen of Parr's recollection was in a journal that reprinted it without comment juxtaposed with a quotation from a book of rhyming survival tips for the '90s child: "Never play with footballs in the middle of the street / Don't take anything from strangers - money, games or sweets" (*The Streetwise Kid*, 1992). The item was headed "Progress of Enclosure", linking the historic private sequestration of common ground with the situation of the contemporary child with considerably less unaccompanied access to public space in today's environment than was taken for granted by earlier generations.

This deferment of independent access to anywhere outside the home was illustrated by my conversation with the veteran anarchist, but can be seen in conversation with different generations of any family. Ask a grandparent, a parent or a child, the age at which they were first allowed to play in the street, go on an errand, or to the park to ride their bicycles unaccompanied, and the age of independence gets higher in every generation. An attempt was made to evaluate this in 1971, with a comparison in 1990 in five areas of England, replicated by a study in West German schools. The researcher, Mayer Hillman, explained the work in terms of the idea that 'universal' car ownership was a guarantee of personal mobility:

"In a statement about the role of the car in today's society, travel was described by Paul Channon, a former Transport Secretary, as 'a barometer of personal independence'. Measured by this barometer, there has been a marked improvement in personal independence over the last two decades for those adults who have acquired cars. What happens if children's personal independence is measured on this barometer? The study ... approached this issue through the medium of perceptions of safety as reflected in parental regulation of their children's freedom to get around on their own, and the resulting effect both on children's and parent's patterns of activity. The research was given a temporal dimension by focusing on changes during the two decades in the six 'licences' given to children by their parents - to cross roads, use buses, go to school and other places on their own, to cycle on the public highway, and to go out after dark."

The conclusions that these surveys reported were that 9½ year olds in 1990 had typically the same freedom of movement that 7 year olds did in 1971. And the authors of the survey report noted that this change had happened "largely ... unremarked and unresisted" and that "children have lost out ... without society apparently noticing." Their findings are that:

"Whereas nearly three quarters of the children in 1971 were allowed to cross roads on their own, by 1990 the proportion had fallen to a half. There was an even more marked decline in the proportion allowed to use buses on their own: half were allowed to do so in 1971 in contrast to only one in seven in 1990. In comparing the proportion of children allowed to cycle on the roads, it should be noted that whereas two-thirds owned a bicycle in 1971 ownership had increased to nine in ten by 1990. However, two-thirds of the cycle owners in 1971 said that they were allowed to use them on the roads; by 1990 this proportion had fallen to only a quarter. Perhaps, most disturbingly, very few children are allowed out after dark by their parents - effectively a curfew for them. Younger children are most affected, with the difference, as would be expected, declining with age: few 11 or 12 year olds now or indeed then would accept such restrictions on their independence. Although more journeys are made for social and recreational purposes than for school, only about half of the 7 to 10 year olds who were allowed to go to these places on their own in 1971 were allowed to do so in 1990. And no parents of the 7 year olds allowed their children to go out alone after dark, a restriction that is removed only for six per cent of the 11 year olds."

It was found that the comparable German children had much greater freedom and that the gender distinctions that in England allowed far more independence to boys than to girls were far less evident in Germany, apart from that of being allowed out after dark. Parents in England tended to give the unreliability of their children or the fear of their being assaulted or molested by an adult as the reason for restriction of their independent mobility, but traffic dangers were more frequently cited by the German parents. Some kind of balance has to be struck. But does it lie in yet more restriction of children's freedom of movement, or in 'taming' traffic? Mayer Hillman tentatively asks a key question, which is whether "the damaging outcomes of the growing parental restrictions on children revealed in our surveys may be associated with some of the anti-social behaviour observed among the current generation of teenagers?"

Earlier investigators of the experience of childhood, John and Elizabeth Newson, found that they got an instant response to the very simple question "Would you call him/her an indoor or an outdoor child?" Mothers responded with answers that revealed both class and sex differences. Today it is almost taken for granted that to have an outdoor child means endless worry and trouble. The outdoor child is up to no good. The indoor child takes advantage of the same home-centred lifestyle enjoyed by adults: central heating, television with an infinite choice of channels or videos, computers and computer games. Our assumption of course is that the child has access to all these alternatives to traditional experiences in a wider environment, or will find them in the homes of more affluent friends.

But if we are attempting to evaluate the opportunities for childhoods in late twentieth century Britain we are bound to conclude that something precious has been lost in the range of environmental experiences open to children. The press reported in 1993 on the case of a 14 year old with 38 convictions for burglary who had absconded for the 36th time from a children's home. He was nicknamed Rat Boy, because he had developed the habit, like an urban jungle child, of making a lair for himself in the heating ducts of high buildings. Somehow adult choices have created a world in which we only trust the indoor child, safely at home with all that consumer software. The outdoor child is automatically suspect, often for very good reason. Is that the children's fault, or ours?

Colin Ward

Send for a free list of our publications
Freedom Press
 84b Whitechapel High Street
 London E1 7QX

A couple of days after refusing to ban tobacco advertising on the grounds of individual freedom the government, without apparent irony, announced a new crackdown on soft drugs. Apparently it is all right to give yourself lung cancer, as long as you pay tax on its cause, but smoking an untaxed substance with known medical virtues must incur severer penalties. It is hard to come to terms with the mind-set of people so concerned with penalising victimless crimes. The same mob plays down the Scott Enquiry revelations, explains away the rising numbers of homeless, discounts the terrifying increase in racial attacks, and ignores the rising mortality rates among the lower income groups. Moral fastidiousness is hardly the most characteristic attribute of any government, let alone one whose flagships were Westminster and Wandsworth Councils and which is still facing the Pergau Dam and Matrix Churchill affairs. Nevertheless Michael Howard (Soapy Michael as he's known in our house) persists in defending a course that has managed to bring papers, police and magistrates, as well as the usual suspects, out against him.

On the surface there appears to be a curious inability to learn from other places and times. In the twenties it was predictable that the enactment of Prohibition would hand the American liquor trade over to organised crime. Today a casual glance at the street crime and murder rates of American big cities shows that the liquor laws gave the rackets a hold on American society from which it never recovered. The man in charge of Prohibition was, after repeal, put in charge of marihuana control. Some people just like banning things. There were predictably disastrous results. A weed that once grew wild over large areas of America came under gang control. Market forces and a social association with allegedly more dangerous substances did the rest. Throughout there was a tendency to transfer blame by attributing socially created problems to chemical causation. Thus alcohol, and soft and hard drugs have all been held at times to be the causes of poverty, ill health, delinquency and general social degradation. Most of these arguments confused cause and effect and failed to distinguish the effects of the drug from the effects of operating in an illegal market.

