

1/-



Contents

Why Anarchism?	John St Lawrence	Page one
What we are for what we are against	after E. Armand	Page two
Why the Individualist strain in Anarchism appeals to me	Roy Pateman	Page three
Chaos in Industry	Arthur Hunt	Page five
Industrial notes	Joe Hill	Page eight
The Oxford Anarchist	Will Warren Roy Pateman Harvey Mellar	Page nine
We told them so.. Now what?	L.O.	Page sixteen
Class society & popular reaction to it	Jolfe Rosse	Page nineteen
A few thoughts on Factory farming	Roy Pateman	Page twenty-three
Police subversion	Almad	Page twenty-five
Truth....& "frotting"	cuttings from the press John Francis	Page twenty-five Page twenty-six
Disarmament & Britain's Economy	Nick Gould	Page twenty-seven
Act for Peace	Laurens Otter	Page thirty
OXAN	articles in future issues.	Page thirty-six
Anarchism & the Cinema	Andrew Green	Page thirty-seven
Buddhism & Anarchism	John Brodie	Page thirty-nine
Drugs & Society	Robert Watney	Page forty-one
Man in Exile	ignotus translated by Tim Oxton	Page Forty-two
Ginsberg, reading at the I.C.A.	Roger Garfitt	Page Forty-four
Poetry	Roger Garfitt John Arrowsmith Guy Gladstone Robert Irwin	Page forty-six

Oxan is published by the federation of Oxon Anarchists, & duplicated on the I.L.P. duplicator 197 Kings Cross Road, London W.C.1

The Editorial Secretary during University terms is Harvey Mellar -
Merton College Oxford.

during Vacations - Laurens Otter

Tolstoi New Yatt rd. N. Leigh. Oxon

to whom all articles, letters for publication, press cuttings, contributions comments, (favourable or abusive,) should be sent.

It is intended to produce OXAN three or four times a year, (depending on whether the non-University members are capable of producing an issue unaided at the end of the Long Vacation. Cost per issue one shilling (statement of accounts appended on back cover.)

Subscriptions and donations to Tony Pitcher, Merton College, Oxford.

Why Anarchism?
 (the case for anarchist-communism) John St. Lawrence with acknowledgements to J.R.

The name anarchist was given Libertarian socialists originally as a term of abuse using the word in the generally accepted corruption of "advocate of chaos"; however since by derivation the word means one who is opposed to all government of men by men, - Libertarians have since been proud to be so called. Anarchism is cooperation without coercion, far from the lack of Government being the cause of chaos, one has only to look round us at our much begoverned (polyarchical) world to see chaos resulting from Government & that the only way within a Governmental context that chaos can be eliminated is by the imposition of an unitary rule tending to tyranny.

Anarchists refuse to support politicians in their search for power, since we believe that those who wield power like those over whom it is wielded are slaves to that power. Those who seek power to change society of necessity must continuously seek more, having converted a party they go on to increase that party's power & to capture the State, having captured the State they must build the State to influence the world: therefore it is inconsistent with the whole system of State politics to attempt to disband centralized power, to attempt to disarm, to attempt to transfer power from the ruling elite to the mass of ordinary people. Anarchists are not interested in capturing the State whether by democracy or insurrection, we hold that any movement that takes power allegedly to introduce socialism, or to make democracy vital, is bound whatever its motives to maintain the power it has taken & in so doing it is bound to maintain & later protect privilege. We say this not because we believe politicians to be necessarily more corrupt than others, indeed on the contrary we acknowledge that there are many sincere & self-sacrificing people in politics, we say it because no man however worthy is good enough to rule others, because the most self-sacrificing are powerless in the face of that power which they themselves wield, & we say it because the most sincere & incorruptible are often the most dangerous. As against the Governmentalist method - attempting to gain power in order to introduce measures on other peoples behalf (to say nothing of one's own) Anarchists attempt to act, & to persuade others also to act on their own behalf, using direct action in a variety of ways so that they intervene directly in their own rule.

Anarchist Communism is the combatting of political & economic authority & the fostering of free association; where in existing society libertarian currents are to be found, Anarchist Communists should be the first to applaud; & so it is for us both a duty & a pleasure to strengthen them, - but unlike the Liberal or Social-Democrat reformers we do this in no spirit of self-congratulation. We do not say; "these libertarian elements are to be found in society achieved partly as the result of the activity of our predecessors, & that this therefore proves that all is alright with the world;" - but that; "we find these libertarian elements & that by developing them & emphasizing the will to freedom, we hope to build the basis of a free society, & that on such foundations by coordinating libertarian aspirations & efforts where they exist one can evolve a movement that will reject authority & the State.

Since Anarchists refuse to choose the lesser evil whenever the rival politicians in their five yearly charades offer it to us, we are frequently accused of having no views or of not caring. We are told that our absolutist position constitutes an holier than thou puritism & a retreat from reality. Trotsky claimed that Libertarian "Ultra-Leftism" stemmed from fear of opportunist tendencies within ourselves. John Lewis in the "Case against Pacifism" alleged that, "Neutrality is the withholding of any response at all." It may be that there are instances where each of these charges may be found to be true; but it would be a fool who would claim that the most important issues in the world figure in political debate, the politicians regularly ignore the question of world poverty, until the last four years they have for the most part ignored the Bomb, & even now - neither side in the last election tried to pose a policy that would have taken Britain out of the Nuclear Power Struggle, (nor of course did the Liberals or Communists) & so only a fool would claim that the way for someone who cares about these to act - is through the political parties. One has only to look at the treatment of pensioners to see that politics will break the hearts of those of its devotees who do care. It should surely be easy for anyone to envisage situations wherein any sensible man refuses to take sides, but it may help if I give three examples where no sensible man would choose & by analogy argue from there.

asked to choose between milk (or water) and oats in the making of porridge, one would refuse to choose since both are necessary,
 asked to choose between differing sweetners (or salt) one may have a marginal preference but one would not be prepared to go to any difficulty to obtain such a marginal preference & one's choice is more often governed by one's pocket than by one's palate,
 but if one were asked to choose between strychnine & arsenic for the same purpose of flavouring, one would refuse to choose since one positively desires to have neither;

so in politics the anarchist,-

asked to choose between absolute freedom and group equality with co-operation, says the one is impossible without the other, & that therefore there is no choice.
 asked to choose between spontaneity & organisation as the means to change society may profess a marginal preference, probably stemming from the particular anarchist's subjective wishes and circumstances, (one can not work for spontaneity, & one can not sit back & wait for organisation,) but having expressed the view that one or the other is a more likely road to anarchism, no anarchist would carry this preference to the point of hostility to the other method,
 asked to choose between self-styled Communism & self-styled Democracy, the anarchist points to the fact that both have rich & poor, rulers and ruled, prisons, prisoners & goalers, both use wireless, television, government news releases & compulsion on the mass media of communication to ensure that what news they wish suppressed & what they want is disseminated, both have colonies acknowledged or otherwise & do not hesitate to send troops to prevent the emergence of Governments not to their liking, both prepare & stockpile weapons of mass extermination; neither are free & neither society is equitable.

Life indeed constantly necessitates choice, frequently a lesser evil must be chosen, but there must be a real choice in order to choose, & there is often a third choice which makes the lesser evil unnecessary. Asked to choose between East and West or Labour and Tory; the anarchist may perhaps reply that there is no choice, both being class systems; may reply that one or the other is marginally preferable but that the difference is so slight that there is no case for wasting time & effort devoting energy to this lesser evil which might be devoted to propagating anarchism. An Anarchist refuses to vote partly because he wants neither side to rule him, partly because generally the difference between the parties is inadequate to make a choice, & where there are real differences as when there is a real danger of a fascist government, or where one side is by intent truly socialist; though the anarchist here is anything but neutral the most positive help he can give to the radicals in these circumstances is to show that it is impossible to defeat fascism or institute socialism by governmental means, & anarchists by using direct action & by refraining from involvement in the farce of government are more likely to provide the radicals with the necessary stiffening than by any other means. Indeed anarchists have learnt from bitter experience that compromise & the choice of the lesser evil does not prevent the greater one. When in Spain the anarchists abandoned their anti-political position to enter the United Front against Franco they opened the door for the Communists who imposed dictatorship on the Republic & re-imposed the Capitalist system in Catalonia prior to smoothing the road for Franco's victory. An anarchist refuses to vote finally because there is after all a third alternative; a free society & only this can prevent war; (which in a nuclear age, means that the world can only survive if people act for themselves against power & privilege & take the power to make war away from the generals & the politicians.).

What we are for . That we are against.

A Summary of Individualist-Anarchist positions adapted by S.E.Parker from E.Armand.

We are a-political and take no part in party quarrels.

In all spheres we are for the voluntary against the obligatory, for consent against imposition, for reason against violence, for free examination against dogmaticism.

Individualists we are against the subjection of the individual to the State in any form; against the absorption of the ego into the collectivity; against compulsory contracts; against forced solidarity or co-operation; against the exploitation of the individual by his fellows or the social MILIEU; against the encroachment of the "non-self" organized or not, upon the "self", isolated or associated, whatever that self is or has (in the sense of expanding or asserting personality); against blind procreation, heedless of the future of the offspring; against racial hatred.

We are with all those who struggle in all places for complete freedom of expression of thought - spoken, written or illustrated; for absolute liberty of assembly, union, grouping association and secession. We are for the tangible freedom of exposition, publicising, experiment and realization.

Whatever happens to be the end sought for, the purpose pursued, we oppose external control - statist or governmental - and all censure, restraint, constraint or requisition whether administrative, intellectual, economic, spiritual or moral, everywhere and at all times.

We are for individual responsibility and autonomy against the oppression and tyranny of castes, classes and rulers.

We are for liberty and free agreement against authority and the imposed rule. (We regard the economic question as a subsidiary one, but conceive any solution to it on the basis of this principle).

Why the Individualist strain in Anarchism appeals to me.
Roy Pateman.

Anarchism is the individual approach to the problems of society or to quote Rudolph Rucker; "Anarchism is not to be conceived of as a definite closed system nor as a future millenium, but only as a particular trend in the historic development towards freedom." Classical anarchist thinkers such as Proudhon, Godwin and Stirner negated the State but distrusted any form of collaboration which could harden into institutional forms. Which is why I regard the Syndicalist movement with some suspicion.

Max Stirner (1806-56), a mild mannered teacher of school girls was the first Anarchist-Individualist and in the "Ego and his own" he shows as his ideal the egoist in conflict with other individuals but uniting with others for the arrangement of matters of convenience. He has some influence in the present anarchist revival; he considered that it is necessary to use force to change the authoritarian and anti-individualist nature of society. A sharp contrast with Godwin's views.

Bellegarrigue had some influence in revolutionary France of 1848 "There can be on earth no interest superior to mine, no interest to which I owe even the partial sacrifice of my own interests". He thought however that the commune can be relied on to reconcile the interests of the individuals who comprise it. He may be influenced by the American Individualist Thoreau in his view that the revolution will be made by the withdrawal of co-operation from the State. In common with Proudhon (Note 1) Bellegarrigue stresses possession as the guarantee of freedom in contrast to the anarcho-communists such as Kropotkin and such individualists as Stirner.

Although many individualists have practised violence to achieve anarchist ends others have a creditable record; Armand and Faure opposed the First World War whilst many syndicalists and communists flocked to the colours.

People often confuse the terms Nihilist and Anarchist. Nihilism was coined by Turgenev in his novel "Fathers and Sons", it is an extreme emphasis on Individualism not primarily a political or social movement. This reflects the views of Pisarev 1840-68 who repudiated all traditional values of a society which denies individuals the right of free development. In his turn he influenced the revolutionary Individualism of Nachaiev (a very sinister figure in the anarchist canon (Note 2) who added to this belief the view that

devotion to the revolution as a means to emancipation justifies every act. (Personally I would have thought a negation of Individualism).

The Nihilist Movement was significant in that as well as influencing Bakunin, one of the most significant of anarchist thinkers it paved the way for the Narodnik movement of going amongst the Russian peasants to educate them for the overthrow of existing society. Unfortunately the educative process did not go far enough; the Bolshevik did it more thoroughly and were able to wipe out the anarchist opposition after the 1917 "Revolution".

Widespread attention to Nietzsche in the 1890s brought renewed interest in Stirner, fostered by Mackay the Poet who had some influence in Germany and Tucker in the USA. Tucker was opposed both to the Communists and the propagandists of the Deed. In his turn Tucker was influenced by Josiah Warren who in 1827 watched the failure of the community of New Harmony and decided that society must be fitted to the individual and not the other way round. The failure of this community as with many others was due to the way property was treated; he agreed with Proudhon that man had the right to the material result of his own labour. Warren started communities on the individualist basis - there were no meetings in the twenty years that the community lasted. He ran a store which sold goods at cost in change for labour notes promising to donate to the storekeeper equivalent time at different occupations. Compare Proudhon's Mutualism. He had some influence on the American populist movement with their strong emphasis on currency reform.

Benjamin Tucker (1854-1939) was a most interesting anarchist-individualist. His most important work was "Instead of a Book - by a man too busy to write one", a fragmentary exposition of philosophical anarchism." Many of his views stem from Stirner. Self interest is the supreme law. Equal liberty for all. Mind your business is the only moral law. Contracts must be lived up to. He had no objection to property in common with other individualists but had a strong feeling about usury; here you see the link with currency reform and its attendant anti-semitism. Two of his precepts I find objectionable but perhaps inevitable. Namely that violence is advisable when it will accomplish the desired end and inadvisable when it will not, and that in a society of individualists norms based on the General Will will be obtained - not precluding prison, torture and capital punishment.

The desired changes in society will come about by disobedience to the state; Tucker as well as Thoreau refused to pay his poll tax. The Press and speech will be used to inculcate the seeds of rebellion and anarchist doctrine. If they are suppressed then force will be used. Armed revolution is no use in the first place - now is the time for the dynamiters. But passive resistance is the most potent weapon, refuse to pay taxes go to jail instead. This has been the weapon of revolutionaries from the Irish Land League in the 80s through Ghandi to individuals in the States and the UK today.

Another idea Tucker borrowed from Proudhon was to start a bank through which one could obtain non-interest bearing currency; the steadily accumulated capital to be disposed in new enterprises until it spread to the whole population. "Instead of a book" is full of useful points. "Civilization consists in teaching men to govern themselves by letting them do it". "Anarchy will be established by getting rid of one oppression after another till at last all the domination of violence shall have disappeared;" "Anarchist society was started thousands of years ago when the first man thought of liberty". The last quotation may be regarded as the starting point of that curious band of anarchists known as the "Permanent Protestors".

Thoreau of all the anarchists I have read is the one who has most influenced me and for whom I feel the most sympathy. His philosophy was formed to an extent by his study of Greek Stoicism, Zeno's critique of Plato and Sophocles' Antigone. He trusted to impulses rising freely rather than rules applied mechanically. Walden is the record of his modest attempt to live simply and naturally, of his desire to simplify society and disentangle the needless complexity of modern living.

His "On the duty of Civil Disobedience", is a classic - a final judgement on any action rests in the conscience of the individual. He was concerned with individual protest and had a profound distrust of the mass mind which made him eschew the collective deed. His most characteristic anarchist quotation is; "That Government is best that governs not at all". A most influential thinker

with lines leading off to Ghandi, Miller, Walt Whitman and Allen Ginsberg. The Beats owe much to individualist and Nihilist thinkers.

In Britain the number of important individualist thinkers is small, Wilde hated cant about public opinion acting as a restraint... "Individualism does not try to force people to be good, when men have no need to hear or envy their fellows they will understand and respect their individualism."

The "Anarchist" published from 1885-1888 had a strong individualist influence and Seymour, a disciple of Tucker proclaimed that individual possessions were the key to freedom and that a rational exchange system was the key to social-liberation.

There is no a-priori anarchist programme since there are only anarchists. An anarchist negates the state because he knows that he can live without it. Anarchism is an attitude, a way of life as we are in a state of legitimate defense against authoritarian encroachment.

I personally try to create by propaganda other individualists who will live and act anarchism with little concern for the future society. The society we want is one in which there is never recourse to violence, compulsion or force to adjust differences. We will continue to denounce the superstition of necessary government (although most of us support it unwillingly with taxes there are many dodges to get some of it back) and to try and live as though it does not exist.

The Individualist Anarchist resists rule by others as the others are too self-interested to be allowed to run any lives but their own.

Roy gives these auto-biographical notes; 29, teaches in an agricultural technical college, has been a blast furnace worker, railway porter, contract sheepshearer, Intelligence Corps Corporal, convict; interested gardening and beautiful, intelligent birds.

Notes:

1. The author's references to Proudhon's views on possessions may be thought to negate the most widely known passage from his work (where he quotes in his youth the Pauline text "Property is Theft"). Later in his life he said "Property is Freedom". (Ed.)
2. "Nechaiev lived for a number of years chained to the wall of a humid cell and when his comrades succeeded in establishing contact and offered to liberate him, refused because he preferred them to concentrate on more important tasks. But later in the emigre atmosphere of Geneva he became involved in the most squalid quarrels and died an obscure no-body. "Koestler "The Yogi and the Commissar" on the Intelligentsia. (Ed.)

Chaos in Industry.
A. C. Hunt, Chairman Shop Stewards (A.L.U.).
Smiths Motor Accessories, Witney.

At the end of the war British troops from Britains shores to the jungles of Burma, were asking what the prospects were for a good life after the years of struggle, and privation. Not all of them had sustained enthusiasm for the war, there had been too many cases of brutality in detention camps, of stupid officers and N.C.Os who treated men like children, of military police who subjected tired warriors to irksome restrictions. There had been mutinies some given publicity but others which the public did not know about. Servicemen had discovered the need for collective action, which they did not forget in later years many of them were denied a vote in the rushed election, and did not get training for jobs which had been specified in an act of parliament.

In industry there had been strikes, largely occasioned by exploitation, and the

knowledge that for the playboy and the profiteer, it had been a good war. The advent of a Labour government did not make things much better for the worker, hours were too long, holidays too short and wages too low, and he was taxed to the limit. There was no ideal, no message injected into a sick society, in theory the worker was a patriot, in practice he was ignorant, and apathetic. In theory he was a good family man, in practice he was guilty of deceit and infidelity when there was the opportunity, or sufficient courage to carry out the inclination. Romance and sentimentality on the radio and television screen, smut and sordid relationships in real life. Sport was a national mode of escapism, little children who never grew up relished this for it was something they could discuss and understand and put completely out of perspective. The people who had been hoodwinked into believing they were the born leaders and subjected to a superior so called education could not and did not display any real leadership, though as always they succeeded in getting the top jobs in industry. There were of course exceptions to these trends but everyone was tainted to some extent. And if anything it was worse at the top.

This then was the wonderful country that men thought about in the deserts, and jungles they were not slow to enter into the spirit of the thing.

In the so called nationalized industries strikes unfortunately did not often take place, wages did not rise much, but excessive compensation was paid to ex-shareholders, in spite of the fact that they had been heavily subsidized in pre-war years, and during the war. The bosses were still in control, and the employees as they are termed still expected to toe the line, this did not suit the modern trend. Sir became a word which was seldom used. Union activity gathered momentum. There was some success in the newly taken over industries, but there was much criticism, much of it justified. The blue eyed boys were more likely to get promotion than the efficient worker, cynicism and laziness inevitably prevailed. The Services continued to hold many people including civilians, for years of idleness in futile, frustrating employment, which made some lose confidence to be able to earn a living in the cold hard commercial world. A chance remark, made in jocular mood could lead to a security check up. A trade unionist who dared to argue was considered a communist, and a trouble maker. Victimization was rife. A small minority succeeded in getting a grounding in trade union practice which they were able to use later to greater effect in private industry.

Private industry was inept its management was unschooled in industrial relations, and management practice, and even more unbearable than the civil servants. A newly engaged worker was not properly trained or instructed. Sometimes after a day or two he left. Piecework presented a great problem, an operator was heard to comment that he was happier in the Burma jungle than on piecework. The only subject discussed was earnings, sometimes men with no guts to approach management would wrangle on the shop floor. A man at Fords walked out of the factory while on night shift and disappeared, was he ever found? It is doubtful if the paper that reported the incident ever gave further information, after all what does a worker matter when there are royalty and aristocracy to fill the gossip columns. The only interest usually invoked is when a "commie" is found under the managing director's table, the newshounds then descend on a locality like a flock of hungry vultures. They have little interest in discovering the real reason for a strike that would alienate their advertisers, the same is true of I.T.V. at the one period the news bulletins were dynamic, reporters went to docks, and factories the public heard the bitter forthright remarks of the workers, they got the atmosphere of mass meetings. Some left wing journals praised the efforts of a new type of communicator, and then something happened, visits to industrial trouble spots became less frequent, supercilious announcers presented the managements version of events with an occasional intervention of the right wing union leaders. Seldom was a glimpse allowed of the man the dispute was about. Auntie B.B.C. was her usual pretentious and ineffectual self, well bred pinkies could damn the manual worker with faint praise but no rough voiced docker or miner had access to the mass media. If a car maker still believes in the myth of democracy let him try to get a letter published criticising his "boss". He might succeed in propagating a number of general observations, but these would only be issued in a local rag, the national press would ensure that no breath of criticism permeated its pages, and then of course there is the law of libel. Advice for protecting the capitalist from justified exposure. The subtle brain washing techniques spread an evil cloud over the length and breadth of industry. Many workers were subjected to it; the majority succumbed as did practically all the management.

They pre-judged every issue and had a reactionary 18th century idea regarding relations between master and man, as out of date as the factory buildings where they exercise control. Suggest to them that they change their attitude and views and they will look for some deep "communist plot", or spread the rumour around that you are mad, and enlist some of your workmates and higher supervision - and, if you are shop steward, some of your colleagues - against you. If you are interested in safety and feel that your antiquated buildings ought to be altered or pulled down you will be told that this will be too expensive or that you are lucky because other workers have to work out in the rain. It will be suggested that perhaps you are unhappy and ought to find alternative employment. This was the attitude in spite of the fact that costs of development would come out of what a firm would have paid in tax.

Some people will say that the critics among the people are too unfair in twenty years since the war they will say there has been progress, a Labour government even now is pledged to do away with victimisation. This may sound very nice in theory but the fact remains that workers are still being sorted out for their union activities, and if they keep their jobs at all have to move to another part of their establishment and give an assurance that they will not take part in any union activity. The most despicable part of the whole thing is not that the managements are tough, we can expect that, but what we should not have to face is the continued hostility to enlightened policies in the ranks of labour in fact the right wingers whether they are shop floor workers or union officials have more in common with management than with genuine trade unionists. When Sir William Carron appears on television it is almost certain that there will be another stupid attack on rank and file militants, Ted Hill knew what he was doing when he told the press that if Jim Matthews - the ex N.U.G.M.W. official who started a business to intervene in industrial disputes - came near his members there would be an immediate walk out. What then is a worker to do that would benefit the opposition to organised society in the world today?

As would be expected there are many contradictory factors to contend with even in areas of the industrial arena. In theory the average worker is a conforming respectable member of our brand of capitalist society, he says the right things at the right time, he believes, so he says, in the royal family, he accepts the authority of the "boss". But there is an important element increasing in number as industrialisation proceeds that questions the sort of society where some spend most of their life at a work bench or in an office while others live a life of idle luxury. And these are not just the left wingers. They will also complain when they think the differential between various groups of workers is unjust, the socialist idea takes root in more minds, even in people who would not admit to being socialist. There are more who think that what is needed is not a "boss" who gives all the orders, but a manager with whom one can negotiate ones conditions of employment. There are few who would admit to being communist but when there is a question of differential people will contend that a labourer and a skilled man should get the same wage increase thus narrowing the gap in real economic terms. This view of course extends outside industry to rating and taxation and other things. It is argued increasingly that richer people should have their advantages cut out. There are of course also unwelcome trends although they might be a blessing in the end, by preventing a continued blurring of issues, the chief danger to our immediate well being is the rise of fascism. James Cameron wrote at the time of the last election in the United States that there was a stench of fascism in the air, that is true of British industry today as shown in the increasing racialism.

What then can an anarchist do - or what should he do in the present situation? Many who might not even know what the word meant have an uneasy feeling that organised government is of no benefit to them, they still work hard, they have to count every penny, they are afraid of a war they feel is just around the corner, and they see no evidence of any other national government that is worth learning much from. Men and women with ability do not get ahead in the political parties, but there is always industry where workers can get their revenge for the indignities they have suffered both in society and in their workplace and at the hands of various organisations and individuals on them and their families; they can campaign and argue on the shop floor; they can address mass meetings; if they feel it is worthwhile, they can join committees and slam the management at every opportunity. Sometimes it is necessary to continue trade union activity for if a tough shop steward decides to discontinue he can soon find himself out of a job.

The worker no matter what his creed or if he has no ideology at all has one thing in common with nearly all other toilers in this country, he does not give a twopenny damn whether he does a job of work or not. He does as little as he dares, the managers and directors are even worse. Is this not fertile ground for anarchy, we do not have to use bullets, or bombs, industry and society will fall into our hands like a ripe plum if only the people who produce the nation's necessities carry their ideas through to a logical conclusion. In any case the present set up will disappear did not Marx say that capitalism has within itself the seeds of its own destruction? That should certainly be true in a regime so inefficient and vandalic as this one.

Industrial Notes.

Joe Hill.

With this quarters shop stewards report I received an appeal and I was pleased about that, the request was for support for the G.E.C. strike at Erith in Kent. The dispute now in its fifth week involves over six hundred A.E.U., members they are supported by the Transport and General Workers' Union and the General and Municipal. The strike declared official in its second week has continued in deadlock. The Managements refusal to revert to the pre-strike position has made a settlement impossible.

For many years the relations between Unions and Management were excellent according to the strikers.

This was brought to a close suddenly in 1961/62 with an attack on the bonus system by the employers. Management was changed and since then workers wages and working conditions have been under attack. In 1962/63 members succeeded in implementing a thirty four hour week to prevent sacking. In 1963 the bonus scheme was terminated, which caused a loss of £3/£4 a week to many. In 1964, after nine months wasted discussion members worked to rule unable to get agreement on an increased rate and higher wage demands. Management issued a week's notice of dismissal to all workers in dispute, but as usually happens in such cases withdrew after the workers refused to be intimidated. The resulting increase in pay only partly compensating members for their losses.

Information is not to hand whether the work to rule was before or after the election of the so called Labour Government, evidently it was before. In the last years of the Conservative 1955-59 administration employers had been tougher throughout industry victimizing workers with impunity. This was nothing to what they did in the period 1959/64. In 1959 Frank Horsman got the sack from Morris Motors, his union The Transport and General Workers not relishing the fact that one of their shop stewards was being sorted out made the unofficial strike official. The A.E.U. caused many good trade unionists to spit at the mention of them by refusing to back Horsman, who still got the sack. The TGW said they were not willing to tolerate this sort of thing, but a union-one of the most left wing in the country-had let a shop-steward suffer victimization. Fords, Rootes, Smiths Motor Accessories and other firms were not slow to lash out with the big stick. With a few exceptions the union leaders stood by letting shop floor workers take the brunt of the onslaught. They lost in some cases, particularly as regards money, which trade unionists seem to concentrate on today to the exclusion of more important issues.

Let us hope that the G.E.C. workers appreciate the ideological content of the problem. In 1965 their management issued a statement dealing with general discipline. Restrictions never before operated were put on shop stewards recognition of the Works Committee was against the provisions of National Agreements- withdrawn as was the recognition of the agreement relating to the mobility of labour. The union representatives aver that the agreement was defined in such a way as to allow transfer of any skilled man to any skilled job regardless of union.

A strike ensued when a job done by the A.E.U. members was transferred to the Boiler Shop without consultation. This is the issue, the need for re-establishing of what the members regard as their rights. It is not a demarkation issue so much as an attack on everything that trade unionism stands for, what other basic principles will be violated if the bosses are allowed to get away with this?

Before the election the Prime Minister paid lip service to technological efficiency, he attacked the old boy network in industry not the unions. But he had not been in power long before he turned on the workers and condemned unofficial strikes. No word now against the bosses, no threats to them, but the puerile sneer that all industry's troubles are the fault of a handful of Communists. It is obvious the working people will have to help themselves, they will get little help from the Labour Government.

The Oxford Anarchists.

The Oxford Anarchists arose from within the Committee of 100. This latter was formed at the height of the wave of radical enthusiasm throughout Britain which stemmed in 1961 from the first C of 100 actions in London. In consequence it got off to an hopeful start and seemed to be succeeding in its task of making the Bomb a central issue in politics. Writing a year after its formation in an article intended for Peace News Will Warren illustrated this mood of optimism saying (in part)

From its start in October 1961 the Committee was plunged into action. Little more than a week later its members joined the demonstration at the Soviet Embassy, some, being arrested. Shortly afterwards special leaflets were produced and given out at a Communist Party meeting where an attempt was being made to whitewash the Soviet bomb. Then came preparations for December 9th. It was decided to organise a mass sit-down at U.S.A.F. Airstrip Number One, Brize Norton. The Working Group met almost every night, visits were paid to many sympathisers, leaflets duplicated, banners made, police interviewed; and in one way or another most of the members were involved. One Sunday in November a Public Forum was held in St. Giles with Verdun Perl (Prospective Liberal Parliamentary Candidate for North Berks.) in the chair and Vanessa Redgrave as principal speaker. This meeting drew what was described as the biggest crowd and most attentive audience at an open air meeting in Oxford since the war. Briefing meetings were held and at the final one, intended for all demonstrators, full and precise information was given and frank discussion took place in spite of the presence of two C.I.D. officials (sporting N.D. badges). This openness was the subject of much discussion afterwards. The demonstration at Brize Norton was successful and encouraging. The arrest of the marshalls at Witney before the march started only served to show how important is clear briefing to as many demonstrators as possible. The march carried on with every man his own marshall. Selective arrests were made as a result of which a number of demonstrators spent Christmas in Oxford prison.

The Committee learnt lessons from this demonstration and soon began preparing future ones.

An Industrial sub-committee, consisting of Trade Union members and supporters, with a large degree of autonomy has been set up and is pursuing its independent course, although not without criticism. A general meeting to which all on the mailing list were invited was held in Oxford at which policy was discussed, with particular reference to the question of secrecy or openness. A heavy majority at this meeting decided to recommend complete openness to the Oxford Committee. It was an encouraging sign that so many people from a wide area (stretching from Wellingborough to Swindon and Chinnor to Cheltenham) attended and took part in a policy discussion and showed an awareness of many problems that the Committee has to face. Future action was also discussed, including the possibility of a march through Oxford on the evening of the day after the announcement of the resumption of tests at Christmas Island, or whatever it might be re-named. (Dare we suggest Devil's Island?). It was agreed to support the Oxford C.N.D., "Crater March", and the Committee voted £5 towards expenses. Relationship with the C.N.D., in Oxford is not as cordial as one might desire, but many members of the campaign support the Committee's activities and turn up in supporting demonstrations.

On the announcement of the resumption of nuclear testing by the U.S. a march through the main streets of Oxford was called at very short notice, proving the value of the convenor system, and resulted in a march quite as large as

the Crater March arranged by the C.N.D., the week before. Owing to the timetable it was impossible to give the required thirty-six hours notice and consequently the Chief Constable warned that the leaders would be summonsed. As there were no leaders and no marshalls the police selected six people at random and took their names and addresses. The Committee as a whole accepted responsibility.

It is fortunate that no one element dominates the Committee, town and gown are fairly equally represented by men and women of various ages and religious convictions, though it is perhaps to be regretted that their political loyalties are almost exclusively to the left. All this means that the Committee has at its disposal a large variety of talent and experience which should prove adequate to the more ambitious undertakings visualised for the future.

Thus it can be seen that Oxford is no home of lost causes as far as Civil Disobedience and Direct Action is concerned.

However thereafter the C of 100 was affected by the pressure felt throughout the Left to rally behind the Labour Party. Writing of those subsequent years Roy Pateman (then Treasurer) paints a far more sombre note.

On 23/24 June 1962 the Oxford Committee of 100 organised a sit down at Greenham Common Air Base (which has since closed thanks to pentagon policy not to non-violent direct action.) The Organisers went deeply into debt and such has been the depressed state of the committee in this home of lost causes that only recently has the committee which meets regularly once a year nowadays, cleared itself.

The Cuba crisis in October saw a renewed interest in the committee and a crowd of about six hundred 'led' by assorted anarchists, trots and CPs marched through the streets in protest against US blockade of Cuba and, for at least some, the building of missile bases in Cuba by the USSR.

Around Christmas 1962 Richard Wallace started to sell Peace News at Carfax starting with six copies, building up to twelve, twenty-four, fifty and so on. Although the Police led him to believe that he would not be causing an obstruction if he sold the paper he was arrested twice and fined £1 on one occasion and conditionally discharged on another. The second case caused much interest; the NCCL took it up and three city councillors announced that they would sell the paper the next Saturday. The Editor of Peace News talked the matter over with the police and an amicable arrangement was reached.

Reflecting the increasing concern of the committee with other problems of the authoritarian state six members of the committee fasted for four days in protest against money spent on armaments. Money collected was given to Oxfam and five thousand leaflets given out.

Except for discussion meetings of the Oxford Anarchists protest slept in Oxford until after Easter 1963 and the Spies for Peace Revelations Details of RSGs in the event of nuclear attack were given out in Oxford and Witney and Peace News sales shot up to over two hundred.

Three members of the Oxford committee were arrested at Marham V Bomber station in May 1963 and charged with offences under the Official Secrets Act - endangering the security of the state. As one hundred people were eventually charged under the same section the charges were reduced and I for one thought I had got off lightly with fourteen days inside. As I was bound over for three years my revolutionary activity has been restricted to fly posting this quaint cotswold town in the last two years.

Nevertheless the Committee did manage to send large contingents on the two Marham demonstrations, and to Porto.

Late in 1962 chiefly under the influence of Wynford Hicks those who stayed with the Committee felt a need to present a theoretically argued case for their continued commitment & therefore formed the Oxford Anarchist Group. This too suffered from the general decline of the Left & the group dwindled. Losing contact with the Oxford group those who lived near Witney started separate discussions at first as an outcrop of the Oxford group & later as a substitute. However since the election & particularly since Christmas the Oxford group has revived (reabsorbing the Witney one) & of this period Harvey Mellor writes:-

The Oxford Anarchist Group began as a discussion group but after a year became a University recognised society, holding speakers meetings & having a card membership. The original group was maintained as a nominal federation for the benefit of two families of non-University Anarchists who were then active, & one or two other contacts, this proved useful when these latter formed the basis of a Witney Group. This worked quite well for two terms but by Trinity 1964 was beginning to weaken. When I came into the group, having left the Labour Party at the end of 1963, the group was entirely devoted to meetings & discussions. The only action suggested in the group's meetings that term was the anti-election Campaign, but it failed to gain any support. But individual members were more active.

The Oxford Civil Defence being very short in numbers had a recruiting drive, but all their recruiting literature was taken & replaced by Anarchist & CND literature and then their headquarters were bombarded with bogus membership enquiries for the next two months.

A fly-posting session using ILP anti-recruiting posters, and large posters bearing an outline of a missile marked Polaris & carrying the slogan "THE GOVERNMENT'S PHALMIC SYMBOL BUT IT MAY MEAN NO MORE SEX FOR 10,000,000 PEOPLE," had a certain effect, but most were removed very quickly though one of the large ones stayed up on an advertisement hording for three days before someone thought it might not be intended to be there.

There were some attempts to have contraceptive vending machines installed in colleges but without effect.

Anarchists in Merton, as was widely reported in the Press, attempted to bring about the demise of the archaic & incomprehensible mediaeval Latin Grace, always read before Dinner. They were unsuccessful even to the extent of failing to enable the individual to assert the right to contract out of the Grace. After the failure of polite requests & petitions a small number refused to stand during Grace until sconced by reactionaries (briefly sconcing involves having to drink straight down and pay for 2½ pints of beer.) They refused the sconce & were fined £1 each by the College authorities, also being warned of the possible consequences if they carried on with their campaign.

In Michaelmas 1964 the new freshmen seemed on the whole to be Right Wing but at the Freshmen's fair we collected about thirty names of people interested and we already knew of about twenty others in other years. A meeting was held & various comrades were asked to arrange meetings, but they were never seen again. A group of about six continued to meet every week to talk & during this time the philosophy and the possible lines of action were thrashed out, but very little action was done. Despite this this term was perhaps the most important as it was then that the most significant discussion took place.

Slogan painting on the Army Information Office was tried & found entirely useless as it was removed very quickly & efficiently. As the six who continued to meet shared an interest in religious matters as well as in Anarchism and were or had recently been members of the University Buddhist Society we made more progress on the religious front than the political. For non-political reasons, we "took over" and for about a year afterwards continued to dominate the Society's committee. Although we shared an interest in religious matters only three of us were strictly Buddhist the others tending to Sufism.

We continued along the same lines for much of the next term, no-one seeming to want to take the initiative for any action. Increasing dissatisfaction

with the Labour Government led us to think that the time was ripe for more activity and so one comrade decided to put into effect one of the actions we had previously worked out, and organised our first literature sale in Oxford. One Saturday five Anarchists set up in Cornmarket with our banner and piles of literature. Operating by Anarchist principles we asked people to take what they wanted and pay what they could. This may sound un-impressive enough, but it involved breaking six University regulations, and Guy Gladstone was eventually fined £2 after his name appeared in Isis associated with one of our literature sales. By setting up on a piece of ground the police thought belonged to the Church, and the Church thought belonged to the Council we avoided trouble from that quarter. We repeated this twice during Trinity term, and by ensuring co-operation and participation from the Witney Anarchist Group we were able to avoid a 7th University regulation about calling demonstrations, by insisting that the Oxfordshire Federation of Anarchists had called the demo and not the University group. One may well question the use of being a University society if it involves us in such complications, but it was felt that the increased chances of publicity and greater freedom within the University outweighed the other difficulties, but this may no longer be true.

Each demo attracted a lot of attention, groups of up to 30 gathered to see our literature and to argue with us, some asked to come to our meetings, a lot of literature was taken, and though only a little money was collected the first time (15/-) the other two each raised £2-10-0, which is very reasonable for 2½ hours. Nine Anarchists took part in the last one and a few left-wing Labour Party people helped us for short times and others were impressed by our activity. Americans regarded us as a British institution, and by a lot of photographing drew extra attention to us, of course the police also took photographs for their records. Slogan shouting, posters and guitars all helped. We were very successful in getting the group known in Oxford as practically everyone shopping in Oxford on Saturday had to pass us, and it is difficult to ignore a group of Anarchists anyway. Anyone requiring our help either in their campaigns, as for example a priest doing a lot for the gypsies, or as individuals, people wishing to get out of the army or wishing to escape from various State institutions, were able to contact us.