One might have expected that Britain would learn some lessons from this but having seen the Great American Disaster we seemed determined to enact the same catastrophe. In the '50s there were a few dopey junkies whose

Sideshowes and Centralism – Soapy Mick's solution?

needs were met by NHS prescriptions. There was no black market to speak of, no real problem. A panic followed the revelation that some doctors appeared to be over prescribing, the Brain Committee came up with the idea of restricting supply to specialist centres, and the villains moved into the gap. Then in the late 1970s the Government ordered the Drug Dependency Units to cut back on supplies to addicts. Once there was a market situation addiction problems became exponential just as criminologists, sociologists and medical workers had predicted. The crime rate took off as well of course. Now fifty per cent (that's right *one half*) of all burglaries, muggings and similar are committed by junkies to feed their habit. The privatisation of banned drug supply meant that all of us, not just users ended up paying a lot more. How much better if things been left as they were. Now something that was not a problem for the majority of the population has become an epidemic. Michael Howard must know this. So why is he persisting?

Another diversion occurred in the proposals over so called 'computer porn' reaching the House of Commons. This too has serious implications. If these proposals go through then simple suspicion will allow a computer to be impounded until cleared of 'pornographic content'. This creates considerable scope for ruining people whose livelihood depends on access to a computer. Small firms will be particularly vulnerable. So will small dissenting groups like Freedom Press, or any minority the authorities wish to hassle. Every PC owner could be 'done for suss'. If innocent the hardware might be returned with apologies for inconvenience but, one suspects, without compensation for the losses incurred. During Bruiser Baker's spell at the Home Office a study it commissioned on the social effects of pornography found the evidence inadequate as a guide to policy makers. (Unless we count the interesting suggestion that people with sexual problems were exposed to pornography *later* in life.) Anyhow there are massive technical problems involved in using computers and bulletin boards for graphic erotica – its infinitely cheaper to look at the newsagent's top shelf.

The real target I suggested in *Freedom* last year ('Bulletins of Freedom', 24th July 1993)

is the BBS and the free access to information it represents. Battles that were won over books now have to be fought again over computers. A failure to win these battles will add another weapon to the authorities' perpetual attempts to cut down on freedom and dissent. However that is probably a side effect, a bonus for the government.

Again we have to ask the reason for this curious sideshow at this time? I cannot remember anything quite like the chorus of disapproval that has greeted Michael Howard's two "law 'n' order" bills, particularly the attack by Conservative peers on the proposed enlargement of the Home Secretary's powers. Almost as extraordinary was the attack by Drug Squad officers, magistrates and others on the projected five-fold increase in drug fines. Those of us who think it important to oppose repressive legislation and concentration of power at the centre found we had some of the most unlikely allies of our lives during the past month.

The reasons go deeper than the need for what Hugo Young has termed 'the smack of firm unreason' so beloved by party conferences. The increase in crime is extraordinary and is affecting us all. The causes are obvious – increasing income inequality, the deliberate engineering of a new poverty, and most importantly the withdrawal of public provision of basic support and services. This support in the post-war years prevented demand from fluctuating as wildly as it might have done. It minimised structural unemployment and kept the victims of capitalist organisation from turning to thieving as I was forced to do in the mid '80s. The withdrawal of this support comes just when the demand for a mobile labour force has weakened the support that used to be given by local communities. It has weakened it at just the time that economic insecurities and growing deprivation have made such support as important as it was in the '30s.

The problem is that Britain and America have been moving from societies with market economies, where private gain was the basis of economic organisation, to market societies where all areas of social life are increasingly mediated by the the necessity for personal gain. Market capitalism was patchy, predatory, and given to violent fluctuations. Because it was geared to subjective wants rather than objective needs it caused appalling suffering. As a method creating and distributing goods, albeit as a side effect of the production of profit, it worked after a fashion. It worked best when its operations were circumscribed, when society through one means or another developed regulatory mechanisms to cope with its failures and victims.*

In the nineteenth and early twentieth century Britain these were the working class mutual aid organisations that Colin Ward rightly celebrates. Unfortunately they too were patchy and left large numbers of the population isolated. As a result they were easily displaced or superseded in the post-war period, when state provision was thought to be the answer to social inequalities. Once they were gone a change of government policy left the ordinary person helpless. People have become prey to permanent insecurity as the casual labour once deplored in the docks has become the norm for much larger sections of society. Meanwhile the market society magnifies status differences and consumption levels, and strips away jobs, security and the informal support of the community. It deliberately creates the very poverty and hopelessness from which the Victorians tried to escape.

At the beginning I noted governments tended to confuse the chemical effects of

drugs with the social evils caused by their being part of the free market. This indicated the real reason behind Howard's two "law 'n' order" bills with their curiously misplaced attacks on local autonomy and computer freedom, their centralisation of police power, their demonisation of marihuana. Faced with a real collapse of the normative order, with the disintegration of society in the face of an economic and social privation that they created, the government can only try and hold the lid on by a combination of authoritarian centralism, displacement scapegoating and sideshows. It is ignoring the evidence about the effects of its economic and social policies the way previous governments ignored the evidence on drugs. The growth of crime that so concerns them is a product of the move to a totally market society. It is the market society that needs to be changed. This can be done, as in the past, by awareness and popular pressure. Market capitalism may or may not have been an inevitable historical development. Our market society though is the result of ideological fixation in Britain and America. It can be changed by popular pressure if enough of us want it. We must not be sidetracked by Soapy Michael's inept circuses.

John Pilgrim

Beer and Anarchy

The year was 1973 and the place was a hotel bar on the Isle of Man. The friendly barman gave this young Canadian his first taste of 'real ale'. Over the course of several nights he led me through them all, bitters, porters, stouts, ales and barley wine. I pointed to a Harp Lager. He winced and shouted "You don't want that, it's nothing bur angel's water!"

Upon returning to the Great White North with a new and permanent addiction, I began a desperate search for beer. First uncovered was a domestic made-under-licence Guinness – which tasted like charcoal, nothing like the creamy black stuff I'd knocked back in the UK. The only alternative was to buy the few imported beers stocked in the liquor store, chiefly Newcastle Brown at three dollars a bottle, high-priced with import duty as protection for the monopolists' pig-swirl.

In the 1980s the beer situation began to change. Many people took up homebrewing and it was possible to turn out some reasonable bitter. CAMRA groups helped encourage the first micro-breweries to develop. A couple of homebrewers set up an illicit underground pub in their home and we were soon consuming and comparing brews on Sunday afternoons. More and more people began enjoying the taste of genuine beer and soon a number of establishments were offering micro-brewery bitter on tap. As well, the liquor outlets started stocking a broad range of imports.

Today, there are scores of micro-breweries and in Quebec the products have fascinating names: 'Massawhippi' (named after the lake next to the brewery), 'Maudit' (damned with a devil on the label, and 'Fin du Monde' (end of the world). Even the big monopolies have entered the fray, producing a porter and a decent red beer called appropriately enough 'Rouge'. It's a rare pub that doesn't have at least one real ale on tap. True enough, imports and micros account for less than 5% of total beer sales, but still this is a major step forward in a country where the overwhelming majority of people once regarded a dark ale with the fear that the uneducated have for 'foreign' foods. Beer and anarchy? This little story shows that by simply changing one's lifestyle and doing just a bit of organising, people can successfully fight powerful monopolies. What's more, you can have a lot of fun while you are doing it.