It is interesting to see what went well. Freedom and Anarchy went very well, those not able to pay the high prices for what they get paying less, Direct Action hardly at all, Solidarity somewhat better, Students in revolt very well (one Solidarist once protested to us that we should not sell Solidarity as it had nothing to do with Anarchism!), Peace News quite well, Resistance we always had difficulty with as we kept on selling out very quickly, Minus One, Cuddons Cosmopolitan Review, Views and Comments, sold out the few copies we had, pamphlets and even books sold; badges also sold well, but we never had very many. Our biggest trouble was always selling out. Old copies of Freedom and Direct Action we tried to give away, but unsuccessfully as people kept on giving money for them.

Each time most of the left wing of Oxford saw us and came up to talk, argue and take our literature; this show of activity on our part enabled us to co-operate better with the left in joint activity, particularly through C.N.D..

Notices for the group in Freedom and Direct Action meant that several more people contacted the group, and anonymous donations started to appear in the Secretary's post (amounting to £2-10-0 in Trinity term). Meetings of the group were as well advertised as possible in the university. We had eight discussion meetings and two speaker's meetings in Trinity term, which is usually a dead time for most societies, but we did not find it so. The general attendance at our discussion meetings was between 8 and 15, and we now have over 90 members, or contacts, in the town and university. James Joll spoke to an audience of about 25, but not being an Anarchist himself, more points were scored against Anarchism than for it that evening. Unfortunately (!) we were so active this term that all our discussion meetings were taken up with organisational work, demos, etc, and no serious discussion took place. An Isis reporter came incognito to one of our meetings and an unfavourable report ensued the next week, another Isis report on one of our demos resulted in Guy Gladstone being fined by the Proctors for distributing pamphlets. Cherwell also did a report on the group, and at the end of term Oxford Opinion asked for an article on Anarchism for the beginning of next term, and Nick Gould is writing articles on Anarchism for the new C.O.U.N.D. publication and the new Socialist Group on.

As to demonstrations during this term. The first was the May Day Rally, our participation in which was reported in Cherwell; 15 Anarchists took part, separating ourselves from the rest of the march by walking about ten yards behind, and at the rally considered setting up another speaker on being told that an Anarchist speaker could only speak if his speech was non-sectarian, and we were then treated to a nauseating sequence of speeches telling us to work for the Labour Party.

Contingents from the group took part in demonstrations in London (over Vietnam), Porton (a fast against research for chemical and biological warfare) and at Eton (against Public Schools). One could not help feeling that these were wasted days, and that the self-appointed artistic heroes of the Peace movement at the Vietnam rally have as much in common, or contact with, the people as the M.P.s and C.N.D. bureaucracy who have stood on the same plinth. The incident of the soldier who was arrested showed up the thoughtlessness of some Anarchists who looked more to provoking the police than to their real aims and by so doing ruined what could have been good publicity, and also they made no impact on the majority of C.N.D. supporters who were already in the square and saw nothing. Had a little more sense been used and the Anarchists followed the rest of the March into the square, instead of going straight on, C.N.D. would have been unable to ignore his arrest when it came.

The opening of an Observer Corps centre at Cowley provided an opportunity for a C.N.D. demo. The night before the new building was painted with slogans, and the next day half a dozen of us mounted a feeble demo outside during the official opening ceremony. The painting seems to have been effective as the police gave us as their reason (for not allowing us to see the official opening) the fact that "something" had happened the night before.

We prepared a leaflet for the Queen and Country debate - it is reproduced below - and managed to give away about 800 of these to people going in. The Press and B.B.C. also took some. Peace News thought it a clever idea to send us 250 copies of P.N. for sale at the debate; we might well have got rid of some had it been a more attractive issue, but as it was we could not even give it away. Reports from people inside the Debating Hall, indicated that the right-wing had packed the debate, and were checking off their people on lists. When the tickets for the debate had originally been offered for sale, 500 of them went before lunchtime on Sunday, and the left-wing were surprised by this when they got there in the afternoon. Not only did the quick selling of tickets look like an attempt to pack, but also the right-wing are the only ones who could possibly be up before lunch on Sunday. Inside a few Fascists caused trouble, and they were supported by a demonstration of about 15 others led by Tyndall, Colin Jordan's former deputy, outside. They marched up and down carrying a Union Jack and a few placards, typical ones read "This is a Red Motion" and "Pacifism is Treason". A few minutes after seeing this at 9 p.m. a counter demo was organised. Six of us with the Anarchist banner, together with twenty or so others with Anti-Apartheid placards from Ruskin marched in the opposite direction, driving them off the pavement into the road. The press were treated to the stirring sight of the Union Jack leading a tidy, orderly march one way, with the Anarchist banner leading a larger, but less tidy and orderly march, the other way. Then the police moved us all into Cornmarket, where we formed up at each end of the "Greater Britain Movement", in my opinion a tactical mistake as not a few people thought it was all the same demonstration and not two opposing ones. About 10 p.m. the police moved everyone on. The only person who ended up in trouble with the police was one S.P.G.B. member in the University, who was moved on several times for standing watching, and apparently could not make the police understand that his political opinions prevented him from walking in the street as to walk either way would have been to associate himself with one demo or the other, and that would be "taking part in a not explicitly socialist action." The result of the debate left us all feeling a bit sick; but as far as publicity goes the group did well, our leaflets went down well, and our part in the demo was reported in the Oxford Mail, Oxford Times and the Sun.

Throughout the whole of the time covered by this report individual Anarchists have been active in C.N.D.. Last year we were a small minority of one or two, today, since the abandonment of speaker's meetings in favour of action meetings, and the abolition of the committee, thus returning all power to the meeting (both of which changes the Anarchists were largely responsible for bringing about) we form about half the attendance at meetings. Anarchists continue to organise the selling of Peace News at Carfax every Saturday, and when Anarchists are selling Freedom and Anarchy are sold at the same time.

The Witney Group was founded in Trinity 1964, when the Oxford Anarchist Group was beginning to weaken considerably. From the start there has been liaison between the two groups and joint activity. The Witney Group continues throughout the year, whereas the Oxford Group is tied to the University terms, and so provides greater continuity than would otherwise be possible.

Mention might be made here of two activities that failed:

The first is a board that was prepared by one of our comrades for C.N.D. showing photographs of Vietnam atrocities. He tried to persuade the Oxford Union, various Churches and political clubs to display it, but they all refused. We did eventually use it at the last of our literature sales in Oxford, even though the priest who's land we were on had refused to have it shown there, and it did attract a fair amount of attention.

The other was fly-posting. We found it very difficult to get any good Anarchist posters, and we are tired of slogan painting, which is no where near as effective. We did not want to put up just Peace Movement posters, as we need today to clearly distinguish ourselves from C.N.D.. We may support them, but we are not the same, but we are being confused with them. Several people thought that our demos were simply C.N.D. demos, partly because our Red and Black banner has a C.N.D. symbol in the top corner, a good idea a few years ago when no-one new of us and we wished to be associated with the Peace Movement, today with C.N.D. as it is, and being much better known, we need to distinguish ourselves clearly.

The C of 100 today in Oxford consists of three individuals, though it has much greater support than this in the Anarchist Group and other left-wing groups. Being so small it is naturally not very active, but it has a fair amount of money, and so recently paid for 500 copies of the Hampstead C of 100 "desertion" leaflet to be sent out to servicemen on the Oxford electoral register.

The leaflet prepared for the Queen and Country debate:

WAR IS THE HEALTH OF THE STATE.

Countries prepare for war to distract attention from discontent at home. Your Queen (or rather the real rulers of society) requires you to fight for your country so you will forget the evils they have caused. If you are still discontented you are the agents of your countries enemies.

Dissidents in Russia are "imperialist fascists", in the West they are "rabid communists". Any differences?

Neither here nor in the East are you really needed to fight for Queen and country (Socialist Fatherland); a handful of button pushers will settle the matter (and you).

The myth is that either a "democratic West" based on "free private enterprise" faces a tyrannical East, or it is that the "Workers' Fatherland" is menaced by the dark powers of reaction. Yet the resemblances between the societies outweigh their differences.

U.S.A. (home of free enterprise)

1. Military expenditure - 40% of Gross National Income.
2. Much of rest of economy also state-controlled.

East and West intervene in satellite states (Hungary and Dominica),

they prepare weapons of mass destruction,

they prepare (little) bunkers where they survive, having destroyed us,

both have colour prejudice,

prisons are the normal method of rule,

poverty is universal.

The systems prop themselves up by mutual fear. Willingness to fight for Queen and country maintains the tyranny of Whitehall, the Pentagon and the Kremlin, it does nothing to combat it.

We who believe in a free society will not fight for Queen and country or anyone else.

We are against all government of man by man.

THE HEALTH OF THE STATE IS THE DESTRUCTION OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

Oxford Anarchist Group.

Where do we go from here:

I have given in great detail our activities over the last year and a half, for I think we must now consider again exactly where we are going. We have managed to build the group up again, and there are signs that various left-wing groups are moving towards our position, so our numbers may be even greater after the next six months.

In my opinion the group as it exists today is too much interested in Anarchism for Anarchism's sake; we will have to go back and work out if we are interested in changing society, and if we are, how we intend to do so. Some are saying that we have nothing to do with changing society, we simply want to live as Anarchists, whatever that means. As I see it Anarchism is an attempt to change society.

The Group has had no chance to work out its basic philosophy over the last months as all its discussion meetings have been completely taken over with organisational work, arrangements for demos, etc. I hope we can rectify this next term and get down to some serious thinking again so that we can work out some new forms of action more effective than those we have been using. Since we are no longer sure as a group where we are going, we have got stuck in the rut of conventional forms of political behaviour. A proper analysis of our aims will enable us to find original means of propaganda.

The larger the group becomes the more organisational work is necessary, and the more the time of our most active people is wasted on this. Fruitful discussion also becomes harder. We need to get as many as possible active in some way, sharing the load of work. If the group is to be at all effective it must show in its own organisation that Anarchism does work. If the group grows much bigger some form of decentralisation will be the best way of sharing work, and the most fruitful.

Once the present rate of growth of the Anarchist Group slows down we shall have to re-consider methods of building up the group. Free subscriptions to Freedom and Anarchy for a couple of months is one idea we are already trying for those who seem interested. Our literature sales are very effective. At the moment there are still a great many people who just do not know of our existence, or even if they do, know nothing about us, so anything that gets the name Anarchist put forward seriously is, at the present time, a good thing. Unfortunately there is very little in the way of Anarchist pamphlets that are suitable as an introduction to Anarchism, there is a similar lack of good posters and stickers.

If serious thinking is to be done in the group, there is a need for greater theoretical study of sound practical steps will not result. The serious literature on Anarchism by Anarchists is small, except for periodicals. The literature selling within the group, and good theoretical speakers from time to time, will help in this field.

The non-political aspects of Anarchism need to be put as well as our political side. We have often fallen down on this in the past, but there is a good chance that this can be corrected in the future, but I must add that I differ from those who consider this side to be the whole of Anarchism.

We need to consider our relationship with C.N.D. and the rest of the left. Is there any point in continuing to work on C.N.D.? Should we use it as a ground for converting others to Anarchism, is it still a fruitful ground for this today? Some Anarchists have objected that we are not a left-wing movement, I consider this to be sheer stupidity. Working with other sections of the left allows us to make converts from them, and to co-operate in action in which we share a common interest. But there are dangers in becoming associated in peoples' minds with the left, and we have to be clear why we take part in this action. Many Anarchists seem to see no contradiction between their being Anarchists and taking part in demonstrations calling on the government to give up nuclear weapons. This sort of confused thinking renders us ineffectual and irrelevant. There are reasons for taking part in C.N.D. and Anti-Apartheid rallies, and all the rest of them, but we must be clear what these are if we are to take effective action during them. We are not there to support, for example, a Governmental interference in, or even a Government boycott of South Africa. If we do co-operate with other left-wing movements we have to be certain we do not appear to be yet another left-wing sect. We differ fundamentally from all sections of the right and left in seeing the major evil in the State, whereas other political movements find, or hope to find, their salvation through the State.

We should take part in C.N.D. and the left political movements in so far as these

enable people to see the evils in the present society, once they see these and if they are sufficiently sincere in their desire to overcome and remove them, they will learn through their activity of the futility of relying on the State to deal with these problems, and will come to see the need for an anti-Statist position. This has happened in C.N.D. and continues to happen, and will we hope happen again within the Labour left as it grows as a result of the obvious inability, or unwillingness, of the Labour Government to do anything about these problems. As Anarchists we should try to get others to see the evils of our society, and to assist in anything that will enable people by their own efforts to do anything to solve these, so that by increasing confidence in their own abilities they will see the irrelevance of the State, and from recognising its exploitive nature, they will oppose it.

Participation in demonstrations needs to be re-examined. Today they seem to serve little purpose other than allowing leftist movements to come together to share ideas and to contact each other, they have little effectiveness at the moment in converting outsiders to our position; this requires new methods. Whilst some serious discussion of what these new methods should be does occur amongst the members of the group, it is no longer done within the group, so bogged down is it with organisational work and orthodox demos etc, and this is a great pity.

The actions of many Anarchists at recent large demonstrations shows they have little idea of what they could be doing and are acting out of pure frustration, continuing to act along orthodox lines, through lack of consideration of what they are trying to do, and thus finding themselves irrelevant and frustrated.

As a University group we also need to consider the usefulness of being a University recognised Society as this does hinder our activity at times. When we are growing, do we need this official position? For people hear of our existence anyway without the extra facilities a University Society has for advertisement and ease of action within the University.

Also whilst we do share things in common with other people in the country, as a University group one of main lines of action should be to work within the University itself, to support any signs of discontent against authoritarian tendencies in the University, and to work for a gradualling encroaching Anarchism inside it. (At the same time we should realise that in a University there is more freedom than is likely to be found elsewhere, and also arising from this the opportunities this gives us, using the University as a base from which to propagandize the rest of society) At the moment all our activity is directed in a vague general way to everyone. We support those who are working in Industry and the efforts Anarchists make there to gradually limit the power of the management, and this is what we should be doing here on our own doorstep. Propaganda for our ideals is all very well, but we can only show they will work by starting to build up the new society within the old, and for University students, this means in the University, after that in society as a whole.

We shall also need to consider what part this magazine is to play in the activity of the group. It will form a useful focal point for some of our activities, but it must be a sub-ordinate part. The idea of a local Anarchist paper is that Anarchism must be built from the bottom upwards; we can here deal with local matters, the way we must work in our own area, in the University, in Industry, in the town and in the county as a whole, as well as wider national affairs, and theoretical discussion.

We told them so! Now what?

L.O.

The Spring Council Elections coupled with the Gallup Poles are generally accepted as showing that Labour voters could not be bothered to vote Labour. Whether they in the mass were disillusioned or whether it was the party faithful who are normally expected to go on the knocker & bring voters to the poles who stayed at home is not really at this stage important; what is important is that after only six months the Labour Government has proved to its supporters what we had long tried unsuccessfully to tell them. The Labour Party is not designed to change society, insofar as it reforms at all it does so in the interests of the efficient

sections of business; the fact that steel shares fell when it was thought that nationalisation would not go through should prove to the most purblind that the one section of the community that the Labour Government will never hurt is the employing section. Labour's crawling support for American action in Vietnam & Dominica, & for the aid sent to Tshombe in the Congo under a phony Humanitarian label; Labour's continuation of the Tory oppressive policy in Aden; her retention of the Immigration Bill & of the Independent Deterrent; should by now have convinced any but those who deliberately deceive themselves - whether because they have believed in Labour too long & have not the moral courage to question it now, or whether they hope to join Reg Sorenson, Fenner Brockway & Donald Soper in the Labour Peace Fellowship contingent in the House of Lords.

We told them so of course, continuously before the election a small minority warned that Labour would not attempt to solve any of the more important issues in the world or in this country; we said that the power hungry will not make a stand on an issue of principle unless so many voters are prepared only to vote for those who do that they could not be elected otherwise; (in which case it would no longer be a stand on an issue of principle;) we told them that Labour would find excuses such as the Simonstown agreement or "our pledge to our allies" to continue arms traffic with South Africa, & to continue Nato; we told them that Labour would put the pockets of its M.P.s before those of the pensioners; that Labour would attempt to introduce a wage freeze in a way that the Tories would not dare. We said this but we did not make our words heard - partly because we were too few - partly because even then we did not put enough work into saying it. We & others in the Committee of 100 & one of two factions even smaller than the Anarchists - the SPGB, the left of the ILP, & Solidarity - managed it is true to distribute a variety of leaflets, arguing that for those who wished to play a real role in politics, & fight the evils in society, the vote was not a short cut as it was supposed, but a dead end; by & large the only effect we had was as a nuisance value - we did not reach the party faithful, let alone the mass of voters, but only those who were once active in C.N.D., but who were by then intent on destroying it, so as to kill any possible rival to the Labour Party. Those we reached by & large fell into two sorts, the honest reformers who genuinely did not know what Labour would be like, & those who knew full well - were prepared in fact to admit it in private, but thought that it was clever to help Wilson discredit himself. While it is infuriating to hear (or read) one of the former saying we would not have voted Labour if we had known, (of David Bulton March "Sanity"), especially if one had actually sent the particular reformist a copy of "How Labour Governed" (the record of the crimes of the 1945-51 Labour Government) nevertheless one knows that the honest reformers are capable of learning - the same does not appear to be so of the bulk of the allegedly revolutionary left.

During the election, one frequently heard from those in the Labour Party who had doubts the cry that Labour would at least abolish the death penalty & that this alone would justify support for Wilson; as this is the one issue on which the Government has not yet had time to betray its election promises, it is a cry that is still parroted by Labour supporters with guilty consciences. One wonders why if this were true the Government will not even allow a posthumous retrial for Tim Evans.

No-one likes being proved wrong - no-one likes being told that they had been told, & so there is a danger that if we stress this too much that we will alienate rather than convert; however, where those who advocated support for the Labour Party now claim regard as politically wise and practical men we ought to query that wisdom & the advantages of that practice; where these make pretensions to socialist leadership, we should dismiss such claims by pointing to the record.