Larry Gambone

Where there's smoke, there's fire

As a non-smoker I certainly didn't complain when increased taxes drove the price of a packet of cigarettes to six dollars. If the silly bastards want to kill themselves, let 'em pay enough to offset the medical costs when croaking of lung cancer. But something unusual happened. A vast neighbourhood network involving tens of thousands of people developed around the sale of illegal cigarettes smuggled in from the United States via the Mohawk territories. Soon three-quarters of the 'coffin nails' consumed in Quebec originated in this manner. The governments, both federal and provincial, deprived of a major tax source, started running frantically in all directions and muttered about 'the growing lack of respect for law and authority'. The final straw for our politicians came when the small shop owners, angry at being deprived of such a lucrative business, began to openly sell contraband fags in a campaign of civil disobedience. At this point the state gave in and cut the tax to the point that illegal and legal sell roughly at par.

The Mohawks and organised crime are the losers in this deal, along with government which still isn't going to get much tax money out of cigarettes. Worst of all, however, is that

this tax cut is a national health disaster for people will now smoke more. The already over-burdened medicare system will feel the effects of this for decades. But among all this gloom is something of interest to libertarians. Smoking cigarettes is now largely the preserve of the poor and the badly educated, who are also the most conservative sector of the population and the least likely to mobilise around issues. But there they were, up on their feet, self-organised and engaged in a form of civil disobedience. Furthermore, they managed to defeat the government, something that isn't done every day.

Having done this once, what might they do next? The Great Cigarette Revolt of 1994, for all the bad things about it, shows that ordinary people engaged in mass action can bring about changes in government policies. Seems there are now many complaints about the high taxes on booze and more than a few ciggie smugglers were bringing bottles back with them. Yeah, I'm tired of paying an arm and a leg for single malt ... think I could get behind this one ...

Larry Gambone

* Doyal and Gough, 1991, *A Theory of Human Need*, Macmillan

Conference Report

The East Midlands Anarchist Conference, held on 19th February at Derby, saw 30 people in attendance from towns and cities in the area including Belper, Burton, Derby, Leicester, Loughborough, Manchester, Nottingham, Sheffield and Swadlincote.

In the morning we started with a brief introductory session after which the conference divided into workshop groups to discuss:

- Community resistance
- Anarchist relations with the 'left', trade unions and the labour movement
- Racism and fascism
- Production of a bulletin

Comrades from Nottingham's 'Flux' collective provided a bookstall with the cooperation of Mushroom Books. 'Mick' from Loughborough provided carrot and coriander soup, cheese and bread for all present during the lunch break.

The afternoon session saw reports back from the various workshops of the morning and there was an interesting debate and exchange of views. Many new contacts were made between those present.

Practical decisions were made to hold further meetings/conferences in the area. Leicester Anarchists are arranging a conference for the weekend of 2nd-3rd April at the Magazine Pub, Newarke Street, Leicester. Also it was decided to produce a monthly bulletin for anarchists in the Midlands to exchange ideas and information - this will be available from March '94 onwards. Any information, short articles, news, details of events, etc., should be sent to J. Simcock, c/o The Rainbow Centre, 88 Abbey Street, Derby, by Saturday 19th March. Finally we would like to thank 'Cliff' and The Rainbow Centre for the use of their premises.

JPS

MacLibel case postponed again

As older readers know well, the MacDonalds hamburger chain claim that some leaflets published years ago are defamatory, and are suing two of the publishers, our comrades Dave Morris and Helen Steel, for libel. Writs were issued nearly three years ago,

Dave and Helen, who have no money, will defend the case themselves and have been ready for years. MacDonalds are employing a high-powered legal team who have delayed the case. Eventually the case was booked for Monday 28th February. Dave and Helen's supporters spent the last of their funds on informing people of the date (including leafletting the customers in a number of MacDonald's shops). People turned up at the law courts in the Strand expecting the beginning of the case.

But on 16th February, the judge had granted the plaintiffs a postponement, on the plea that they had served another 48 - another forty-eight - witness statements. The hearing is expected to last several months.

The new starting date is 18th April.

By the time you read these words you will have surely seen the video, read the story in the newspapers and heard all about it through the grapevine.

The 'state' of Wandstonia is different in nature to all other states we, as anarchists, have consistently opposed. In the light of the nature of this particular emergent state is this something we can, or have to, come to terms with?

Many people regard the existence of Wandstonia as an incredible occurrence, and before 16th February with its tremendous impact, something in the nature of a fantasy.

However, Wandstonia has been *de facto* recognised by the fifth estate (by the main newspapers and the main television stations) so it is by no means a finished issue.

Whatever the outcome, the recognition, however belated, of the sovereignty of Wandstonia has brought this anarchist-inspired 'state' very much into the political foreground.

Politically, this has come at the worst time for the beleaguered Conservative 'government' in the midst of arms sales scandals currently under investigation.

It is openly said that the M11 roadway contract was given to the builders after a £100,000 donation to Conservative Party funds. No government in living memory has been hanging on, without an ounce of support in the country, for so long. But whether the government is now forced to resign is not so important to us as the consideration, which is no longer remote, of a complete change in political structures, of which this Wandstonian type of anarchist thinking is one

Through the anarchist press

of the examples.

We must not forget also that it was another extremely serious, effective, but brilliantly good humoured anarchist group, the working Class War, which brought down the previous government, although it also enabled a *coup* to take place in true Banana Republic style, which secured the sneaky premiership of the present prime minister who is still hanging on to office. That the banana skin on which the Conservative adventurers should slip was to be seven well-designed houses with gardens for family occupation in Wanstead, was difficult to foresee.

From now on events will escalate at a rapid pace, the M11 Link Campaign has announced 'operation roadblock' starting 15th March (081-530 5709).

The only reason that the Ministry of Transport was able to mount this operation was because a vast amount of money was spent on procuring labour. It was admitted by the 'government' side that costs of £200,000 were incurred *on the day alone* on payments to 800 police, 200 riot police, 700 reserves, plus the bailiffs and their mechanical equipment.

That anarchist economics *works* was actively demonstrated once again. The

defenders were all sovereign individuals who contributed their own sovereigns and from the anarchist side of the operation cost nothing. That is the simple fact of anarchist economics: nobody, not the 300 occupiers, not the 200 sympathisers, were there because of 'payment'. No money would have been adequate 'payment' for this resistance. As Aeschylus put it in his play for the Persians, *nun uper panton agon*, "the fight is now for your all".

The confrontation was deadly. Everybody there hated the futility of it all. But the drama had to be enacted, *nobody was willing to stop this farce of communal ineptitude*.

Silver gave the commands which only Gold could countermand. No, this is not a line of a poem but the code-names which the police used on the day to disguise the name of their commanders.

Talking of videos it would be good to know if anybody has compiled a list of films which document anarchist activities. The excellent 'Dare to Dream' by Marianne Jenkins comes to mind. It would be good to refresh memories of glorious doings in the past. I personally was reminded of Wanstead's proximity to Ilford where there was a lot of squatting activity in the '60s with ample television coverage, but without success. I remember a brilliant documentary by Monica Foot on a commercial channel which lingered on a *Freedom* headline: 'Defend the Homeless'!

John Rety

Freedom of speech is reduced even further in Britain

The new Criminal Justice Bill currently passing through parliament has within it a number of clauses that are intended to criminalise acts that are currently more social and civil law. These are the criminalising of hunt saboteurs for trespassing on land and preventing a 'lawful' activity, the laws preventing travellers from parking anywhere and the bureaucrats obligation to provide sites for travellers and making squatting criminal rather than a civil offence.

It is bad enough that the government feels obliged to pass laws that affect a minority group who have chosen to, or in the case of squatters have no choice, but to act accordingly for whatever reason, and demonstrate their feelings.

However there are wider implications, especially regarding the clause affecting hunt saboteurs. Remember the clause suggests it will be a criminal offence to trespass on another's land and prevent a lawful activity. This could be and would be used to cover a wide range of scenarios from pickets to public demonstrations and actions. In effect it will add to the enormous range of laws already suffocating freedom of speech, assembly and choice, as well as uphold the authority of those in power and its servants the police and legal system.

These clauses have echoes of Nazi Germany and destroy any myth about democracy and freedom being one and the same thing. As anarchists we are probably already aware of this, but for those who aren't and reading this paper for the first time, take note.

We have already seen this government's lies and

propaganda machine convince the population that criminals are not human beings trying to survive in the wacky world of capitalism. This law will fuel this illusion and add to it the political act of stopping hunting, an act in itself both immoral and cruel. Most hunt saboteurs are there because of their beliefs, and making them criminal again has echoes of fascism.

In addition the laws outlawing travellers and squatters is both immoral and disgusting. For the homeless, squatting is often a means to an end to avoid the choice of the streets. Their predicament having been created by a housing policy that is designed to favour wealth rather than seeing housing as a social need.

Unless people wake up and take collective action against any government, those in power will continue to behave as they do, passing laws and rules to suit their whims and undermining people's freedoms. Any attempt at protest will become more difficult as government continues to treat people as unable to think and act for themselves and show their dissatisfaction for the current system that oppresses rather than liberates. We don't need to demonstrate against the BNP and other extreme authoritarian groups, when those in power are already behaving in a manner similar to those groups.

How long must we wait for people to reject the system as it exists. It won't be long before papers like *Freedom* are seen as a threat to those in power, but by then there won't be anybody left to protest.

Chris Platts

New titles available soon

AGAINST POWER AND DEATH The Anarchist Articles and Pamphlets of Alex Comfort

edited and with an introduction by David Goodway

Articles published between 1943 and 1986 in the journals *War Commentary*, *Freedom*, *Now*, *Peace News* and elsewhere, together with the pamphlet *Peace and Disobedience* (1946).

168 pages ISBN 0 900384 71 9 £5.00

HERBERT READ A One-Man Manifesto and other writings for Freedom Press

edited and with an introduction by David Goodway

The complete texts of all the articles, broadcasts, reviews, poems and speeches of Herbert Read published in the anarchist journal *Spain & the World* and its successors *Revolt!*, *War Commentary* and *Freedom*, from 1938 to 1953, together with the pamphlets *The Education of Free Men* (1944) and *Art and the Evolution of Man* (1951).

208 pages ISBN 0 900384 72 7 £6.00

FREEDOM PRESS

84b Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX





There has been some discussion in *Freedom* about 'gender'. When I went to school I learnt that people had a sex (male or female) and parts of speech had a gender (masculine, feminine or neuter). The learning of French was made difficult because although most words referring to male people and animals were of the masculine gender, and female people and animals generally took the feminine gender, this was not always the case: a bird was *le oiseau* even though she laid eggs, and a male frog, however often he might a-wooing go, was *la grenouille*. When I came to learn German I had to bother about the neuter gender. However female a maiden was, she had to be referred to as neuter – *das Mädchen*.

We are now faced with a form of Newspeak, which emanates from America, which tries to avoid the big, bad word *sex* by calling it 'gender'. It will be remembered that in Orwell's book *Nineteen-eighty four* the state tried to control people's thinking by inventing Newspeak, a horrid form of debased English which set out to destroy the language and force new meanings on it. The rationale of this was that as the English language was a means of engaging in independent thinking, it should be distorted so that 'thoughtcrime' (thinking in channels other than those approved of by the state) would be abolished. A great deal of

Nonsense about Gender: let's stick to plain English

modern American sociology, particularly that of the loonier sort of ultra-feminist variety, is very unhappy about sex and would seem to wish to abolish it. The modern nonsense about 'gender' is the result, and this side of the Atlantic it has become trendy in some quarters to refer to 'gender' where 'sex' is meant. Let us not try to be trendy; let us stick to plain English and say what we mean.

Some American writers attempt to make 'gender' refer to more than 'sex'. Thus Albert Brok writer:

"Whatever else gender might be, it is clear that it is a concept embedded in and linked to social and cultural reality. Kaplan (1990) notes that 'gender refers to concordances of sex (male/female) with various social ideals of masculinity and femininity' ... From a psychological point of view, gender issues can be discussed in terms of gender role and gender identity."

But in the very same book* another

* Barbara R. Weinrib (editor), *Gender issues across the Life Cycle*, 1992, New York, Springer Publishing Co.

contributor, W. James Cosse, maintains that "gender refers to the biological sex of the individual", and he couldn't put it plainer than that! Which definition are we to accept? It seems to me that these academics, in trying to elaborate a Newspeak, have got themselves into a fine old mess. Suppose we abandon the Newspeak and refer to English as it is spoken and written on this side of the Atlantic; in fact, to the Oxford English Dictionary:

"Gender, grammatical classification (or one of the two, or three, classes) of objects roughly corresponding to the two sexes and sexlessness (MASCULINE, FEMININE and NEUTER; see also COMMON EPICINE), (of nouns and pronouns) property of belonging to such class, (of adjective) appropriate form for accompanying a noun of any such class; (joc.) sex. Hence genderless a. [f. OF gen(d)re f. L. GENUS]"

This is from the Concise OED. It will be noted that at the end it gives the meaning of 'sex' as 'joc.' (jocular), that is, when people are trying to be funny, they may refer to a man's sex as his 'gender'. I think that there is some merit in referring to the dictionary when we are discussing the meaning of words, instead of playing Humpty Dumpty with them, for although English words and usage are always changing over time, the dictionary is our only bastion against the various forms of Newspeak which pressure groups seek to foist on us and confuse our thinking. I agree with Orwell that the English language is worth defending. I think that all who regard themselves as writers, even if they write to *Freedom* very occasionally, have a heavy responsibility on them. They are the custodians of that precious commodity, language, without which we are mere beasts, and cannot strive for freedom of thought. When the year 1984 came and went we congratulated ourselves that our comparatively civilised society had not

succumbed to the awful nightmare that Orwell predicted in his novel. But in some ways Orwell was a true prophet; although our civil liberties, our dignity, and our right to express ourselves freely is not absolutely controlled by a brutal and sinister Thought Police, there are forces at work which would literally introduce a form of Newspeak.