The vast mass of Labour voters are unlikely unfortunately in their disillusion to turn to acting for themselves, & so we cannot expect any spontaneous growth of direct action. Far more likely they will in their disillusion (as their forbears did in 45) cease taking an active interest in humanitarian politics, turn cynical & self-seeking and decide that if Tory policies are to be implemented then we might as well have the authentic make. A few equally cynically will no doubt given the temper of politics as it is turn to either Stalinism or fascism. We can not hope with numbers as small as those of the Anarchists, to persuade any large number that there is a way for real socialists provided they are prepared to act for themselves & build socialist organisations outside the context of Parliament oriented politics; unless we can first involve more people in spreading Libertarian socialist ideas, & to do this we must somehow make converts & considerable numbers of the same from among the Labour Party activists. But to do this we cannot afford to allow ourselves to become equated in popular minds with the Conventional Labour and Stalinist Left - even the dissidents therein. Two examples of recent demonstrations in which the anarchists & the Labour Left were involved;-

Here in Oxford the Mayday March Committee began publicizing that it was holding a demonstration backed by all sections of the left, mentioning us by name. Like fools we thought that if we cancelled our own demonstration & provided a large contingent on the March (in fact we were the largest single group behind any banner) the committee would honour its pledge & invite one of us to speak on behalf of the group, we were told graciously that I might speak provided that I allowed my speech to be vetted & made no sectarian remarks-naturally we refused. The star attraction of the demonstration making what was obviously the most important speech, told us that the way to protest against the Labour Government's support for the USA was to go out and canvass for the Labour Party in the elections, an exercise in double-think only equalled by that Government's "Minister of Disarmament" justification before the disarmament conference of Nato. The Chairman's keynote, & the bulk of the other speakers all plugged a generally Labour Party or fellow travelling line, all assured the audience that they had warned before the election that Wilson could not solve the country's problems within the context of Capitalism, although while they may have admitted this in private, they had all canvassed for Labour with no such qualifications. Except for an insult from the chair to ourselves & one other group which was allegedly sponsoring the demonstration, no attempt was made to show that not everyone present supported the Labour Government critically or otherwise. Looking back we can see our mistakes; by carrying our banner in their demonstration, even intending to criticize the organizers we identified ourselves in the eyes of any casual observer with the March & therefore with critical support for the Labour Government; even though we took the anarchist banner away before the demonstration ended, a dissatisfied Labour voter if they had happened to turn up, & had seen the anarchist banner there & heard no speaker say flatly & without qualification that Labour was as bad as the Tories & that votes should be withheld, would have assumed that anarchists in some way support Labour & would have looked elsewhere or given up looking. We can not again allow ourselves to be so outmanoeuvred. Small though we may be, we differ from the Conventional Left in not being discredited, they therefore need us to provide an element of ethical responsibility to their machinations, we are therefore in a strong bargaining position, we should in future refuse to agree to any joint action unless we have a guarantee that for every speaker from the Labour or Communist Parties there will also be a speaker from the Libertarian Left (whether ourselves, the ILP or what) (Liberal speakers not counted under either heading, provided there are no more of them than of the Libertarians.), otherwise we organise distinct demonstrations.

This brings us to the other example, the Aldermaston March. I was not present on the last day so I cannot enter the debate as to how the Anarchists behaved. What is certain is that people who are normally sympathetic to anarchism were alienated & not just those who are prepared to go so far but fade away when they meet a policeman's baton as one writer in Freedom suggested. Resistance had an editorial attacking the sorry spectacle of the Anarchists on the March, (& the editors of Resistance have served on average nine months apiece for direct action) the Socialist Leader carried an attack from Alistair Graham who not only was one of those who joined in on the earliest Direct Action Committee demonstrations, but who also practised do it yourself politics as long ago as 1952 when he founded an integration and anti-fascist grouping in West London - long before these became fashionable. These are people who whether they call themselves anarchists or not have won the right to be heard with respect in anarchist circles. It has been suggested that the demonstrators were once a year anarchists who were never otherwise seen, one wonders to what extent this merely means that they were not residents of the County of London. Comparison has been made with Anarchist behaviour on the last two marches & the myth seems to be growing up that everything was occasioned by the 1962 decision to carry anarchist banners on the Marches - such banners it being suggested attracted the irresponsible; (they hardly attracted anyone in 62 who had not the previous year marched behind the PPU banner.) In point of fact the comparison with 63 is totally inaccurate, that year under the influence of the excitement of the Spies for Peace all sorts of non-anarchists joined the anarchist contingent, at least one YCL banner and one YCND group very much under C.P. influence were classed as anarchists for the day; & very much in evidence were that group of London YCLers normally to be found trying to provoke a punch-up with Mosley's supporters, while admitting that this does no good. They may have been there this year, but also judging by the first day of the March there were many who had canvassed for Labour & were disillusioned (including one Town Councillor.) These new converts to anarchism may well not yet have thought out a method of getting anarchism, may well have found no substitute for their former Labour Party faith & in exasperation & desperation turned to rather immature violence; but this is not anarchists attracting the irresponsible or not exclusively so. If people equated this sort

of action with anarchism this is because anarchists have not provided a sufficient expose of what really should be done; because until recently there was never any suggestion in the major anarchist weekly of any positive anarchist proposals as to direct action & method of struggle; because finally anarchists did not have the sense to provide a more constructive alternative. It was certainly wrong during the March for Anarchists to try to take the front of the March (this, of course, the London Group tried to do on the C of 100 demo last year) but otherwise the mistakes were on the last day. The wisest course might have been to have arranged that at Hyde Park there would be an Anarchist meeting at the time the official C.N.D. March moved off to the Square (with other speakers from revolutionary and libertarian groups) & when this was over (when the Trafalgar Square funeral party had also finished) then there ought to be some properly thought out and constructive civil disobedience. In this way the other marchers would not have been alienated, it would have been apparent that a large section of the March were prepared to put the aims before the interests of the Government, & there would have been an opportunity for fuller consideration of how those aims can in fact be attained by Direct Action. In future a distinct March going to a base might well be arranged.

Since writing the above the Vietnam demonstration in Trafalgar Square has made the question of Anarchist tactics on Marches even more immediately relevant.

Three soldiers were on the March & we had reason to know that the police would arrest these; the need for solidarity action was obvious & except for those of us who argue for non-violence on all occasions whether as moral principle or as an invariable tactic, it may be that there was a strong case for the use of violence, (& it behoves those of us who are Pacifist to prove in action that non-violence would have succeeded.) But even if violence was intelligent, Anarchist conduct on that march was stupid, long before we came near the police a batch started drawing attention to the soldier by linking arms & slowing down to snail's pace, disrupting the march in so doing & thereby alienating those of the March who did not know what was going on; when we reached the square it would have been possible to wheel right, enter the square by the nearer steps where there were only two police and therefore have taken the soldier down to join the main body of the demonstration, where the police would have been unlikely to risk the unpopularity that would have ensued & where the press would have had to take photographs; as it was the group marched forward still at snail's pace (therefore allowing the police to send for re-inforcements) towards where the largest body of police in sight were. The police were able to choose the time to attack had their own vantage point & had all the initiative, in terms of violent riot it was a flop, the only people it can have satisfied were those who wanted a fight for the sake of a fight & were not interested in the ostensible reason of keeping the soldier from arrest. When I say that the Pacifist has a duty to prove that non-violence would work better, we have a duty to prove it better than intelligently used violence, I am prepared to be dogmatic to the point of refusing to bother to compare what happened with non-violence, since what happened was so palpably foolish & so inefficient that it can not be seriously considered.

Class Society and the Popular Reaction to it.
Jolfe Rosse.

The immediate reaction in most people when an old evil is rectified - however partially & inadequately - is relief & a willingness to disregard the defects that accompany the reform & to believe that these are only temporary. Therefore it is natural that modifications of the nature of class rule are followed by periods in which triumph & relief leave no room for doubt, (whatever the palpable facts of the actions of the new ruling elite - provided the crimes they perpetrate are not the crimes their predecessors perpetrated it is assumed that the new crimes are merely incidental & unimportant & that time will cure them.) Reaction against a new ruling elite is not therefore instantaneous, popular consciousness is certain that the rule of the Capitalist, Aristocrat, or King has been ended & having believed for so long that all evils in our society stemmed precisely from this rule, this popular consciousness is assured that while there are no doubt residue elements of the illness these will vanish with the fullness of time, & that therefore there is no longer a need for radical struggle against the establishment. There can only thereafter grow up a mass radical movement-or

anything approaching a mass movement - when people have become adapted to the new system & begun to react against this, when indeed to some extent the evils of yesteryear have been forgotten so that people can begin to look at the evils of today; to this extent the growth of conservatism & apathy that follows a period of social change is an inevitable precursor of the new growth - while the persistence of the more honest of yesterday's reformers in speaking as if nothing had changed positively delays any new radical emergence.

When the reforms are such as merely to increase the power of what is already recognised as the dominant section of the ruling class, this lag between the establishment of the new order & the emergence of a radical antithesis is not apparent as though the tactics of the old radicals may now be out of date, nevertheless the fact that the structure of class rule has merely been modified, & that therefore only a modification of radical tactics is necessitated, means that in the interim the residue of the old radicalism can do duty for the new. When however the modifications are such as to involve not a change in the nature of the rule of one particular class, but the attainment of power by a new class; though the actual reforms that made this difference need not be much more fundamental than those which re-adjust the old class rule - they nevertheless involve for their contradiction not merely a change in tactics but in strategy. As a result the main body of last year's reformers are now either totally irrelevant or (since their policies would merely re-inforce the position of the new rulers) positively harmful; the minority who have anything valid to say may be either those who showed greater perspicacity than their fellows & adapted faster to changing circumstances, or those who never adapt the remains of that saving remnant fortunately always to be found on the Left which is concerned to speak not in terms of tactics but in terms of eternal truths of social justice.

Where there is a need only for a changed radical tactics & where the former radical movement is therefore not totally irrelevant, protest against new evils is grafted onto the old movement & the new tactics emerge gradually within the larger body. But where the change in conjunction with earlier changes amounts to a fundamental social transition, the fact that the old Left is irrelevant causes it to get bogged down in passing motions in committees & the new growth is totally independent - though it absorbs the more radical elements from the old. This is both a strength and a weakness as will be seen if one examines the Chartists, the classic example of such a growth in this country. They had to start from scratch, but they started unhampered by the dead-weight of the past, & they came nearer to overthrowing Industrial Capitalism than any subsequent movement, (even though they had no adequate analysis of what Capitalism was.)

Industrial Capitalism emerged economically in this country during the latter half of the eighteenth century - an age of considerable technological advance - as a result the new bourgeoisie produced by this "Industrial Revolution" found itself forced to act against both the old mercantilist rulers & the remaining landowning aristocrats who had not been absorbed by the mercantilists; throughout the first half of the nineteenth century the new Capitalist class struggled first for power & then to extend their conquest to a position of near monopoly. During the same period partly out of the old radicalism, partly independent of it, emerged the earliest specifically working class protest movement. Abroad this accession to power by the bourgeoisie was seldom as easy & the different stages were therefore more marked but the end results were the same. It is often remarked that, Thermidor, Brumaire & even the restoration of the Bourbons did not lead back to a pre-Capitalist society; it is obvious that the French Revolution did not lead to a classless society, it is less often added that it also did not lead to the conquest of power of those mercantilists who at first seemed to be the class most ready to gain. The French Revolution & the subsequent happenings represented the simultaneous attainment of economic & political power but the productionist capitalist class, & the society produced was in no sense mercantilist, anymore than it was aristocratic or egalitarian. Traditional radicalism was therefore made irrelevant - at first the Cordeliers & the Baboeuvistes - might talk in terms of revolution betrayed & might argue that all that was needed to maintain the original aims of the revolution against those who had usurped it & allowed the old order to disfigure the new. Their arguments failed to meet general response since their analysis clashed with the general consciousness or the demonstrable facts of the case; as a result they had to make way for new radical arguments rooted in new circumstances. It was this that gave rise to the emergence at the end of the Chartist period of scientific socialism; the Chartists had attempted to reconcile the radicalism of the past with the circumstances, (indeed a specifically proletarian anti-capitalist consciousness could only grow up after the working class had had experience of struggling against the middle class

liberals; such struggle had to be fought more in terms of Humanism & fundamental values of liberty & ethics, than in terms of any full political analysis:) but as the working class learnt, from its experience of Chartism, the realities of Capitalist rule; it turned to theories which fitted this experience. The fundamental postulate which justified the early scientific socialists in discarding former radical beliefs was that developments of industry & the mode of production determine the economic infrastructure of society & that this in turn shapes the political superstructure; both the nature of class rule & popular reaction to it.

The invention of the conveyor belt, & the development of the internal combustion engine & evolution of the car, coupled with the invention of wireless all of which were seen at the end of the last century, ushered in a period of far greater technicological change, than anything seen as a result of the steam engine & the flying shuttle. The Russian Revolution & the Stalin-Hitler era also to a far greater extent than the French Revolution & the Napoleonic Wars, released new social & political forces, so that new strata emerged both politically & economically to dominate society. As before there were the same cries that the Revolution was betrayed, the same debate as to the nature of Thermidor & its potential outcome, the same belief that evils were merely the residue of the old order & would vanish in time or would be eradicated by further advances of the radical movement; as before the cure advanced to evils produced by the measure of the reformers was more of the same sort. The "Infantilist" Left Communists, the Russian "workers' Opposition" & "Democratic Centralists," & other such groups argued for instance that the Bolsheviks had only imperfectly overthrown Capitalism in Russia & that though Capitalism in order to restore itself would be forced to adopt new forms it would nevertheless inevitably so do. In this they mirrored the Orthodox Communist critique of social-democracy. The fact that though during the Thirties practically everything evil that could be imagined was true of Russia, & yet there was no significant move to return to the forms of rule of traditional capitalism; coupled with the New Deal & the later rearming Social Democrat Governments in the Capitalist world; & also the fact that the owners of the bulk of German Capital died in the Nazi Gas chambers, meant that classical socialist theory became more & more unrelated to popular consciousness of the world & from this fact if from nothing else less & less scientific. In these circumstances a variety of attempts were made to define the nature & the limits of the growth of the new ruling class. (1) The first serious attempt - that of Bruno Rizzi was plagiarized & oversimplified in Burnham's *Managerial Revolution*; but though Burnham made no significant contribution to the debate, much of the most interesting thinking on the subject was made by such American Marxists as Carter, Schachtman, MacDonald, & Dunayevskaya. Ure & James, Chaulieu & Orwell all contributed analyses that at the time made an impact - during or soon after the war, & lesser known radicals - Fontennis in France & Buck Taylor in this country were more concerned to determine how to overcome the new oppression than those who got more publicity. Paul Cardan's *"Modern Capitalism & Revolution"* (Solidarity 3/6) is the latest of such; while it does much to refute the illusions of more ante-diluvian Marxists, & while even for those of us who travelled the same way long ago it may well be essential reading, it is nevertheless a very disappointing book; the writer, the translator, & the publishers have all severally done far better than this in the past both in written articles & in lectures (or conversation).

---- (1) There are of course always political flat earthers to be found to deny any development, a typical example of "socialist" refutation of the anti-Managerialist thesis is the beginning of Robin Blackburn's essay *"The New Capitalism"* in the New Left symposium *"Towards Socialism"*. Though in this there is a reference (in a footnote) to Burnham there is none to any other writer who described Managerialism as twentieth century tyranny rather than twentieth century socialism. Much play is made with the fact that management papers make no mention of the Managerialist Revolution, (it would be interesting to know of any Capitalist papers in the early part of the 19th Century which referred to the Capitalist one,) & any available straw is produced to prove that Managerialism does not exist. As the policies which the writers in this symposium advocate in their several journals would lead to a considerable extension of Managerialist rule, & their condemnation of Wilson stems from the fact that his compromises with the old ruling class inhibit the rise to power of the new, it is not surprising that these "socialists" wish to deny the facts.

The book refutes many traditional dogmas of the Left - immiseration, boom-slump, militant & active working class commitment to socialist policies; & painstakingly describes the nature of existing bureaucratic society, the way in which it is moving & its limiting factors; it advances a series of minima, (essential to any revolutionary movement,) which if they may not add up in themselves to a full recipe for the radical movement of the future nevertheless effectively debar many of the harmful survivals of the past, & signpost the way towards what is needed. All of this is useful & indeed necessary, why then is it disappointing? The faults are harder to pinpoint. One can only make a series of quibbles & hope that consideration of these will lead the publishers to work out a way of saying the same thing in a more lucid way & to drawing conclusions not as yet even remotely suggested. Many of the defects are no doubt caused by the desire to justify their views in the eyes of rival Marxists. Thus while there is great emphasis put on the fact that classical socialists talk in a language not understood by the masses, considering problems that only exist in their theories & the experience of the 19th Century, & shaping these in unintelligible jargon; nevertheless the term alienation recurs constantly used to describe at least three distinct concepts of which the most intelligible is the tendency to dehumanization experienced by workers doing routine jobs in modern mechanized factories; the plain English for which (pace the materialists) is that they do soul-destroying work. Humanitarians (whether anarchist or pacifist-socialist) have been concentrating on this aspect of the evil of class society for some time, but the book talks as if no one had mentioned it until Marxists began to rediscover Marx's earlier essays about ten years ago, & even among fellow Marxists there is little readiness to accept that others may have read these.

The evolution of capitalism is defined as: "the constitution & development of two classes of men & a struggle in which neither class can act without acting on the other;" & from the context it is clear that capitalism is seen as the only society in which this is true. Elsewhere mention is made of the Capitalism described in Kapital as being an early stage of capitalist development whereas we are now in a late one, it is clear that Mercantilism is not seen as a capitalist society. Now if the fact that working class action is essential to the development of capitalist rule, (as distinct from peasant or slave revolts which were alleged not to have affected the rulers) is the hall-mark of capitalism, then anything like Orwell's 1984, (where the bureaucratic rule is complete & where automation has made the acquiescence of the vast body of proles unnecessary, since there are more than adequate means of suppressing them, provided that discipline in the middle strata -inner party- is maintained,) would no longer be capitalist. But if capitalism cannot embrace the degree of bureaucracy foreseen by Orwell then it is highly questionable if it can contain the degree foreseen by Cardan. On the other hand it is unproved that the mutually necessary hostility that is seen between the bourgeoisie & the proletariat (though it may provide proof of dialectical orthodoxy & may be a nice rounded phrase by which to delimit capitalism,) is lacking from the relations between the merchants & their employees - once these had evolved into hereditary classes, or differs in kind rather in degree from such. While if Mercantilism were seen as a variant of capitalism it would be hard to show at what period in history it became dominant & hard too to exclude some pre-mediaeval societies. Indeed the whole theory that bureaucratic society (or state capitalism) is an higher stage of 19th century-type capitalist development, rather than that both are distinct variants of capitalism is in some senses a reversion to that earlier Left Communism which Rizzi showed to be inadequate. In this there is an interesting contrasting resemblance with Fred Longden's "Proletarian Heritage" (Strickland Press 1948). It is this that may account for the fact that the desiderata (good though they are) for the new revolutionary movement nevertheless give inadequate thought to the problems of breaching the communications barrier between those who are already revolutionary & those who while discontent have nevertheless been bought by the Bureaucracy & form the lower levels thereof, whose conversion is an essential prerequisite of revolution.