Most educated and sophisticated adults may laugh at the ridiculous language of 'political correctness', but there are children and young people who are being subjected to the insidious pressures of the media which purvey an impoverished and bastardised form of English. Historically, language is changing all the time, as it has done over the centuries, and sometimes the changes are not for the better. It is obviously more efficient and elegant to inquire 'Where went you in London, and what saw you there?' than to use the modern construction of 'Where did you go in London, and what did you see there?' The pervasive and clumsy word 'did' has come to stay because we sound pedantic if we use the earlier construction. Writers, the custodians of the language, have been lax in letting this unfortunate change take place. In our responsible position of guardians of the language, and hence of freedom of thought, we should endeavour to see that the changes that take place enrich the language, not impoverish it. We should not let an incorrect meaning of a word take the place of a correct meaning, as with 'gender' instead of 'sex'. Here the motivation of the perverters of language is obvious; it is because they object to the word *sex* on principle; their campaign is part of the wave of the new prudery, that emanates largely from the extreme of the lesbian-feminist movement of America.

Champions of freedom of thought, do not let us burn our dictionaries; they are not perfect, but they are all we have. When some Humpty Dumpty claims that a word means what he or she, or their political group, claims it to mean, we can always look it up in the dictionary and refute them.

Tony Gibson

Food for Thought ... and Action!

Recent additions to the bookshop stock.

Memories of a Makhnovist Partisan* by Ossip Tsebry, Kate Sharpley Library. Originally published in 1949 in Russian, it was later translated into French, and this is the first English translation. It is a short description of one man's experiences in a Makhnovist unit in the Russian revolution, taking on all-comers – and winning surprisingly often. It reads like entries in a diary, somewhat, and has a pleasing personal feel about it. There are some curious typographical errors in it, but it is otherwise clear and well laid out and the accounts of the various actions have the ring of authenticity about them. A5 pamphlet, 19 pages, £1.00.

The Spanish Civil War: anarchism in action by Eddie Conlon, Workers' Solidarity Movement. A competent and very well produced general account of the Spanish civil war and revolution, first issued in 1986 and now reprinted. As well as the title chapter there are others on 'Rebellion and Resistance', 'The Counter Revolution' and 'A Fresh Revolution'. Typographical errors are fewer than in the Tsebry pamphlet, but an embarrassing sub-heading on page 13 reads "BUKUNIN". In addition to the main text there are four photographs, a map of old Spain and, usefully, a chronology of events and a glossary of the principal parties involved. The introduction mentions the role played on behalf of the CNT by Captain Jack White, of the Irish Citizen Army. A good value introduction to the events in Spain in the '30s. A5 pamphlet, 40 pages, £1.50.

Kick it Over no. 32, K10 Collective, Toronto. This issue contains a detailed article on the revitalisation of a run-down area of Camden, New Jersey, by a group of squatters and a community action group; part of an essay on libertarian municipalism from Murray Bookchin's *The Limits of the City*; an account of how a new radical ecology group in Montreal is trying to tackle the urban crisis; a wonderful description by a Chicago taxi driver of how he seduces his passengers into discussing anarchist ideas in his cab; plus a lot more. A4 magazine, 48 pages, £1.50.

Echanges, no. 72/73, Bulletin of the *Echanges et Mouvement* network. Good coverage of social and workplace struggles in France, Guatemala, Italy, the USA, China, Germany and Greece. A5 pamphlet, 76 pages, £1.50.

Class War, no. 61, Class War Federation. The main feature in this issue is a four-page pullout on fascism and anti-fascism which, apart from being peppered with the slogan 'Kill All Nazis – Class War' in boxes, does precious little to "answer some of the questions and point out a few ways forward". Simplistic 'solutions' and the confusing

of racism, nationalism, fascism and nazism don't help anyone. Some of the other articles are much better, including one on resisting the imposition of VAT on fuel. 16 pages, 50p.

The Prosperous Few and the Restless Many by Noam Chomsky, Odonian Press, The Real Story series. Compiled by David Barsamian from interviews held with Chomsky over the last two years, this little book provides an insight into his thoughts on a wide range of topics. Here we are treated to his views on the wars in former Yugoslavia; GATT and NAFTA; class in the USA; food and third world 'economic miracles'; the roots of racism; the Pentagon's Somalia operation as public relations exercise; Gandhi, non-violence and India; plus a lot more. All these pieces are tied in with his fundamentally anarchist analysis of power – the fact that, as he puts it, the real drama is the "relentless attack of the prosperous few on the restless many". 96 pages, £4.95.

Ireland and British Imperialism, Workers' Solidarity Movement. Although published before the 'Downing Street Declaration' the chapters of this pamphlet, made up of articles from *Workers' Solidarity* magazine, give a useful overview of the situation in Northern Ireland and the Republic. From the reasons for Partition, the civil rights movement, the Easter Rising and Sinn Féin's 'socialism', to workers' strikes against bigotry, joint Unionist and Republican struggles against poverty and unemployment, and the Anglo-Irish Initiative, this pamphlet ties together the threads. It is all very well for Patrick Mayhew to sound off now about Britain having no selfish, economic or strategic interest in Northern Ireland but the historical reality clearly shows the opposite had always been true up until now. A5 pamphlet, 40 pages, £1.50.

Green Perspectives, no. 28, Social Ecology Project. Absent for over a year, this informative bulletin is now back on an occasional basis. Its aim is "to stimulate the serious thinking necessary to understand the grave social and ecological dislocations of our time and the potentialities that now exist for reconstructive alternatives". Included are reports from various social ecology groupings from all over the world, and reviews of recent and forthcoming publications, plus a letters section. The intellectual side of green anarchism. A4, 10 pages, £1.00.

KM

Titles distributed by Freedom Press Distributors (marked*) are post-free inland (add 15% towards postage and packing overseas). For other titles please add 10% towards postage and packing inland, 20% overseas. Cheques payable to FREEDOM PRESS please.

Chaos: science's new toy

"I know readers of *Freedom* are highly intelligent, but John Griffin's 'Chaos Theory and Anarchism' (22nd January) discussed the theory as if everyone already knew what it was about."

If you want to participate in the talk about new technical wonders, you need two qualifications: to have read (but probably not understood) *A Brief History of Time* and to have a nodding acquaintance with chaos theory and fractals. The latter turns up in all sorts of fields, often expressed as hauntingly beautiful colour graphics. The explanation lies, forbiddingly, in things called 'nonlinear differential equations' which are fortunately not quite as awful as they sound.

Nonlinear what?

We have to start by appreciating – though not actually manipulating – some equations a few steps ahead of ordinary 'O' Level Maths called differential equations, which govern how most ordinary physical processes work. Our basic physics lets us set up descriptions in terms of on rates-of-change, and rates-of-change-of-rates-of-change (accelerations), and so forth; and the solution is to find how the quantity itself changes with time, or distance, or whatever. Thus the decay of radioactive material is proportional only to the amount present (solution: the amount halves each time a set length of time, or half-life, elapses). Or, knock a *frictionless* pendulum bob a *small* way from the centre, and its acceleration towards the centre is proportional to a displacement away from

there (solution: it executes a smooth sinusoidal wobble forever).

Now imagine a similar object whose acceleration over time is proportional to displacement *X* elapsed time. This is called *nonlinear* because it has two unknowns multiplied by each other, and has no exact solution. Many important scientific problems are nonlinear; previous tactics were to approximate it to something linear, over each small area, and solve that and then hope for the best. But this leaves out certain global features of nonlinearity which aren't easily ignored.

The butterfly effect

Think of ball-bearings being rolled down a sloping board – a dull sort of game, because linear and predictable. The multiplication of unknowns has the effect of adding some nails or passive bumpers: a tiny difference in initial speed or position is multiplied – stretched out – until it makes the ball go *all the way left* of the bumper or *all the way right* of the bumper. Given three or four rows of bumpers, impossibly small differences in input position very soon add up to vast differences in where the ball emerges. This is what Ed Lorenz noticed with his very slow, very simple computer weather model. To make it carry on from a given point, he just typed back in the temperature and pressure values to the nearest thousandth of a unit ... and the nonlinear 'bumpers' in his model stretched those tiny errors so much that within half a day it was doing wildly different things to the original run.

If you ever see one of those speeded-up pictures with great white whorls of weather

(continued on page 8)

Joke of the month

Dear Editors,
Your leader writer in the 19th February issue rather misses the point in his references to the Institute for Fiscal Studies' recent report on the effects of tax changes, "The latest survey (*Guardian*, 9th February)". It is not a question of telling us what we already know about poverty. It is important to have objective evidence, or as close as we can come to it, in order to nail the lies of the Tories or any other bunch of self-seeking rulers occupying Parliament at any given time. Unless we are simply going to accept oppression, or get our heads busted in some form of insurrection, objective facts are the best allies we have in combating Tory lies about everyone ultimately benefiting from the change of emphasis to indirect taxation, the reduction of social security, the whole phoney economic miracle of the Thatcher years. Remember all the Parliamentary assertions about how 'everyone was better off'? Reports like this do help nail the obfuscation and fake statistics that gave the Tories so much working class and professional support.

Where I live ordinary people don't see the *Guardian*. They read the *Mirror*, the *Mail* and the *Sun*. Without reports like this the impression these papers leave is that Tory claims are broadly true. Just before Christmas I was talking to a bricklayer, a bright young man who made some effort to know what was going on. He was seriously maintaining that we had to have high income groups because of the 'trickle down effect'. My protestations that that economic fantasy was nailed a hundred years ago had little impact. The IFS 'who benefits report', well publicised on television, did make him think again. Whether our solutions are anarchist, socialist or anything else, we must increase our support and nailing politicians' lies with clear well-argued evidence is one way to get it.

Can I also put in a plea for *Freedom* to stop writing of capitalism as if it were still the single system which the British accidentally started in the sixteenth century and brought to fruition in the eighteenth and nineteenth. Capitalism

has changed and divided just as socialism and anarchism have done. The free market capitalism so loved by Minford and Thatcher didn't work in the nineteenth century, which is why it was progressively modified through most of this, at least up to the advent of the New Right. The state capitalism of the former Soviet bloc may have met some basic needs but redefined them to meet the political interests of the ruling élite. It is a different ball game being poor in Major's Britain, as one of the contributors to *The Raven* 'Crime' issue noted, than it is today. The so-called 'mixed economy' may have had dreadful inequities, it may basically have been a con job in many areas, but it was less desperate in terms of everyday living and a damned sight more hopeful for those of us at the bottom. It was capitalism true, but it was different in its effects as far as most of us were concerned.

I am not defending any of these forms. I am suggesting though that if anarchists and libertarian socialists want to make headway they have to be subtle in their analyses. And facts about the real state of our society, about who gets what, will help us do it.

Eric Bosworth

Unpretentious realism

Dear *Freedom*,
BM's article in *Freedom* (5th February 1994) is a pragmatic and realistic assessment of the anarchist movement at the time. I would concur with his view that once people have taken up the ideas and established a truly free society we should melt into the background and enjoy the new freedoms we will be able to enjoy; the benefits a new society could bring.

However, the entrenched views and fear of the new or the unusual that many people express makes progress a slow and unsteady thing. As BM recognises, it is important to continue to promote the alternative ways of organising that anarchism has to offer, and a self-congratulatory pat on the back can only be a good thing. So let's carry on the good work folks!

Chris Platts

Love or Money

Dear *Freedom*,
I was told by a reliable informant, and it is only too true or only too unbelievable which is almost the same verdict, that a bank manager was taken out to lunch by his client, and the client paid the bill, only to be presented by the bank manager with a bill for £100 for professional services rendered during a lunchtime chat about money. This is a subject that comes as easily as breathing to a capitalist, and is always a topic which he loves, or at least commands his enduring efforts and affections. The capitalist sees the world in terms of money, and there is little if anything that he does not place a price on, and from the above little tale we know what we have always been aware of, i.e. there is no service on his part that he would not present a bill for.

Anarchists too present bills for their services: love for what is lovable; fair treatment for fair conduct; comprehension of what is sensible; and appreciation for what cannot be weighed, bought or sold, that being the graces and truths of art, philosophy and humanity. We recognise that money has its uses and is a tool to be used, but to be used for the betterment of ourselves and the world and its inhabitants, which are part of us, and which we cannot exploit or tread down without damaging everybody and everything; including ourselves and our immortal souls. Capitalists somehow think that they are exempt from such reasoning as mine and yours. They have a system of greed, destruction, misery and negation justified by a political, economic and social doctrine that fewer and fewer people can understand or fight because it has nothing to do with reality. If such capitalists as our bank manager ever admit to greed then they reply that greed is natural to human nature, and any humanitarian sentiments are symptoms of failure or nobility leading nowhere in this world at least. What a mean and warped assessment of a glorious and complex being called human. We know and can prove countless cases of care and generosity in people who can and cannot afford such grace, and we know that were this empty, exhausting and corrupting doctrine to be dumped in the dustbin of history how much better and brighter this world and everything in it would be. We can even prove it. Get rid of capitalism

and of crime.

If after one hour of my fascinating presence I were to lean across the table and say: 'Well, comrade, you have had sixty minutes from a philosophy graduate, an Un Femme Du Certain Age, and one possessed of ruined existentialist beauty and that will be £100', then I would be either laughed or stoned out of our movement, providing that I could convince the comrade that I was not a lunatic or a joker. Yet a capitalist expects virtue and intelligence to be given to him as his right, and will pay 10% or less if the object of his interest is not his property or fully qualified in terms belonging to capitalism. I know - I have met them.