The publishers somewhat peevishly complain of being called anarcho-marxist & are at pains to say that anarchists are out of date as well as Marxists. The term anarcho-marxist is both specific & flexible. Specifically it means one who on a basis of a Marxist analysis of society (as it is rather than as it was in Marx's day), rejects Marx's immediate measures & for reasons quite other than those posited by the classical anarchists advocates an anti-statist socialism. Loosely it covers a wide variety of interpretations of

such anti-statist socialism & does not specify which policies proceed from the rejection of state socialism. It is certainly not (as Solidarity seems to infer) a term of abuse. It is a term which in their day accurately described Johann Most, the early French Syndicalists & the first Wobblies in America; and to a lesser degree described elements of the thinking of William Morris & even Daniel De Leon, Eugene Debs & the Guild Socialists who rebelled against the orthodox Marxism of their day & prophesied that the policies of the Social Democrats (parliamentary Reformism supplemented by strikes & street demonstrations) would not overcome Capitalism which would merely adjust itself & absorb the reformers. Though many such Anarcho-Marxists & indeed many classical Anarchists supported the Bolsheviks, Bordiga, Pannekoek, Korsch, Serge & others again in their revolt against the new Bolshevik orthodoxy posited an Anarcho-Marxism; which in turn gave rise to the "bureaucratic centralist" critique of Trotskyism, & the critics from that period have since either evolved an anti-state position or returned to social democracy. (To say nothing of those who moved further right). As for the charge of archaicism those anarchists (& they are the majority) who base their arguments not on an analysis of society but on Humanist appeals based on the intrinsic desirability of freedom & equality, & the inherent evil of rule of one man over another, do not merely speak in a way that has an eternal validity but in a way that has a natural appeal to those who protest against a bureaucratic collectivist society. It may be that from a post-Marxist viewpoint those who are not interested in economic determinism, & who proclaim Mahkno, Zapata & Wat Tyler as their political forbears are right for the wrong reasons; but insofar as their arguments are attuned to the discontents of today, right they nevertheless are. It is only those who are under the erroneous impression that they are scientific socialists & who believe with the Marxists in believing that socialism can only come in an economically advanced country, but who nevertheless have not bothered to examine the nature of existing society who can fairly be dismissed as Adullanites. For the Humanist Anarchists (as perhaps for the SPGB) the nature of existing class society is irrelevant; & at least at this stage at the beginning of a new class dictatorship they speak to the condition of those in revolt, - which is the first requisite of a scientific revolutionary.

+ + + + +

Since this article was written Solidarity has held a meeting in London, at which Paul Cardan spoke on his book at some length, & then in a very interesting speech Alasdair MacIntyre illustrated the thesis with a fair amount of new & specifically English material to introduce discussion. This last however was somewhat un-edifying, the traditional Marxists (obviously to a pre-arranged pattern) monopolized discussion and used every scabrous phrase of Marxist abuse up to and including that "gem" made famous in the late thirties by Strachey, whereby those who refuse to work in the Labour (or perhaps Communist) Party are told that logically since they oppose the "mass organisations of the working class" they should also not be Trade Unionists & what is more should logically blackleg during strikes. (As Ken Weller of Solidarity said, "We are not in the Labour Party partly because its leaders consistently blackleg.") But while the debate demonstrated the bankruptcy of the traditional and entrust leftists, it emphasised the faults in Cardan's book, at a variety of points too trivial in themselves to mention. Cardan in his book shows that he has only partially shed his Marxist fetters, & debating with other Marxists he enthusiastically redonned these. He was fairly accused of plagiarism, & of having attacked Marx for not having said things which he had in fact said, but none of his opponents (any more than he) referred to others who had analysed the growth of bureaucratic centralism since the New Deal, the rise of fascism & of Stalinism; & a certain piquancy was given to this by the fact that among those silent & not called to speak was the editor of Contemporary Issues a paper which had been founded on the basis of the same social analysis fifteen or more years before.

A few thoughts on factory farming.
by Pateman.

Last June yet another committee was appointed; this time to consider "the conditions under which livestock are kept under systems of intensive husbandry and to advise whether standards ought to be set up in the interests of their welfare." Two factors which led to the late lamented government instigating this action.

were the publication of Mrs Ruth Harrison's book "Animal Machines" product of three years careful research and serialised in "The Observer", and the activities of Animal Machine Action Groups who demonstrated outside Battery Egg Farms and Intensive Veal Units.

Several bodies have submitted evidence to the committee and most unsportingly released it to the press at the same time. The Humane Farming Campaign, the Universities Federation for Animal Welfare, the RSPCA and the Soil Association (vaguely) are calling for the banning of battery cages, intensive methods of veal production and on sweat box pig rearing.

Apologists for modern intensive livestock production say it is here to stay as a cheap and efficient form of farming. Opponents that it is intensive exploitation, mass production extended towards sensitive creatures, unable to defend themselves and subjected to inhuman treatment for nothing but to make money.

Most of the eggs we consume in this country are British! and 25% of these are from Battery units. The largest Battery farmer is Jack Eastwood of Notts and he hopes eventually to produce 25% of the market. (Here is a rare case where Marx has been proved correct: - in his assumption that under Capitalism large scale agricultural production will triumph.) Battery birds do little besides eat, drink, talk and lay eggs. Costs and mortality are less than with free range birds and profits more. One of the few virtues of the battery cage is that it eliminates stresses which man has imposed, for example on the deep litter system, by lack of attention to detail. Under this latter system infection with parasites and micro-organisms may reach dangerous proportions necessitating the use of food additives such as antibiotics. The emergence of resistant strains of bacteria as a result of the continuous use of anti-biotics may have possible repercussions on the health of consumers. Further, under the deep litter system overcrowding can lead to feather pecking and cannibalism which however can be controlled by debeaking. This operation when properly carried out is a painless process rather like cutting your nails has made some of the anti-factory-farming party rather cross.

It is doubtful whether one can class all this as cruelty, the birds brain is about 2gms compared with our 1500gms and is less convoluted and fissured than ours. Their capacity to feel bored, frustrated and angry must be limited. However if one feels strongly about eating battery eggs buy Danish; they have banned batteries.

A common complaint is that Broilers haven't the flavour of the old boiler fowl. This is because the modern spring chicken is slaughtered at nine weeks when still a baby against the tough old bird of 18 months. The Broiler industry is controlled by three large firms which are closely integrated and certainly produce a cheap source of meat. Undoubtedly overcrowding exists in many broiler houses and the birds suffer from considerable stress - for this reason a 200' long shed will be lit by only two watts. Not only is it cheaper but it keeps the birds quieter than a lot of bright unsettling lights. The broiler chicken is not subject to meat inspection but the producers have their own grading standards and diseased sub standard birds go to make soups and pastes. It is not thought these constitute a danger to public health. There is no evidence that battery eggs and broiler chickens are less nutritious than the free range variety. They do though have less Thiamine.

At a recent meeting where Mrs Harrison spoke to a group of farmers a veal producer vigorously defended his methods. There has been a considerable increase in veal production in the last ten years much of it going for the kosher trade and some being exported. Calves are fed for twelve weeks on a milk substitute diet; in order to obtain white flesh the diet is deficient in iron and the haemoglobin counts of veal calves are lower than traditionally fed calves. The animals are kept on slatted floors and are not given any roughage, this is considered essential as calves fed hay or straw will not drink sufficient substitute and not put on weight quick enough. I have seen young calves out on grass eating quite a fill of grass so there does seem to be some deprivation under this system. In earlier days it was thought that complete darkness and high temperature were essential and you would find very miserable looking calves but now they are usually kept in lighted buildings at a lower temperature of about 63'. They are not usually tethered but often have less floor space than is recommended by the Ministry of Agriculture. The intensity of stocking is not reflected in greater deaths than with natural rearing of calves. One big veal farmer producing 1200 calves a year only loses 2% of his calves as compared to 8% on other farms, but 25% of the calves he buys in do not thrive under the system, and are killed before they are 12 weeks old, even though they are dosed with antibiotics.

About half a million animals slaughtered for beef last year were fed on a ration mostly consisting of barley. Providing the animals are given a little hay, good airy housing without draughts and the calf house is disinfected periodically they do not appear to be any worse off than bullocks grazing poor pasture outside. About 30% of their livers are condemned at slaughter but this seems to have little effect on the animal. Some beasts are implanted with synthetic sex hormones to make them grow quicker but there is growing butcher and consumer resistance to this practice, understandably.

Only about twenty sweat box systems of pig keeping exist in this country and there appears little justification on the scientific evidence available for the adoption of it generally. The pigs are kept in a temperature of 80° and humidity of 90% and generally look pretty sad, which is a pity for such intelligent, normally clean animals. Increasing numbers of pigs are being kept on slatted floors and the pigs are cleaner and drier than on solid floors. In some intensive systems it has been necessary to dock the tails of young pigs for the purpose of preventing tail biting at a later stage in growth; even so tailless pigs will bite ears if perverted by overcrowding and bad management.

Even rabbits are kept under intensive systems; about 40% of domestic production is provided by broiler units. The Universities Federation for Animal Welfare recommends that all commercial rabbit producers should be registered as standards of stockmanship are poor in some cases.

Whether the practices I have covered above constitute cruelty I leave for anarchists to judge. It seems evident that ruthless exploitation of animals and birds for pure gain is bound to have in the long run a deleterious and degrading effect on human personnel involved. On the other hand many stockmen in intensive units are highly skilled and with an innate feeling for animals.

+ + + +

The author teaches in an Agricultural Technical College.

+ + + +

Police Subversion

by Ahmad

The police are known to have files on many Anarchists. Special Branch men are continually subverting our activities & those of all people opposed to the State. Disguised as anything from respectable Liberals to drug addicts they attend our meetings & by reporting back to their headquarters can arrange pre-emptive action to frustrate our efforts to create a free society. By letter-opening & telephone-tapping & all the technological means available to the police in a modern State, they make a mockery of the freedom which the State purports to uphold. When these methods fail they resort to others such as the planting of bricks and drugs and the employment of agents provocateurs which are completely incompatible with the freedom they claim to defend.

To combat this we are proposing to carry out the following:

1. To obtain photographs and keep files on all plain clothes policemen working in the area.
2. To observe and record the beats of policemen and the regular routes of police cars and motorbike patrols.
3. To compile a list of private cars used by the police.

Would anyone with information, or who is prepared to help, or would be interested in the results of our investigations please contact the Oxford Anarchist Group. We hope also to discuss methods of sabotage and evasion of these police tactics.

TRUTH AND

"I hated the Army. I only made the film because I was demob happy. I came out altogether a month after that film was made & I was very glad to do so." He joined as a boy soldier in 1953, & served in Germany Christmas Island & Cyprus with R.E.M.E. In the television film, he is the corporal who looks out from the radiator of a Land-rover & says: "It's a good life in the Army. I have a trade & £1,000 in the bank & that is not bad for a young man. Mr Bignall a gardener at Parkhall Camp Oswestry said: I have to laugh when I see

myself on television. I was hand-picked for the job because I was an ex-boy soldier. It took all day to make the film & I didn't get a penny. Honestly I didn't like the Army one little bit." He made the film when he was stationed in Malta nine months ago. It was released two months ago.
From a report in the National Press.

A police constable whose picture appears on hundreds of recruiting posters in Hampshire & the Isle of Wight is leaving the force next month.
GUARDIAN June the twenty-first.

A smaller percentage of Negro children attend integrated schools today than did before the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

Leonard Perlman in Contemporary Issues Spring 65.

So much for Parliament & the courts!

Just as there has not appeared in the Cuban leadership any tendency that proposes self management, neither has there appeared any which looks to the development of those bodies which in a socialist democracy express the will of the people: soviets, workers' councils, unions independent of the State, etc.,.....

The revolution has not given enormous material advantages to a great part of the Cuban people. It has brought them on the other hand problems & difficulties which did not exist before.

There was a decrease in the quality & quantity of cattle production as the result of errors committed during the first stage of nationalization of great holdings.

Quotes from "Inside the Cuban Revolution" - Monthly Review October 64 - by Adolpho Grilly a pro-Castro journalist.

So much for Bolshevist "revolution"!

....."TROTUNG"

John Francis

As we go to press, I do not yet know what caused the coup in Algeria. Judging from the fact that all reports in National papers are self-contradictory & from the regularity with which writers unsay what they had said the day before, I suspect that no one else does either. Such evidence as I have suggests that Peking is backing a rightist-nationalist movement. I do not know if this is merely another example of Stalinism in practice, or whether (as has been suggested) it was purely from a desire to hold the Afro-Asian Conference that Peking backed the faction that had until then been Moscow-inclined, & that the same accident has forced Moscow to deplore the Swing to the Right. We as anarchists of course shed no tears at the replacement of one tyrant by another - & of course do not rejoice either, - we never shared the belief (common on the Left) that Ben Bella represented the hope for social-justice in Africa.

Three members of the University group had previously arranged to spend their Vacation in Algeria, they will by the time of publication be on their way there. If they get there & more to the point if they get back again, we will have first hand reports in future issues. Harvey Mellar, who is doing the bulk of the work producing this, is one of the three, so it may well be that if we can not have such reports we equally can not have future issues.

On the home front I await with interest the Gavotte of splits & reunions of the sundry brands of Marxist-Leninism that will follow. In particular since Michel Pablo (a former General-Secretary of the Fourth International) is one of the deposed Ministers, -at least I assume he is deposed,- (it would be even more intriguing if he were not,) I look forward to amusing divertissements from the various Trotskyist groups, especially since Pablo was removed from office for preferring Khrushchev to Mao & for too uncritical support of Ben Bella. As far as I know only three of the four bodies now claiming to be the Fourth International have sections in this country; (though associated with the editors of the "Militant" & "The Week" are members of leftist & rightist tendencies within the "United Secretariat"); & so there is no one immediately associated with Pablo to be disturbed by Algerian events. But nevertheless since the other three "Fourths" are all pro-Peking it will be interesting how they explain away this Stalinist doublecross, or whether at last they will make their criticism of Communism fundamental & do more than pay lip-service to internationalist socialism.

Editor's note

This article with its acceptance - indeed emphasis on the need for Government supervision of the process of disarmament may seem oddly out of place in a magazine edited by anarchists; but it is the writer's belief that the cold war presents a danger so immediate that any solution in terms of converting the masses to anarchism is hopelessly idealistic. He believes that unless we persuade the general public that disarmament is desirable, we will never stop the arms race; and that it is easier to convince them of the benefits of peace than of the benefits of anarchism; so if we are Pacifists first and Anarchist second we must not shrink from offering or supporting non-anarchist remedies for the problems of international conflicts.

Some of us would argue that any distinction on these lines between an individual's pacifism and his anarchism is impossible, and would add that Governments will never (indeed unless yielding to very considerable pressure for disarmament cannot) take the steps that would lead to real Peace; (that Governments exist to maintain power and that they never voluntarily abandon such power unless it be to prevent future greater loss, so that the only circumstances in which a Government would willingly disarm would be if there were a very militant mass movement for unilateral disarmament able and liable to use civil disobedience on a very wide scale in a way that would be almost if not completely revolutionary and then only if it were thought that disarmament would kill the pro-disarmament movement and that therefore the surrender of power would be merely temporary; that further such a movement can only come about on the basis of clear-cut and dramatic demands flying in the face of the normal compromises of politics; but accepting that not all anarchists are agreed on this question we offer the article below for criticism and comment. It raises too wider questions; for even if we are convinced of the feasibility of an anarchist society we have perhaps given too little thought to the problems of clearing up in an anarchist way, the mess left by existing society; while even if we accept the possibility of getting governments to make worthwhile reforms for us if we are to compromise our anti-state position to achieve this, we have to show how the gain is to be maintained and the government inhibited from undoing the good later?

What methods should anarchists advocate in the immediate future, for the solution of such problems as say the population explosion and its attendant evils? Can non-authoritarian remedies be practical in the context of the existing political set-up? The questions must be faced and we hope this article may provide one among many starting points for its consideration.

DISARMAMENT AND BRITAIN'S ECONOMYNick Gould

This country is at present spending on Defence about £2,100 million a year - getting on for £40 a year for every man, woman and child in Britain, or about £60 a second altogether. This expenditure may be essential to our survival, or it may merely be a particularly elaborate and costly way of committing mass suicide: for the moment we will assume not only the desirability but also the possibility of disarmament, and consider solely whether it is economically feasible or not.

We will confine our remarks to Britain, though they would apply equally to other West European countries: the U.S. presents special problems, owing to its vastly greater present dependence on arms expenditure, the greater concentration of this expenditure in certain areas, such as California and Texas, and the traditional American dislike of Government planning.

Precisely what, in terms of money and men, is involved in today's defence business in Britain? Of the figure of £2,100 million per annum already mentioned, about one-third goes in pay to servicemen, and to civilians directly employed in Defence; most of the rest goes to the industries supplying the armed forces. About 1,100,000 persons are directly employed in Defence - 440,000 in the armed forces, 260,000 civilian employees of the Ministry, and 410,000 as research,

(c) The electronics industry at present has about $\frac{1}{4}$ of its labour force of 270,000 engaged on defence work: but these men would have no difficulty in finding new jobs. Electronics is an expanding industry, with many unrealised possibilities in peaceful fields. Also, even more than the aircraft industry, it is concentrated in the booming South-East. It is arguable that Defence work is actually hindering this industry, by employing skilled men badly needed for work on civil projects.

With one exception, other industries present no problem; for the proportion of Defence work to total in, say, the motor industry is very small, and disarmament would cause less disruption than many of the normal fluctuations of the economy. The exception is Ordnance, Small Arms and Explosives; it can hardly be expected that demand for sporting guns and fireworks will rise sufficiently to take up the slack! Approximately 40,000 men might be put out of work here: since the majority are directly employed by the Government in Royal Ordnance Factories, they could reasonably expect adequate Government assistance in the form of retraining and re-employment schemes.

How could the money saved by disarmament be spent? During the transition period, obviously, it would all be needed for the various purposes discussed above. Thereafter, the way it would be used depends to some extent on the political complexion of the Government of the day. Any or all of the following measures could be employed:-

(1) Reduced Taxes: This would stimulate private spending, and so give a boost to the economy in general - but it is noting that this effect would be greatest where the reductions benefited the lower income groups; the rich would be more likely to save the extra money, which would be undesirable - to avoid a slump the money saved needs to be re-injected into the economy; it must be used for peaceful purposes with similar economic effects to those of military spending.

(2) Increased Pensions and Allowances: The results of this would be similar to the above; very little of such money would be saved by the recipients.

(3) Easier Monetary Policy

(4) Increases in Development Programmes for Nationalised Industries

(5) Subsidies to Private Industries: These would all provide means of increasing directly productive investment. At present the proportion of our national income spent on capital investment is considerably below that of e.g. the Common Market countries.*

(6) Social Investment: Anyone who is afraid that disarmament would be followed by a slump need only consider the immense amount of work that needs to be done in this field: education, housing, roads, health services - all the money saved could be spent on these alone, without any unnecessary expenditure. Moreover, increased spending on e.g. housing could provide short-term employment in areas where it is particularly needed: since the worst slums and the worst unemployment often go together, this would serve a double purpose.

(7) Research: 40% of all research in this country at present is on military projects: it is sometimes argued that great benefits accrue to civil industry from discoveries made in military research. Up to a point this is true; but it is plain that far greater benefits would result from the transfer of that 40% to direct work on peaceful projects. Indeed, one possible reason for the superior industrial techniques of e.g. West Germany and Japan may be that their scientists and technicians are not so much taken up with military work: whereas in Britain a Government White Paper showed that in 1959 defence absorbed 20,000 graduates, scientists and engineers - while at the same time there were immediate vacancies for 10,000 such men in industry and peaceful Government work. A sensible proposal is that the Government might keep on all military research workers after disarmament,

* Note that even now private industries needing special help, such as agriculture and aircraft, receive some assistance. Help would be needed over some years for industries and areas affected by disarmament or already in decline. Grants to firms moving into regions of high unemployment are an obvious example.

development and production workers (Ministry of Defence estimates, mid-1962: the latest figures available). In addition, there is the labour engaged in sub-contract work, ancillary services and the like: so it would probably be safe to assume that about 2 million workers would be affected to some extent by an end to Defence expenditure.

How long would be needed to change over to a peaceful economy? Three or four years should be ample. After all, in 1945 we had about 9 million people in the armed forces and the industries supplying them: military expenditure was 46% of Gross National Product. By 1949 these figures were reduced to 1,500,000 and 7% respectively; yet unemployment was no higher than it is today.

The disbanding of today's armed forces, obviously, would be a trivial problem compared with that we tackled in 1945; of course, re-training would be necessary and compensation would have to be paid, and for a few years this might take a considerable portion of the sum formerly spent on defence. But even since the end of National Service, the Forces have had plenty of experience in preparing men for the return to civilian life: total demobilisation would only involve the expansion of the existing machinery. The civil servants put out of work by a rundown in the Ministry of Defence could be used during the transition period to administer the process of disarmament: thereafter most of them would be able to transfer to other departments, such as Housing and Education, expanded as a result of the post-disarmament increase in public expenditure.

It is in the field of industry that most fear seems to be felt about the economic consequences of disarmament; but the disruption it would involve has often been exaggerated. Many workers at present supplying the armed forces would be almost unaffected: for demobilized soldiers would go on needing food, clothing and other consumer goods, if anything in greater quantities than before. Only three major industries would be profoundly affected: aircraft, ship-building and electronics.

(a) The aircraft industry seems likely in the near future to be providing us with a controlled experiment in the economics of disarmament. Whether this process can be carried through without undue inconvenience and hardship to the workers concerned, depends largely on the efforts the Government are prepared to make. At present, about 70% of output in this industry is for military purposes, though less than 50% of the 260,000 workers are engaged in military work. There is no prospect of an increase in demand for civil aircraft sufficient to offset the loss of military contracts; nevertheless some increase is likely, for the underdeveloped countries, if disarmament is accompanied by increased foreign aid and easier credit terms for overseas buyers. Moreover, some diversification is possible within the industry on the lines already pioneered by some aircraft manufacturers, to the production of air-conditioning plant, boats, lorries etc. But most of the men redundant in the aircraft industry would have no trouble getting new jobs: they are skilled men who would be in demand elsewhere, and the industry is concentrated in the South-East, where there is a labour shortage. No doubt large scale help from the Government would still be needed: but it is anyway - disarmament would not add to the problem, but rather provide the setting for a constructive solution.

(b) The ship-building industry has been in decline for years: the further impetus given to this decline by disarmament (at present about $\frac{1}{4}$ of the output of the industry is military) would mean that ship-building could only survive with extensive Government help. In addition, it is concentrated in areas - Scotland, Northern Ireland and the North-East - which already have high unemployment. The increased trade which would accompany a lessening of world tension might increase demand for merchant shipping: but even so other work would be needed for many of the 200,000 men at present engaged in the industry - schemes such as the Government-sponsored experiments in turning some shipyards over to the manufacture of prefabricated housing are a foretaste of what would be needed, but the solution could really only be found in comprehensive plans for the redevelopment of the various regions. The Northern half of Britain has too long been the "poor relation" of the South, and the recent half-hearted Government awareness of the need for large-scale planning in such matters as the locating of industry is long overdue: disarmament could provide a useful and necessary stimulus to decisive action.

for civilian research: this would have advantages over private research, for the financial risks in this field are such as to discourage private industries. Much of the research needed is too general to be of interest to an individual firm; but in some cases it might be feasible for the government to make grants or loans to private industries for research purposes, perhaps conditional upon a contribution from the firm concerned.

(8) Foreign Aid: It is obvious that disarmament would be preceded or accompanied by an easing of international tension; and projects for overseas aid would vastly increase as a result. (At present, aid is falling off, though the need is as great as ever.) Nations are seldom altruistic, even when they can well afford to be: so it may be necessary to point out that greater prosperity overseas would mean increased markets for our goods - in the long run what is good for world economy is good for Britain's economy.

All the above measures would increase employment, and so compensate for the close-down of Defence industries and the disbanding of the armed forces. Clearly, some items would comment themselves more to a Conservative, some to a Labour Government. But under any Government the country would benefit from disarmament, only assuming careful planning and assistance at all stages, and the readiness to replace military expenditure with a corresponding rise in peaceful expenditure. A tenth of the organization and effort at present wasted on preparations for war would be ample to prepare for an enduring and prosperous peace.

"Bibliography":

- The Economic Case for Nuclear Disarmament. (C.N.D.)
 The Economic Consequences of Staying Alive, by Geoffrey Goodman. (C.N.D.)
 Disarmament: What it would mean to Britain's Economy. (United World Trust. An abridgment of the Economic Intelligence Unit's book The Economic Effects of Disarmament.)

ACT FOR PEACE
 Laurens Otter

The raison d'etre of CND (as distinct from older movements) is its unilateralism. Unilateral renunciation of the Bomb, and unilaterally opting out of Nato. Initially two grounds were advanced for advocating unilateral as opposed to multilateral action; morally - people should be responsible for the Government which rules them, (which they support or by their apathy condone;) or politically - the world's statesmen have more in common with each other than they have with those they rule, and so a meeting at the top is unlikely to lead to anything in the interests of those ruled. These arguments apply with equal force in all countries, and they are valid arguments for more far reaching unilateral disarmament.

Can Nuclear Disarmament alone by itself prevent war, judging by the fact that most nuclear disarmers are active in other progressive movements, few if any believe that Unilateral ND is of itself sufficient. Logically since just as it is impossible to fight tanks with pea-shooters, it is also impossible to fight H-Bombs with tanks, Unilateral ND involves more. Given that any war may escalate into a major war it already involves an unilateral pledge to engage in no conflict that might precipitate a world war. Nuclear Disarmers have rightly held that rather than destroy the world we should go voluntarily naked into the Council Chamber, they have not always been prepared for the full implication of this,

Those that have stressed the fundamental and intrinsic importance of unilateralism have been concerned to add that to be complete it must be carried over into the personal field. Those for instance who have used non-violent resistance at rocket bases and elsewhere, have in large part tried so to apply it, as have those who have refused to pay taxes, or have endeavoured to persuade others to refuse to serve in the forces. Obviously there are other fields for such

personal responsibility and these need to be explored, periodic civil disobedience cannot amount to living unilateralism and no one who has used Direct Action would think it did.

Morally many weapons are as vile as nuclear ones, not merely biological, bacteriological and psychochemical ones whose renunciation as weapons of mass destruction is implicit in the whole moral perspective of CND; but also Napalm and heavy conventional bombing.

"In front of us a curious figure was standing a little crouched, legs straddled, arms held out from his sides. He had no eyes and the whole of his body, nearly all of which was visible through tatters of burnt rags, was covered with a hard black crust speckled with yellow pus. A Korean woman by his side began to speak, and the interpreter said: 'He has to stand sir, cannot sit or lie.' He had to stand because he was no longer covered with a skin, but with a crust like crackling which broke easily."

Quoted by Victor Gollancz at the beginning of more for Timothy from a Manchester Guardian report of the first use of Napalm bombing by United Nations forces in Korea. Napalm is described as "jellied petrol which unites stickily with a man's skin as it blazes and cannot be detached so that the man and the petrol burn as one indivisible unit."

More people died when Dusseldorf or when Cologne was pattern bombed, or in the fire storm at Tokio than died at Hiroshima or Nagasaki. If CND stands morally for anything, it stands for British renunciation of the power to do this again; - or (since Napalm was used by the United Nations) to have it done again on our behalf.

These same ethical principles dictate that the money we save be spent, at least in large part, on the relief of world poverty, in the underfed two thirds of the world; dictate too opposition to racialism and lesser forms of colour discrimination, and a rejection of all forms of imperialism. (These are of course linked issues; it would obviously be illogical to feed money into underdeveloped areas in famine relief while still stealing it through economic exploitation.) So it was no accident that the first annual conference of CND passed a motion by a large majority saying that colonial freedom and war on want are issues that concern the CND as the CND; and so most campaigners have also felt that CND as CND is involved in the campaign against Capital Punishment, since the immorality of the hempen deterrent differs only from that of the Nuclear one in degree.

It hardly needs saying that a society that depends on the Bomb and on the rope for survival, which produces racists, which employs colonialism and permits two thirds of the world to go hungry needlessly is fundamentally unhealthy. It is obvious that the malaise characterises both the Western and the Eastern systems, that there may be differences of degree between these two, and internal variations within the blocks, but both are essentially evil. It is also fairly obvious that the existence of Empires and Spheres of Interest leads to power struggles between the blocks and occasions both wars and the oppression of subject people. One does not have to be one of the "Heinz Varieties" of Marxists to see that the existence of inequality in Wealth and Power makes for such Imperialism and for War.

In an age when the control and use of property is no longer synonymous it follows that power is normally in the hands of a clique distinct from the nominal owners; and that this clique, in order to retain its power, has to pursue more power - even at the risk of endangering the world with war. In the West as well as in the East, the State plays a far more decisive role in men's lives than it did in the last century and has become the chief power interest, and whereas it used to express the wish of the ruling elite, - whose power lay elsewhere - it now of its own accord constitutes the motivating power of the new elite. The social malaise however goes deeper than the power of the State and the ownership and control of industry. Any social organisation based on the conveyor belt as the predominant means of production would be bound to be soul-destroying and unsatisfactory. Any system of society where such a high proportion of the work done is useless or even harmful, (as is the making of weapons, as is advertising, and where the anomalies of the system have to bring forth such cures as insurance, (which would obviously be unnecessary in a moneyless economy) is obviously rotten; we live under an insane system. The Bomb is just the greatest symbol of a sick world. Those who oppose it

responsibly oppose it as such, but argue that we cannot cure anything else without curing it, since it lies at the heart of the power system.

Remembering that while society exists as it is there will always be a danger of the Bomb being remade, it is generally appreciated that we would gain nothing if we got rid of the Bomb by means that would make society more violent, less fraternal, less equal, less free, that would make the state stronger. (There are of course means that are advocated that would so do, and there is considerable disagreement as to which) For years the majority of CND thought that Unilateralism would come through the Labour Party, even now when it is in office and in no way better than the Tories, curiously some still hold to the illusion. It was never however justifiable. Long ago, Labour Politicians were so anxious to avoid being painted by the Tories as anti-defence that they fell over themselves to assure the public that while they would not continue wasting money on building more bombs they would not scrap those we had. (While they have broken even this promise, no one would have been under the delusion that Labour had any principled objections to Nuclear Weapons, and therefore no one had any reason to believe that if further building of weapons was found to be expedient it would not be done by a Labour Government) We were not to have the positive step of disarmament, and the relief of world tensions that might have followed therefrom, we were to have no moral lead, no dramatic call to the peoples of the world to push their governments to disarm, we were merely on economic grounds to limit ourselves to outdated weapons. This in no sense would have lessened world antagonisms or led away from war, but would merely have ensured that such war could not efficiently have been waged; as in 1939 the worst of both worlds. Even had Labour Conferences consistently backed Unilateralism, it is certain that the multilateralist majority in the Parliamentary Labour Party would have sidetracked the issue.

The Labour Party's record of course was not such as to inspire much confidence. Attlee, as Prime Minister, sanctioned Hiroshima, and though it was not then universally known that the Japanese had wanted to surrender six months earlier, it was known that they had wished to surrender two days before. (The day before Hiroshima the Vatican Radio had broadcast relaying the Japanese wish to surrender to the Peoples of the West. The day after Hiroshima the Japanese once again pled to surrender as was reported next day by the Times and other British papers, this last surrender offer was the one accepted the day after Nagasaki) Attlee was also responsible for Britain making its first Uranium Bomb, for joining Nato, and for the decision to make the first Hydrogen Bomb.

On other issues: Labour's colonial record was hardly better than the Tories, India was freed certainly but only after mass civil disobedience; Labour's contributions to fighting world poverty were negligible; the Attlee Government showed blatant anti-semitism in its treatment of the Palestine crisis, and total disregard of the rights of smaller nations in its occupation of the Sinai Peninsula and its bullying of Iran over the Nationalization of the Abadan oil refinery. There was therefore no reason for surprise at Labour's conduct in Aden, or her maintenance of the Immigration Act. There never was a reason to expect a predominantly militarist Labour Party to get rid of the Bomb, and though there were always other issues of interest to Unilateralists on which most Unilateralists made up their minds to vote at the last election, there was ample precedent to show that Labour's commitment to the Bomb was part of a commitment to the status quo as a whole, and that it would not materially alter the policies of the Tories.

While the Labour Party continues the same policies as the Tories, the Communist constitutes itself the apologist for the militarism of the other block in the Cold War; justifying the Russian Bomb, tests thereof, Hungary and other Soviet Crimes. A variety of groups are to be found ready to agree which assure us that neither the Labour Party nor the Communist Party are in any way likely to lead to socialism, but which having said this then insist that socialists should join one or the other - probably the Labour Party - and work for an united front including both the Labour Party and the Communist Party, by and large their policies are apt to amount to making the same mistakes as these two parties have made in the past - but more of them - on the assumption that the cure to the bureaucratization and centralized Nationalization, introduced by social-democrats and others in the past, is to engage in more whole-hogging measures of nationalization. The more Right Wing of such groups and the more Left Wing social democrats advocate strengthening the United Nations. Indeed, the Labour Party has recently made pledge on this line - in an incredible exercise in double thinking - troops are to be given to the United Nations to increase the "Peace

Keeping Force." It would hardly be necessary to argue to Unilateralists that such aiming for Peace by preparing for war is an ancient fallacy, exploded in practice too often to number, but nevertheless still seriously advanced by all exponents of the Conventional Wisdom.

Not one of these can have anything to offer CND; in each and every case the fundamentals of their political philosophy runs counter to Unilateralism. An unilateralist movement since it is demanding that State voluntarily renounces the major instrument of its power, since its aim is incomplete if it does not ensure that the Bomb is never remade, is advancing a revolutionary demand; but revolutions are not made by those who are unprepared to work for their aims themselves without relying on others, certainly not where they rely on others whose aims are not those of the revolutionaries. Those who are sincere about CND must as individuals and corporately assume responsibility for working to change society in such a way as to make it impossible for rulers ever again to make weapons of mass destruction. Since those who believe that the Bomb is the supreme embodiment of the evils of war, and that all war and all crimes against humanity arise from the pursuit and defence of power and privilege in society; see the answer in Non-Violent Resistance as much as Unilateralism and as the natural corollary thereof; and since in an industrialized society Industrial Action must of necessity be an integral part of Revolutionary NVR, (which must also include a variety of other forms of mass action), commitment to Unilateralism involves activity on a variety of lesser humanitarian issues, resistance to the injustice of the social system, and finally replacing the existing order by a new co-operative one with neither violent nor economic coercion.

To leave the question here would be to beg it, to leave unconsidered the issue as to which forms of action, what personal commitment, is most likely to be effective. One must insist at this stage that to emphasize personal commitment does not mean that only individualist activity is valid. But means that such action to be effective must depend on the depth of commitment of the individuals who make up the movement, as well as on their co-operative effort; the latter will emanate from the former. If people are sufficiently determined to attain an end they will seek the most effective means which in politics are almost always co-operative. The fact that Unilateralists are a minority in society, and that only a minority of Unilateralists are ready to put their Unilateralism before loyalty to other groups and interests (be they political parties, churches, or even perhaps television sets), means that at this stage all action must be propagandist or it is valueless. So consideration of means in fact boils down to what means are most likely to persuade others to join in opposing social violence. Propaganda however is not limited to merely verbal means, example dramatising the aims of the movement is when in the form of direct action intrinsically desirable, and also provides a form of propaganda in which the new convert can immediately join, and practising which he will be able to increase his understanding of the issues involved, so allowing for conversion by stages.

This is, of course, the main reason for use of such measures as non-violent obstruction, the reason for tax refusal, for appeals to servicemen to refuse to continue serving, and for several such "dramatic" acts, it is also on a less obtrusive plane a reason for forming communities, for engaging in social work, or in work for such organisations as Oxfam; any such communities or such social work when engaged within a class society is of course bound to be corrupted by that society. If therefore such work were seen outside the context of propaganda, the case advanced by various Leninist groups that it merely serves to give people the false impression that society can be cured without a major change would be valid. Seen in the context of propaganda, it can be seen that however such an experiment may be doomed to be corrupted, however impossible it may be for a community to remain libertarian and survive, it can do much in its earlier stages and even, to some extent, something later, when corrupted to help convert others.

Most communities suffer because they have to give so much of their efforts to surviving financially that those who came together in the community as a result of meeting in anti-war and radical movements find they no longer have time to work for these movements. Frequently, the resulting subconscious resentment felt leads to the break up of the community. On the other hand, many communities break up for precisely the opposite reason, those that have too much financial success become corrupted by this, - the classic example was of course Oneida, - but one need not go so far afield;- in Wiltshire,

one of the wealthiest farming families, (members of which are in the millionaire class and now in no way radical) owe their fortune to the fact that some of their ancestors were pioneer communarians.

Enough has been said in criticism of the employment conditions of the Factory for Peace without needing to rake it over again now, - it is obvious that whatever the intentions of the founders, the circumstances of having to compete with capitalist enterprises on terms previously fixed by capitalism, force it to be far from egalitarian: no one can blame the management for the fact that in order to survive in competition with more orthodox firms they have had to borrow many of their practices, but by the same token no one should be deceived into thinking that the factory can hope under present circumstances to form a viable alternative to capitalist industries or that any other such project would succeed where it has failed. The only circumstances in which such communities can succeed within a class society are where there is a strong enough radical movement that it can help finance them, or better still it can aid them in other ways. If there were sufficient co-operatives to make it possible to dispense with money in exchange of goods between them; if sufficient industrial workers were concerned that the community should survive and were prepared to use industrial action to prevent it being undercut, then the community would no longer have to compete on capitalist terms with capitalists but, instead, would be competing on terms tending towards socialism. But this, in fact, means that communities can only survive uncorrupted in conditions tending towards revolution (which is of course not the same as insurrection.)

This is emphasized by the fact that even more established copartnerships, such as Farmer Enterprises and the Scott-Bader Commonwealth, would not have survived if there were not a distinct streak of paternalism. Similarly Oxfam had a reputation for Bureaucracy even before the Congo crisis launched it as a successful organisation; the meteoric career it has since had has been accompanied by a growth of this bureaucracy which might have astonished Parkinson, while the organisation has become increasingly equated with Establishment thinking, - under the slogan "we must not offend the old ladies of Cheltenham" removing successively from published literature all suggestions that feeding the world's hungry is a necessary act of justice and restitution rather than mere charity. At one time, no Oxfam supporter would seriously have suggested that charity would do more than scratch the edges of the problem - the purpose of the organisation was to prick the consciences of those in one metropolitan state, and by bringing about a change in national thinking lead to the realization that a social change and general approach to the problem is needed. Now such a view is found embarrassing. - But the lesson is not that the work in building such communities or agencies to help the underdeveloped countries is wasted, but that since in order to succeed they will inevitably become corrupted, they cannot fulfill the high hopes that they originally embodied, they do undoubtedly have some success and do something to spread the understanding both of the needs for society and the means for change, and even when corrupted they may well still present opportunities for putting a more radical case. In their more formative years they are able at best to advance a wider Peace Movement, or in periods of decline to slow down the growth of xenophobia and militarism; and if the radical movement is otherwise healthy, their own corruption is moderated.

While the fact of corruption should not make Pacifists reject this as a method of action, they are wise not to put their whole faith in communities. Frequently Pacifists are told that the reason for the failure of such and such a Peace Group is that it did nothing to go to the roots of violence in society and did not do any social work at the local level; - where this is a plea for some such work by all Pacifist groups it is obviously sound, but too often it appears to be a plea for such work to the exclusion of all else, and where this is so the advocate (usually some one doing very worthwhile social work himself) is short sighted, since his own work would be more difficult if it were not for the direct political challenge to the establishment made by the radical movement as a whole. Moreover, putting all eggs in the community basket is a costly way of working and often has little propagandist value since usually such social work, when done on a small scale, is only publicized by sympathetic outsiders, and these are most readily found where there is a large radical movement of which the communities form a part.