I believe that humanity as spelt out by far more intelligent, wide-ranging thinkers and feelers will eventually triumph because it is not only good and positive but also because capitalism is negative and narrow, and leads nowhere. I predict no easy victory. But in the meantime we have our love and faith to keep us warm. The bank manager will find himself with a £200 bill if he ever takes me out to lunch - I could not bear his company. He has saved money and my soul is at peace. Good luck to him too. He needs it more than I do.

Mary Quintana

At War with the Truth

Dear Editors,
The review of Larry O'Hara's 'At War with the Truth', penned by S. Panza, was interesting - especially the quote from Don Keoghty: "Anti-fascism simplifies difficult issues". 'Fascist' seems to be used as an all-embracing hate word - just as 'working-class' appears to be used as a love-word. It is a simple goodies/baddies story.

Using this simplistic categorisation, Prince Kropotkin, in supporting World War One, would become a 'ruling-class fascist', all the troops who died in the trenches would be 'working-class fascists', the Bobby on the beat would be a 'working-class fascist (pig?)', and your ordinary private in the army joined because he was an 'out-of-working-class fascist' with a family to provide for.

Now I can understand someone who is starving and out of his mind with worry becoming violent, but I just cannot understand people who can afford the train fares to get to demonstrations doing so with the intention of using violence on behalf of an *idea*.

Ernie Crosswell

A mystery solved

Dear *Freedom*,
I have long been baffled by what appeared to be an unsolvable mystery. It concerns our rulers. Presumably they have a human brain like the rest of us, and yet they make statements and pass laws that are stupid beyond belief. Everything they do proves this. Their efforts to control education, for example, are fit for nothing but a laugh. They have a judiciary that will grant a pardon for a crime that a person did not commit and will punish a person with more than one life sentence. Their bureaucracy is so dumb that it will allow armaments to be exported to a future enemy. And, most alarming of all, they say they are defending us by preparing for a nuclear war that will destroy us all.

Until recently I could explain the asininity of the rulers only by saying that they gave themselves no time to think. They were probably too busy

committing adultery and fathering their bastards. Recently, however, due to the carelessness of one Member of Parliament, we have the complete answer. This man was found dead, naked except for women's suspenders, stockings on his legs and a hand, and a plastic bag over his head to complete the ensemble. He had been using a length of flex to induce partial strangulation but had lost control of it.

So now we know what we get such stupid laws and unintelligent governmental behaviour. Our rulers are probably deciding our future while they masturbate as they experience extreme sexual excitement brought on by a breathless condition. Many of them are moronic because they are half-suffocated wankers.

People should recognise the true nature of their rulers and deprive them of the power to control their lives by abolishing all governments.

Derrick

Chaos

(continued from page 7)

systems spinning off like frisbees across the Atlantic ocean, you must also appreciate that the system is 'boiling' with random swirls and eddies at every level ... most of which amount to nothing, but any of which - maybe no more than the whorl of air from a butterfly's wingbeat - might grow to a massive hurricane (or might be the last dying fall of a past hurricane before vanishing away altogether). Thus there is a new fundamental limit on what we can and cannot exactly predict: *some systems may be in practice beyond the possibility of predicting more than a few days ahead, because of the inherent amplification of initial error.*

Order of Chaos

Chaos is, however, not just unpredictability. There are two areas of pattern in it. One is that anything we can say about solutions to nonlinear problems is often *independent of scale*: like English coastline, which is about as crinkly as a detail blow up of the North Cornish coastline, as a particular bay, as a particular complex of puddles ... These are called 'fractals' and their overall nature is summed up in a black bug-like pattern with a fractal edge known as the 'Mandelbrot set'. Another pattern is random oscillation around a fixed average pattern or 'attractor'. For instance, dribble sand of a given wetness (i.e.

stickiness) at a steady rate: while the sides of the cone are sub-critical it will rise, cross a critical level, and as it gets steeper than that have an ever higher chance of 'avalanche' collapse. The observed behaviour is that, the higher it gets above critical, the more chance each small random avalanche has of triggering more than one daughter avalanche in giving up its own energy. At any rate, the *average* position is at the critical slope, which depends only on the stickiness of the grains.

Chaos and politics

We cannot sensibly inject chaos into standard political ideas. We can use it as a *metaphor* to help us think about politics; but the usefulness of the result must be judged by standard political criteria. We do know, now, that the Science Fiction idea of equations that predict the smooth flow of history are just that - Science Fiction - and likewise for smooth models of the economy or the stock exchange; these things, like the weather, must be in principle unpredictable beyond fairly short ranges because of error amplification. The sandcone model may be quite a good model for stock exchange collapses: the more capital aggregates in single large units, the more likely that random fluctuations can drive bigger fluctuations. We can also take comfort because the nature of revolt is nonlinear; not so much that each small measure of oppression brings its own small measure of protest, but rather a stick it bent more and more until suddenly it snaps all the way ...

Dave Bird

Improbable

Though anarchists are unlikely to have known James Rusbridger, who was found hanged (and will be declared a suicide or perhaps someone who died in the middle of kinky sexual experimentation) in the middle of this month; few will have failed to note his letters in *The Guardian* and elsewhere revealing this or that aspect of Whitehall dirt.

Given that not long ago he wrote saying that he was certain that a journalist who was found in just such circumstances (a journalist who it so happened was attempting to investigate Mark Thatcher's financial doings, particularly his involvement in selling arms to Iraq) had in fact been murdered by someone's secret service, very possibly our own, certainly with the acquiescence of MI6; and that he was reputed to be developing this theme as a book; it seemed a little improbable. Even more improbable when one adds that he had voiced suspicions to other writers that the similar death of Stephen Milligan was also false.

I am as it happens in contact with Gary Murray (as I am at the moment involved in organising a memorial meeting for Hilda Murrell) and so I rang him to see if he knew Rusbridger, and knew any more. Apparently investigative journalists are all assuming that this is a secret service killing. (I later learnt from Rob Green that the efforts to paint a masturbatory death were rather bungled - though Rusbridger was widely known to be gay someone had pinned up in sight of his body a number of soft-porn pictures of girls.)

But then that also calls into question the death of Stephen Milligan. Was it sheer coincidence that Milligan had died this way, or was Rusbridger on to something when he expressed his doubts? (Gary Murray said that despite the *millipede's* reputation

as a parliamentary crawler, he is reported to have unearthed a clear case of corruption within the Tory Party and to have reported this to Norman Fowler asking for an investigation.)

Yes, certainly this all sounds like paranoia, but I learnt from a telephone call ten years ago this coming Spring Solstice that the time has come when the suspicions one dismisses as paranoid, and so fail to voice sufficiently loudly at the time, turn out to have been true all along.