At best communities can act as power houses for wider movements, can provide places where worn out and depressed radicals used to working in isolation can go and

and meet kindred spirits and recoup in their company, being reassured that others feel their way and something material is being achieved, can act as show places where radical ideas are demonstrated in action, and so on, having all this to offer; it is worth the movement as a whole's while to support them financially and in other ways wherever possible. The return for such aid cannot be measured in terms of money simply because the most important thing they can offer is the existence of oases where money is not the prime criterion of value.

Non-Violent Direct Action as a means of converting people, going to those places where the Bomb is made, maintained, transported, sited, serviced or controlled and there by trying to take on oneself the violence latent in the actions of those who would use, by saying do it to us not to those you have never met; this was the motive force of the Nuclear Disarmament Movement for years and it is a method that can be used successively on a variety of issues, the American Integration Movement has in the Southern States demonstrated its effectiveness at a far deeper level and against far more determined opposition, than anything Nuclear Disarmers have yet met; it has been used in this country in a small way against Rachman type landlords, and as the Peace Movement develops it is bound to be found appropriate in ways we have not yet imagined. This is the forward and outward reaching element in propagandist work; but it must be reinforced; as we have tried to show communities do so reinforce propaganda but are themselves vulnerable if isolated and so the Campaign needs another shoulder, less dramatic and less spectacular than the other elements in its work but essential nevertheless. It is no use using the propagandist techniques of NVDA unless this is coupled with more mundane action, leafletting, canvassing, building groups, which can interpret the Direct Action to a wider audience and which in turn can benefit from the interest in the subject gained by Direct Action. It is no use building communities unless these are sustained. The insights into the evils of society which may be implanted as a result of NVDA, and the glimpses of a non-violent society that may stem from communitarian work, are useless unless bound together in a composite philosophy and advocated as such. Nor is mere orthodox campaigning adequate to complement DA and communities; for even such intensive campaigning as can come from the Campaign Caravan and other highlights of the CND past, are only meaningful insofar as they have been able to speak to people of radicalism in terms applicable to their everyday working lives, and in terms compatible with aspirations to make that working life meaningful. If people only glimpse part of the evil of militarist and unjust society, even if that part is the Bomb or some other evil which is symbolic of the whole and cannot be cured outside the context of a total change; the conflict between the desire to cure the one evil and their belief that it is necessary to keep the rest as it is will lead at best to the enactment of totally inadequate palliatives and at worst to the abandonment of all hope of reform as impractical. While since fraternalist organisations can only be built and kept uncorrupt if they are linked to a larger movement, since spreading the ideas of such a movement can only be done in terms of a composite body of theory applicable to everyday life; the campaign badly needs such a theory and to organise in the best way to fit such a theory.

Therefore though by no means the only important field of activity, the Industrial one is probably decisive; since here most effectively groups can be forced to promote unilateralism by real struggle, here unilateralism must be explained in terms of how it will effect other peoples lives, here is a form of power that if convinced can be involved and mobilized in an anti-war struggle is seen as part and parcel of a struggle for a better world. While far more Pacifists are to be found working and militant in industry that might be supposed from the attacks on them in the Marxist journals, - it is true that many if not most Pacifists distrust specifically Industrial Agitation. Not surprising, since this is so often agitation for differentials, for demarcation disputes between workers, to exclude coloured workers, or to continue making weapons or other harmful products at the popular expense so as to preserve sectional interests. Activity is often militancy within the context of class society rather than in opposition to class society, - perhaps a prime example is the sight of doctors militantly acting in order to put themselves ever more firmly into the ranks of the overpaid and widen their contrast with nurses; and this certainly in no way contributes towards changing society. Even on issues where there is considerable reason stemming from whole histories of exploitation, the demand for a closed shop may too often mask racism. While even normal wage increases usually merely result in change in the cost of living which does not hurt the capitalist and only harms other workers. But this is not a case against Industrial Action, but a case for insisting that such industrial action be

clearly directed towards the attainment of a changed society, and the more vigorously this is pursued the less will selfish interests advocate such action for their ends.

If it is agreed that the demand for a society based on co-operation is the natural corollary of Pacifism in social matters, the industrial expression of this is worker's control with the elimination of power and privilege. Therefore Industrial Action that would advance Unilateralism will be Industrial Action aimed at winning for workers a greater measure of control over their own lives. The Right to a say in the management of their work goes hand in glove with the Right to have a say in whether the State shall incinerate millions of people in other lands, and without the responsibility of the one, the worker is apt to feel that the horror of the other is none of his business. Each partial measure of encroaching control gained besides being worthwhile in itself, gives producers the greater self-confidence necessary to the knowledge that they can run industry more justly than it is now run; therefore each act is both intrinsically desirable and of propagandist value. Also as workers are more used to making demands for control, the belief that industrial action should not be used for political purposes that now bedevils much of Left Trade Union thinking would be transcended. Here then is the second shoulder to any Peace Movement, the Pacifist must agitate as far as he is able in industry for workers' control and to persuade other workers to devote their industrial militancy to ending the class system rather than to looking after number one within it.

Discussions of Pacifist views on revolutionary Industrial Unionism are often bedevilled by the misuse of the phrase "class war"; since some unthinking socialists talk as if the class war were a crusade led by the workers to dislodge an entrenched Capitalist class, rather than an inevitable struggle occasioned by the conflicting interests of ruler and ruled, in which the ruler tends always to curtail as much as possible the power of the ruled in order to preserve his own and the ruled is faced with the choice between extinction and resistance. Resulting from this misused term many Pacifists tend to think in non-resister terms that the Pacifist must abstain from such struggle in industry as they abstain from struggle between nations. But just as in National affairs the Pacifist answer is not acquiescence in tyranny and submission to aggression but is non-violent resistance to both, and ending the aggression by transforming the society which produces it, - so in industry where the class war is the aggression of the ruling class the answer is resistance using non-violence as well as strikes to the continued exploitation of the ruled by the rulers; positing as an alternative a transformed society. Since such struggle can only effectively be waged on an industrial basis, it means that sooner or later to succeed a Peace Movement must organise industry by industry to propagate belief in workers' control as in disarmament, and to mobilize action for it. Obviously such organisation is only valid if it conforms to the specifications desirable for society, that is if power in the organisation is firmly kept in the hands of the rank and file; obviously too, such organisation will not be immune from the inevitable corruption undergone within class society by all organisations for whatever good purpose founded; but in the measure that such industrial revolutionary organisation actively pursues, changes and fights bureaucracy both in society generally and within itself, it will take longer to corrupt.

The author was an early member of the Direct Action Committee and can remember being arrested 17 times, and has spent 9 months in prison for direct action.

We hope in subsequent issues to publish Derek Hughes' pornographic epic - the Peneid also articles on Genet & Artaud, on Jazz as a protest, & on political conformism in modern art; also reviews of books & anthologies of Bakunin, Stirner & Malatesta as of the New Left Symposium "Towards Socialism!"

We will also publish Jim Petter on the essence of workers' control, & a critique by Nick Gould of the anarchist role on the Easter March; Harvey Mellor will write on primitive communism in Dervish Orders.

We hope also to carry an article on Industrial Unionism & the General Strike as a means to Anarchism, on Vegetarianism, on "Student Democracy", on Doctors & Anarchy, on libertarian child bearing & schooling, & on radicalism in schools.

Anarchism and the Cinema
Andrew Green.

Film has long appeared an attractive medium to Anarchists. It is able better than any other art form to attack all that is ridiculous and self-contradictory and justly hated by anarchists. To "show the bourgeoisie that their pleasures would no longer be complete, that their insolent triumphs would be disturbed," what better way was there than to point the dispassionate eye of the camera at this bourgeois decadence itself? To project on the cinema screen the sufferings of the poor, the starving, the bodies of the dead - whose death was made necessary only by the inadequacy of the system under which they lived, all this could be material for revolution, a practical demonstration of what was to be destroyed, and what rescued. A film can be explicit and therefore anarchic; it can be documentary and therefore destructive. But the anarchist cinema is not for the most part documentary; the only director of documentary film claimed for its creators, Flaherty, was concerned with a kind of Utopianism which anarchists like to forget, because it forms one of the more embarrassing elements in the ancestry of their thought; for we fear that the anarchism that is adopted by primitive communities or by those united by some elemental struggle with the harsh environment of ice and snow or the sea, which Flaherty portrayed is of little relevance to anarchism now.

The attractiveness of the cinema for anarchists springs from the directness of the assault upon audiences of the devices of film construction, rather than from the original qualities of film as record. This was realised initially by those who like the Belgian, Storck, attempted to express their anarchism by a collection of recorded episodes whose simple juxtaposition showed a violent destructiveness in place of the meaningless facts conveyed by the episodes apart from one another. The immediate appeal of a film for the anarchist director lies in the unavoidable acceptance by the audience of a succession of ideas, which, properly presented images give it no opportunity to reject. The distinguishing feature of an anarchist film is its lack of argument in terms of speech or conventional order borrowed from some other artistic device. The argument of the anarchist film is contained in its presentation of a single but comprehensive case in terms inexpressible in any way other than its own succession of images. It is of no importance in the composition of these images whether they are documentary, or are scenes constructed for the purpose of directly conveying the director's idea. What is important is that each image must have an impact which can be scarcely be more than emotional: for the anarchist is not arguing and allowing the admission of irrelevant details in his work, but is applying the force of his distaste and disassociation alone against what he would like to see fall for lack of support. The anarchist director concerns himself both with realism, the record which demands revolution, and surrealism, the case which incites people to revolt.

The two most prominent directors who have created the anarchist cinema and its influence, both chose at once to use the means of surrealist expression to convey their ideas of revolt. Vigo's "Zero de Conduite" shows simply the rebellion of schoolchildren, who, having gained control of their school, are left in enjoyment of their freedom on the roof. This conclusion, repeated more graphically in "L'Atlante" as one character rushes to the sea, is imitated by Truffaut in "Les quatre cents coups" and can only indicate his adherence to Vigo's demand for the freedom of children from any kind of control. But this development into crude symbolism of Vigo's simple idea should not obscure the genuine surrealism of his films. The schoolboys of "Zero de Conduite" are represented as being conscious of far different ideas than their masters, who are relegated to the status assigned to them by the children's imaginations: the headmaster is a dwarf, and the sports master walks like Chaplin. Setting up a bed with a sleeping master in imitation of a crucifix the boys process past him in the false dignity of slow motion. By comparison with the boy's behaviour, the masters appear ugly and vindictive. What is lacking of surrealism is supplied by Bunuel's films. From the disordered violence of his earlier work, Bunuel quickly passed to a more expressive surrealism which has characterised his work from "L'age d'Or" to "Viridiana". For Bunuel, every film of his and every image of his films contributes to his one end: "But that the white eye-lid of the screen reflect its proper light, the universe would go up in flames." Bunuel allows no partial solution to the problems presented in his films. The peity and charity of the novice Viridiana and the priest Nazariu create disasters, far outweighing their achievements. The Mexican children of "Los Olvidados" suffer equally whether they are angelic or have beaten someone to death. But these plain statements are irrelevant outside the unavoidable conclusions which Bunuel's images convey to his audiences.

"I ask myself," he has said, "what must this character reach for? a revolver? a knife? a chair? In the end I always choose whichever is most disturbing." Bunuel's most disturbing ideas are never explicable: they coincide with his most tense, most violent passages. When the old blind man in "Los Olvidados", robbed and stoned by children, lies writhing on the ground, a black cock appears by his head. "Don Jaime was kissing the lady," says the little girl of the novice Viridiana and her uncle. "A black bull came into the room". When the prostitute in "Nazariu" wakes from her feverish sleep, she reaches for a bowl to drink from: and drinks water with which her own blood is mixed. To the rebellious and lyrical qualities of Vigo's films Bunuel adds the violence and the predominantly destructive demands which he believes the cinema is ideally suited to convey. His third film combines all the qualities which the anarchist cinema exploits superficially: a documentary film, it shows the "land without bread" of the Hurdes region of Spain. Here the democratic republic allowed a people to exist who threw away bread, because they did not know what it was. Beside the wealth of the Catholic Church appeared sordid poverty, idiots, corpses: "juxtaposing the hovels in which families and animals live pell-mell in filth with the prosperous churches provides more impact than a long speech," writes Ado Kyron in his book on Bunuel. "It is all as clear as the phrase a ragged underfed urchin writes on a school blackboard: 'Respect the property of others.'" There is apparently, the film assures us, no solution to these problems: the film does not produce the advice of a conventional documentary, but appears to be a practical exercise in surrealism. Bunuel finds it easy to apply his idea of reality to whatever he finds. "A man says, 'Give me a light.' That kind of thing interests me. 'Give me a light' interests me enormously." To dissect things to give them disturbing connotations is Bunuel's aim. "I've been criticised" he said "for showing a knife shaped like a cross. Such knives are found everywhere in Spain..... It is photography that brings out the mischievous surrealist nature that is mass produced in all innocence.

Without any symbolism without any attempt to deceive its audience by the presentation of facts which they can not instantly dismiss as false if they wish to do so, without any pretence that its significance is destructive or revolutionary, the anarchist film presents simply a demand for a recognition that there are inconsistencies, distasteful ideas, violent irrationalities in human behaviour, worthy of Bunuel's most savage criticism. If the anarchist cinema contributed only such an exposure to the popular commercial cinema then it would be valuable: but films dependent on mere sensationalism are able to do this. What is more important is that implications of construction, of realism in fact, should not be omitted. "I am against conventional morality, traditional sacred cows, sentimentality, and all that moral filth of society which comes into it. Obviously I have made bad films, but always morally acceptable to me," Bunuel has said, "I have always been true to my surrealist principles." But he has progressed beyond the stage when, with Dali, he delighted in shocking the bourgeoisie. His two most important films since 1958 show a sympathy for his subjects far wider than could be expected from the director of "L'age d'Or", where the Church, the police, the family and the army are attacked, so that "love stands out alone as the great and unique hope, the major revolt of man." "Nazariu", "Viridiana" and no doubt such other works as "Le Journal d'une femme de chambre", give more real and genuine expression to this sentiment. In "Viridiana" there is scarcely an unsympathetic character: although all are mistaken in some way and their mistakes have terrible consequences, the characters themselves are not being condemned by Bunuel: he accepts their existence, their reality and the impossibility of reforming them. The beggars, blind, deformed or diseased, which Viridiana collects and looks after are shown as people equally inclined to kindness or viciousness as the more respectable characters such as Jorge, although the circumstances under which the beggars live has clearly made them more inclined to viciousness. "Nazariu" is an even more delicate and carefully sympathetic film. The Christ like priest never lacks Bunuel's sympathy: it is the priest's own Christ-like qualities which prevent him from sympathising with the people with whom he comes into contact. Nazariu preserves his own innocence: he does not realise for example that when he takes a job in an area where unemployment is at a high level, then he will cause trouble: Bunuel emphasises the point by making the priest leave fighting and death behind him. Nazariu does not realise that people are ignorant or simply superstitious; that a woman prefers her husband to extreme unction when she is dying; that the church itself despises and makes use of these weaknesses; and that his efforts are futile because the people, like the man who protects him and who is no thief, but takes money from churches, want to make use of the church. The film shows the education of Nazariu. He finds that the women who follow him love him as a man, not as a saint, and that he has taught them nothing, since they are unwilling to learn what is unsuited for their own lives.

Since he made "L'age d'Or" in 1930, Bunuel has been constructing complex and coherent

films. They are not expressive of anarchy in the sense of disorder, senseless destruction and iconoclasm, but of the kind of anarchism demanding the substitution of new standards, undefined because the anarchist recognises the futility of being dogmatic about anything other than what is wrong. Besides the violent destructiveness of the anarchist cinema, there are its hints of tenderness, of the hope of making use of whatever is most attractive in the worst of situations. This is the morality present in Bunuel's films; it is developed to a greater extent in the films of Vigo and his followers, which, although they lack the direct revolutionary significance of "Zero de Conduite", retain the contrasts of its children and schoolmasters, the reaction of tenderness and innocence to the depravity of those given power over it. In England, Lindsay Anderson's "This Sporting Life" shows a conflict of these qualities in one person, whose self-expression by violence is compatible with success rather than what he finds as satisfactory: and Karel Reisz was perhaps developing this idea in his portrait of the psychopath Danny Williams ("Night must Fall"). In France, Truffaut began his career as a director with the appreciation of the anarchic qualities of children which Vigo taught him, and there is hope that this important tradition of anarchism in the cinema will not be lost as the films of George Franju become better known. What Bunuel expressed simply by images of purely sensual love in "L'age d'Or" has been developed into a tradition of the criticism of authoritarianism and its violence, the constantly demanded replacement of what artificially binds a society, a community, together, with its more permanent links: a repetition of what should never be ignored, but is ignored, that a solution is necessary, a solution which we do not define, but call anarchism; and some anarchists have found that the best instrument for expressing all this is the cinema.

Buddhism and Anarchy.

John Brodie.

Chairman Oxford University Buddhist Society.

In recent years, at least, Buddhism has been more associated with Anarchy than any other religion. There are several reasons for this; not all of them give a proper perspective of the issues involved. From the beginning of this century, but specially in the last fifteen years, there has been a great increase in interest in Buddhism in the West, at first because of its logicality and apparent freedom from institutional perversion, later for almost opposite reasons. It would be unpleasant but not excessively unfair to say that Western interest in Buddhism was first acquired by people with an aversion to Christianity who were nevertheless strongly conditioned by it. They used western missionary tactics to spread a Buddhism which to the unprejudiced observer seems to have absorbed many of the worst traits of Christianity. The next wave of interest, in a very different discipline of Buddhism was brought about by the post war opening up of Japan and the spread of the ideas of the beat generation. These people, totally disillusioned with western society as they saw it, found solace in the seeming irrationality and emphasis on spontaneity of Zen. The coupling of these religious ideas with the anarchic organisation of beat communities naturally aroused the idea of a similarity between Buddhist and Anarchist social principles.

Such an assumption can not be dismissed out of hand, nor can it be given unqualified support. For this there are two reasons: first that Buddhism is a religion and therefore does not consider social organisation to have the same importance as spiritual development, and second that, being very tolerant Buddhism has even more different schools of opinion than other religions, concerning doctrine, method and social behaviour. In its earliest historical manifestation, Buddhism was quite unconcerned with society. Those who followed it would make an almost complete break with society and live in the forest in the tradition of Indian religions at the time. There was a voluntary conformity to certain moral precepts which were considered to be the best way of spiritual advancement and in cases of doubt those concerned submitted to the opinion of the Jura (Note 1.). During its period of importance in India Buddhism was not vitally connected with the State organisation. Even Ashoka, (Note 2.) while he did much to spread Buddhist ideas, usually refrained from authoritarian methods to do so.