LO

On March 21st at 7.30pm at the William Morris Hall, Shrewsbury, there will be a meeting to mark the tenth anniversary of the abduction and subsequent murder of Miss Hilda Murrell (coupled obviously with a request for a belated open inquiry).

The Bishop of Shrewsbury will be in the chair, Gary Murray and Commander Rob Green will speak (Tam Dalyell is unable to come because of hip trouble). Councillor Derek Woodvine will open the proceedings, singing a song he composed on the abduction.

Raven 24

on

Science - 1

Now available

96 pages £3.00 (post free anywhere)

The Raven

Anarchist Quarterly
number 24

on
'Science - 1'
out now

Back issues still available:

- 23 - Spain / Emma Goldman
- 22 - Crime
- 21 - Feminism
- 20 - Kropotkin's 150th Anniversary
- 19 - Sociology
- 18 - Anthropology
- 17 - Use of Land
- 16 - Education (2)
- 15 - Health
- 14 - Voting
- 13 - Anarchism in Eastern Europe
- 12 - Communication
- 11 - Class
- 10 - Libertarian Education
- 9 - Bakunin and Nationalism
- 8 - Revolution
- 7 - Emma Goldman
- 6 - Tradition and Revolution
- 5 - Spies for Peace
- 4 - Computers and Anarchism
- 3 - Surrealism (part 2)
- 2 - Surrealism (part 1)
- 1 - History of Freedom Press

£3.00 each (post-free anywhere)

from

FREEDOM PRESS

FREEDOM
fortnightly

ISSN 0016 0504

Published by Freedom Press
84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 7QX

Printed by Aldgate Press, London E1

London

Anarchist Forum

Meets Fridays at about 8.00pm at
Conway Hall, 25 Red Lion Square,
London WC1R 4RL (note new
venue).

SPRING TERM 1994

4th March - Discussion: With what other
groups should anarchists work?

11th March - An Experiment in Cognitive
Therapy or General discussion (speaker has
not confirmed)

18th March - General discussion

25th March - General discussion: Bringing
together the strands

SUMMER TERM 1994

15th April - General discussion

22nd April - Anarchism and the Gift
Economy (speaker: Michael Murray)

29th April - General discussion

Sunday 1st May - *May Day Picnic* in
Chiswick Park in Chiswick House Grounds
near junction of Great West Road (A4 leading
to M4) and Chertsey Road (A316 leading to
M3) close to North and South Circulars (car
park off southern carriageway of Great West
Road). LT Tube stations: Turnham Green,
Chiswick Park and Gunnersbury (also North
London Line) and Chiswick BR Station from
Waterloo, Clapham Junction and Reading (via
Witton). Good pubs in Chiswick and
Strand-on-the-Green for early arrivals. Café
and WC.

6th May - Anarchism and Utopia (speaker:
Jason Wilcox)

13th May - General discussion

20th May - Talk by a member of the Socialist
Party of Great Britain (specific details yet to
be confirmed)

27th May - General discussion

3rd June - The Co-op and its Place in Politics
(speaker: Tim Pearce)

10th June - General discussion

17th June - History of Native Americans
(speaker: Jim Baker of Boston BAD [Boston
Anarchist Drinking Club])

24th June - Paganism, Feminism and
Ecology (speaker: Daniel Cohen)

1st July - General discussion

8th July - Drawing up the 1994/95
programme

Monday 29th August - *Summer Picnic* (venue
to be decided)

If anyone would like to give a talk or lead a
discussion, overseas or out-of-town speakers
especially, please contact either Dave Dane or
Peter Neville at the meetings, or Peter Neville
at 4 Copper Beeches, Witham Road,
Isleworth, Middlesex TW7 4AW (Tel:
081-847 0203), not too early in the day please,
giving subject matter and prospective dates
and we will do our best to accommodate.
These could be sometimes instead of a general
discussion but note that these are not merely
unfilled slots but are popular occasions in their
own right so we are unwilling to relinquish too
many.

Note: as we are no longer meeting at the Mary
Ward Centre we are no longer tied to term
dates so the meetings may continue into the
summer.

Peter Neville / Dave Dane
for London Anarchist Forum

Anarchist Research Group 1994 Programme

— 9th April —

speaker and topic to be announced

— 9th July —

John Dohoney (Vancouver)

'What are the roots of anarchism?
A socio-psychoanalytical
perspective'

— 22nd October —

Colin Ward

topic to be announced

All meetings held on Saturday at
2.30pm. The April and July meetings
are at the International Relations
Room, Institute for Historical
Research, Malet Street, London
WC1. The October meeting (jointly
with the Anarchist Bookfair) will be at
Conway Hall.

Red Rambles in Derbyshire

A programme of free guided walks in
the White Peak for Greens,
Socialists, Libertarians and
Anarchists.

— Spring 1994 —

Sunday 6th March: Castleton to
Mam Tor. Meet at Castleton main car
park at 11am. Circular walk. Bring
strong boots and waterproofs.
Length 5 miles approx.

Sunday 3rd April: Alstonefield and
Lower Dove Dale. Meet at 1pm in
Alstonefield National Park car park.
Length 4-5 miles.

Sunday 8th May: Cycle 'ramble' on
the Tissington Trail. Meet 10am at
Ashbourne end of the Tissington
Trail. Cycles can be hired at this
point.

Telephone for further details
0773-827513



FREEDOM AND THE RAVEN SUBSCRIPTION RATES 1994

	inland	abroad surface	outside Europe airmail	Europe airmail
Freedom (24 issues) half price for 12 issues				
Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	14.00	22.00	34.00	28.00
Institutions	22.00	30.00	40.00	40.00

The Raven (4 issues)

Claimants	10.00	-	-	-
Regular	12.00	14.00	18.00	16.00
Institutions	18.00	22.00	27.00	27.00

Joint sub (24 x Freedom & 4 x The Raven)

Claimants	18.00	-	-	-
Regular	24.00	34.00	50.00	40.00

Bundle subs for Freedom (12 issues)

	inland	abroad surface	abroad airmail
2 copies x 12	12.00	13.00	22.00
5 copies x 12	26.00	32.00	44.00
10 copies x 12	50.00	60.00	84.00

Other bundle sizes on application

Giro account number 58 294 6905
All prices in £ sterling

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To Freedom Press in Angel Alley, 84b Whitechapel High Street,
London E1 7QX

- I am a subscriber, please renew my sub to *Freedom* for issues
- Please renew my joint subscription to *Freedom* and *The Raven*
- Make my sub to *Freedom* into a joint sub starting with number 24 of *The Raven*
- I am not yet a subscriber, please enter my sub to *Freedom* for issues
and *The Raven* for issues starting with number 24
- I would like the following back numbers of *The Raven* at £3 per copy post free
..... (numbers 1 to 23 are available)
- I enclose a donation to Freedom Fortnightly Fighting / Freedom Press Overheads /
Raven Deficit Fund (delete as applicable)

I enclose £..... payment

Name

Address

..... Postcode