The situation altered with Buddhism's spread to other parts of Asia. Like Christianity it has always been prepared to adapt itself to previous ideas, and this has given it a popularity which it could not otherwise have acquired. In Tibet especially, the whole state apparatus became absorbed in a Buddhist framework after the country's conversion by Padme Sambhava. Before this Tibet had been a feudal monarchy, it was to become a feudal oligarchy. The religion was rigidly systematised and based on strong discipline. The effects were not a libertarian's paradise although on the whole the people were quite happy. It is important that in the absence of the concept of original sin and eternal domination the people were free of some of the worst western taboos such as that on sex, and though people were exhorted to take advantage of being born as humans and follow the religious life, those who chose not to were regarded more with sympathy than disdain. The belief in reincarnation has had a great tempering effect on those religions which subscribe to it since it makes any particular life less definitive and less urgent. Unfortunately the power of the religious heads in Tibet was at times inevitably abused, but according to many accounts the principal result was to raise the moral and spiritual level of the Tibetans much above what it had been.

There is a branch of Buddhism which most others would gladly disown. This is Tantrism, a sect which has followed practices which are looked on with almost universal horror by all religions. The theoretical basis for its practice is Buddhism's central teaching against dualism, i.e., that the concept of good only exists in relation to the concept of bad and that in the final analysis there is no difference between them. Normally this is tempered by the injunction to lead a temperate life in order to cultivate the faculty of properly appreciating this, i.e., in order to acquire a Buddha nature; but some sects decided to interpret it much more literally and plunged themselves in to orgies of sex and drink. The Buddhist opinion is that the important thing is not what you do but the way it influences you, and in this light it is unlikely that many were enlightened by this behaviour.

In China and Japan the Zen form of Buddhism was developed. This was based on the theory that it is impossible to become enlightened by logical meditation because one cannot use a dualistic method to eliminate all idea of dualism. The alternative was satori; sudden enlightenment which was induced by intentional avoidance of logic. However, if enlightenment was sudden, it was accepted that there must be a long training to make one capable of receiving it, and in the monasteries a strict discipline with implicit obedience to the guru (Note 3.) was maintained. In all its main forms Buddhism as a religion has maintained the need for discipline to accomplish spiritual improvement. The achievement of spontaneity requires a removal of all the conditioning which prevents the ordinary person from being spontaneous, and this is a very difficult object which can normally only be arrived at gradually. The association of Buddhism with anarchy is based on its basic social attitude. This is that anybody is free to choose or reject the path of enlightenment, and that all Buddhist philosophy is a path and not an injunction. Buddhism does not threaten heretics with the wrath of God, it simply states that if you do this such and such will happen. Its first justification, that which made Sakyamuni (Note 4.) seek enlightenment is that this world is a world of suffering. Buddhists believe that sooner or later everyone will recognise this and it shows them the method to overcome suffering. Thus the impulse to religion is a free and personal one. Anyone can be dissolute, but he will eventually be dissatisfied with this and then he will voluntarily submit to the discipline required to rise above it. It is this aspect of Buddhism which has attracted anarchists who approve of the idea of methodology rather than coercive religion as we have known it in the West, and on this plane Buddhism has much in common with anarchy. But whereas for most anarchists, anarchy is its own end, for Buddhism it is merely a basis for religious fulfillment.

Notes:

1. Jura: - the community of elders controlling the monasteries,
2. Ashoka: - 2nd century B.C. Indian Emperor, under whose rule, the whole of his empire was converted to Buddhism.
3. Guru: spiritual guide,
4. Shakyamuni: "Wise man of the Shakya tribe" - one of the names of the Buddha.

Drugs and Society

Robert Watney.

I

"Drugs, the lot! Drugs for us!" is not a cry to bellow from libertarian lungs. Briefly the libertarian proposal should be: Anyone who is mentally competent should have the right to explore the varieties of conscious experience if he can do so without unduly harming himself or others. Begs too many questions? So do the assumptions of present day society.

And then why should an anarchist be specially concerned with drugs? An interest in drugs is often accompanied by a conviction that "how are we to live?" is answerable only in personal terms and not through first assuming a belief in man as a collective animal. An anarchist asks to be free of the coercion that would prevent him in this exploration. Drugs can be an affirmation of an individuality increasingly threatened by mass society. Allen Ginsberg's "Howl" is such a testament. The user of drugs seeks to free himself not to exert power over others; and in moments of clarity he should be able to see how much unhappiness arises from needless argument, violence and obsession with attachments and how modern society fosters these in abundance.

All the instruments of social force however, - lawyers, police and psychiatrists, are likely to oppose any narrowing of the gap between what people are and what they are allowed to show. Society is founded on intolerance. Shaw declared; "The degree of tolerance attainable at any one moment depends on the strain under which society is maintaining its cohesion". But most anarchists - and many others, would agree that there is no real voluntary cohesion in the present order of society, and that there will be no prospect even of harmony until people regroup themselves on a different basis. The present state of public opinion (and the law) on drug-taking merely reflects the fears, anxieties and values of those currently in a position of social authority. It is often as irrational as our over organised but chaotic society.

Not surprisingly those who take drugs often form a community of their own, and this community of interests dimly reflects and ideal of anarchist thinking. On the other side society's agents have tried to appropriate drugs to their purpose. An anarchist should oppose the legalised use of drugs in most aversion therapies, whether for sexual perversion, alcoholism or crime for which "thug-drugs" have been proposed. In these cases, quite apart from the coercion usually involved, society will only acknowledge the symptom because it is unable itself to eliminate the underlying causes. Similarly the widespread over use of sleeping pills is a far more serious social condition than a dozen pepped up nods in every English beat club.

II

An anarchist would insist that people decide for themselves how much freedom is to be permitted to human expression. This means in effect; what freedoms are people to take for themselves in order to live in these times when society makes such unfamiliar, undeserved and often disagreeable demands on ones person. If the conflicting and contradictory demands of everyday living become unendurable some people take aspirins or a whisky, others the holy weed. Drugs, if used intelligently can simplify ones experience ordering and clarifying it, eliminating distractions. The most common effect of marijuana for instance is a deeply satisfying sensation of peace. Ones mood becomes contemplative; implications are seen and sense impressions received that ones dull normal vision precludes. A boomword like "escapism" is too relative a term to be useful in this context...

When a person "flips" or is "high" with the aid of a drug, he demonstrates vividly the lack of alignment between his immense inner world and the outward facts of social life. This release of imagination indicates how poor the content of our normality (that which is shared by most people) is in action, thought and feeling. Most people while using a drug are primarily interested in their inner life and in communicating it; they pay a minimum attention to their outward behaviour such as their movements in relation to the clock. They can sense the irrelevance of time and motion study living and the fixedness to human relations that economic planners assume and project; that newspaper reading millions, their first concern when and where rather than what, absorb.

III

In spite of the increased use (and failure) of prevention measures drugs are here to stay, especially among people born the last thirty years. They will be taken, quietly ignoring the law, because an enlargement of his experience is in itself valuable to a thoughtful person. If the user has a definite purpose in mind and more accurate information on their effects than is widely available today, so much the better.

But there is enough truth in some common fears about drugs to warrant a few further general remarks. Drugs are vaguely associated in the popular mind with the underworld, delinquency and mental illusions. The present law encourages the pusher (and worse the racketeer behind him). And because drug-taking is generally deemed by society as immoral and criminal, it is bound at present to cause some accompanying unease. The drugged teenager who punches a policeman or elderly citizen hits back while he can at symbols of the society that frustrates him. So drugs can involve an abdication of good sense and become a release for people deficient in vitality and reaction or for people who want to be free of the need to make decisions. In only a very few cases do drugs result in a psychotic break with reality.

Addictive drugs of course defeat their own ends. These include heroin, morphine, cocaine and even the various barbiturate and amphetamine drugs. They must be clearly distinguished from the relatively harmless (Note 1.) and immeasurably more interesting drugs - marijuana, hashish and various hallucinogens like peyote and LSD. Our welfare state, with its prescriptions and free treatment for heroin addicts is more enlightened than the U.S.A., where the police throw addicts into jail. But it is time the law against marijuana was changed. In the meantime a libertarian attitude needs propagating. The law remains as it is partly because non-smokers suspect anything that their inhibitions bar them from enjoying. Euphoria, which meant cheerfulness and glad thoughts to the Greeks now has, to orthodox psychiatrists pathological connotations and to laymen the suggestion of a fools paradise.

The law under the present system wont be changed without a campaign to inform the public of the facts. (Note 2.). Another step as suggested in "Peace News" is to demand interim research centres, open to the public on a membership basis. Here the effects of drugs could be openly investigated and the frequently misleading statements of the press and law courts countered.

Note 1.

Marijuana is a mild intoxicant, non addictive, less habit forming than nicotine and less dangerous to the health than tobacco. The New York Mayor's Committee in 1944 produced a definitive report on marijuana which established some pertinent facts. NO mental or physical deterioration was attributable to it after a period of years. Marijuana has no specific stimulant effect on the mechanism of sexual desire, and has no direct relation to crimes of violence (unlike the heroin addict who must often turn criminal to support his habit).

Note 2.

Marijuana Law Reform Association, Secretary, Chris Holmes, 39 Hannon Road, Birmingham 14.

Man in Exile.

Translated from the Spanish by Tim Oxton

(The author lives in Spain, has been in prison once for a political crime and does not wish to go back and so we are not revealing his name).

I flee from my Yorn, my lair. The lurking-place of a beast at bay, helpless. The prison of my memories. I leave my hotel of misery and loneliness, where I was flung by the backwash of a lost war. I reach the street, which is deserted: deserted and cold, like me.

Pains are softened by the passage of time. A few are only soothed by death. But no-one dies of loneliness, and loneliness is not cured by time. This eternal loneliness of mine, in the great city without a soul.

I am the product of a war which was heroic and sterile, mean and generous, glorious, sordid. A war of giants and dwarfs. A war of big ideas, big words, big lies. I lived this passionate war; a hundred times intoxicated with the exultation of triumph, beaten down a thousand times by the desperation of defeat. Until the end came, which for me was first exile, then bitterness, and finally loneliness. The infinite, piercing loneliness. The eternal night.

The rain is falling, fine and persistent. The echo of my footsteps rebounds on to my ears. The echo of my footsteps bounces on the walls of the narrow streets and rebounds on to my ears. Behind those resounding, dumb walls perhaps there is life. There must be life. Yes, life is there, warm, palpitating.

Now I cannot hear the noise of my footsteps. I hear whispers of love, children crying, passionate pantings, laughter.

I too know how to love, and weep, and laugh. I believe I know, because I also have loved and wept and laughed. But I have been sunk for so long in this anguish of oblivion and loneliness. But if someone were to help me, if something were to push me to desire it, I would love again, and laugh, or at least weep. Someone who spoke my language... Something which would cut the bonds of my numb soul. But I am deluded. I, who do not believe in God, expect a miracle.

But hatred dies also. My hatred gradually dimmed, and died conquered by time and distance. And it left an immense void. Then came loneliness and occupied that void. It occupied it without filling it, because loneliness does not fill. Loneliness deepens the nothingness, even to making it material and tangible. Yes, I know I am delirious, I know this void is not physical, but I do not imagine that I could possess guts, like other mortals who weep and laugh and love.

Now I am walking along a street with a strange name, like so many other streets, so many other strange names in this huge merciless city. The drizzle has stopped, and the echo of my footsteps is mingling with other footsteps, still far off. I see no one. A night watchman? A doctor dragged out of his bed? Maybe a man alone like me, a fugitive as I am. Who hears whispers of love, and laughter, and prayers... I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth... Meaningless words.

But I can flee no longer. I have to return to my country. This idea, rebuffed so often, obsesses me. But I cannot return. I am defeated, and I accept my defeat. Destiny marked me down to lose, and I know how to do that. I cannot return to my country!!!

I feel sick and I want to vomit. But nothing comes out of the void within me. I turn towards the centre of the city. I must see people, mix with people, rub shoulders with people. I will seek that chimera again. There, in the midst of them all, I will pretend that I am not alone. There, among the people, that miracle may happen for which I, poor deluded fool, have been waiting. To be able to recover peace, that peace which is born of forgiving and forgetting, that harmony which arises from feeling oneself a brother among his own people...

It is raining again. Some cars drive past at speed. There are people on my pavement, coming and going in a hurry. Now there are more people, many people. There are lights, many lights. My footsteps make no noise now. I am in the centre of the city. Now I am not alone.

If I live like a rat it is not for fear of punishment. Punishment is this life which I have imposed on myself. This constant nausea, this void. What others might put upon me could not be greater punishment. To tread the soil of my country again, to hear my language again. To breathe my air, to drink my water. To be once more among my people... Because we are all one. We are all one! I must be mad.

The rain is getting heavier. Now I do not want to get wet. Now I am among people. The people are coming out of a cinema. An avalanche of people. It is raining, and the people don't want to get wet. We are under the canopy. There are many of us. We are all mingled. All together.

With my left shoulder I am leaning against a boy. A woman is squeezed against my right arm. I can almost feel her warmth. I look at her out of the corner of my eye. She is young and very beautiful. I am motionless. I do not dare to look at her again. I scarcely dare to breathe... Cars are coming and taking the people away. The boy on my left has gone now. We are much fewer. The woman on my right is not propping her arm on mine now, but she is very near me. I look at her again. Her eyes are very sad and she is alone. I realize that my temples are pounding. If I were to smile at her, talk to her, perhaps she would understand that she need not grieve. Who knows if this is not the miracle I hope for? Suddenly a strange tenderness invades me. An intense desire to protect her. An anxiety to love this defenceless being. Clumsily the strange words of that language which is not mine come to my lips.

'Senora, I have waited so long for you. At last you have come. Let me teach you to forget, help you to forgive. No, it is not easy. But everything will be all right. I know it, and you, in your heart, know it too.'

She is still in front of me. There is no sadness in her eyes. I see that she is troubled and confused.

Another car has stopped in front of us. The lady at my side goes out into the rain and gets into the car beside her husband or lover.

We are very few now. An attendant has closed the cinema doors and the lights have been switched out. It is hardly raining now. A couple, the last to remain sheltered by the canopy, go out into the street, and ride off on a motor-scooter. They are young and in love. They are all in love. They all go away, to their own lives.

I remain alone and lean against the door. I am weeping. I am quivering, with my silent tears. I am sobbing, my God! Something has finished. Everything has finished. A dam has broken here inside me and I am filling, filling. Life is bursting out again within me. I must live. It is necessary that I should begin to live. There, far away, in my country.

I start walking, in the rain. Everything is deserted now. I am going towards my room, which is no longer my lair. Every step brings me nearer to my country. Every instant brings me closer to my life, to that life which I want to regain, which now is not lost.

I look up to the sky, and the rain washes away my tears. I am not empty. Now I am not alone.

GINSBERG reading at the I.C.A.

Roger Garfitt.

When I went to hear Ginsberg I was disillusioned in three stages. First his voice - the room was packed, we had to stand on the stairs, so I only heard his voice at first - it was a typical young American voice: a heavy accent, but a White American voice, no deep resonance: he could have been a High School Ambassador on In Town Tonight.

Then I advanced in the crowd and peered between heads and over shoulders to see him. I had only seen one photo of him previously, the Christ-like portrait in "Nothing Personal" - naked to the waist, white loincloth, right hand raised How-fashion, black eyes shining - now I saw him in shirt, tie, jeans & horn-rimmed spectacles: he looked like a sturdy cobbler.

I could still have worshipped this cobbler had he looked anguished. But he did not. He was happy, playing to the audience, slightly drunk: his

"Obsenities" were not cries torn from the tension between love and hatred of the flesh: they were beery humour. I was faced with a beat poet who was being cheery.

So there you are. I didn't meet the real Ginsberg, the man who wrote the poems. The tone of his poems is completely sincere. Occasionally I do wonder, as when, in "Transcription of Organ Music", he says:

I want people to bow as they see me and say he is gifted with poetry, he has seen the presence of the Creator

and a statement like:

I had a moment of clarity, saw the feeling in heart of things, walked out to the garden crying

may seem too bald to be convincing: but in the same poem justifying everything there is:

Flowers which as in a dream at sunset I watered faithfully not knowing how much I loved them

and:

The music descends, as does the tall bending stalk of the heavy blossom, because it has to, to stay alive, to continue to the last drop of joy.

But from hearing Ginsberg read, I did learn that he reads very emphatically: his voice stresses heavily and his arms and body illustrate: he makes drama out of a very undramatic sentence. This points to one fault that I do find in his poems, that sometimes a sentence falls very flat, seems written without any spark, does not swing with the driving rhythms of the whole poem. What he calls "bop prosody" is difficult to write: sometimes he just cannot find the words to match the excitement. His voice also showed that he is excited by words themselves, and sometimes is carried away without really catching exactly what he wants to describe. Yet, conversely, his way of reading may also indicate that he means some of his words more seriously than we might tend to: the words that we bounce over are not just rhythmic elements and vague impressionistic strokes: he sometimes breaks the rhythm of his reading to emphasize them, lets his voice crack over each word.

In a way, I experience with Ginsberg's poems the same breaking of the spell that I suffered in seeing him. I first read "Howl" straight through once, did not look at it again, and it lived in my mind for months. Yet when I glanced at it a second time, it seemed very thin. The same happened with the poem about Walt Whitman in a supermarket. Yet I re-read today both "Howl" and "A Supermarket in California", and the magic worked again. Ginsberg writes poems that enter you and live. And when you look closely at "A Supermarket in California", you see that it is not surprising that they live. Within that short poem you have the brilliant initial image of Walt Whitman in a supermarket, with all that that says about the emptiness of our urban life: the atmosphere, caught perfectly, of the search of the more enlightened, a search in which there is a thrill that seems a promise, but leads nowhere--

Will we walk all night through solitary streets? The trees add shade, lights out in the houses, we'll both be lonely--

and the coming of death, and the hopelessness which lies in that fact--

Ah, dear father, greybeard, lonely old courage teacher, what America did you have when Charon quit poling his ferry and you got out on a smoking bank and stood watching the boat disappear on the black waters of Lethe?

Footnote: Ginsberg's singing of a Mantra may seem pseudo if you just read about it in the newspapers: but it seemed to me at the time that he had found a temporary form of peace in this rhythm and drone, and wanted to share it with his audience.

KANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPOETRYOXANPO

* * * * *
bertirwinroberttirwinroberttirwinroberttirwinroberttirwinroberttirwinroberttirwinroberttirwinroberttirwinroberttirwin

*
* red and
* black
* together
*

Will the Black Sun rise in libation?
Will the red poppy bare his throat?

Tears of blood and phlegm
Thread the beard of the Marxist Prophet:

Black worms crawled from his wounds
Into the sunlight.

The Commisar Anafortas scatters
His flesh in the fields.

Red the rose and black the sun;
Max Planck walked amid the cypress trees,

Black their branches and red their sap,
In the gardens of Bomarzo, in a wispy flux of cigarette smoke

Maxwell's Demon reveals his stigmata,
Nordic crosses spot his palms,

'Iam GOLEM THE STATE !
You breathed life into me!'

The proletariat passion fevered into life,
In a motorized Babylon, crying

'Whose hands are these?!
'Throw ope the fiery gates!'

Blast furnaces open their portals
In a skeletal frame of smoke.

Death and the Angel croon of this :
Love is the Angel and Death her lips .

'Throw ope your lips!'
Red her lips and black her panties.

The lunar nightingale shrieked through the forest:
Hob Robin, Stylite of the woods,

A hand upon her shoulders,
Another drunkenly pointing East,

Where the hanging curls of Absalom
Burnt green and orange in the sunset.

The encyclopedias salesman, intellectual,
Hawks the words wares, black scripted,

Red leather, in the land of the prodigal
Where Kulak pigs guard St. Anthony.

And the wine, the sacred vine,
Sweeps and flows over the dust.

Stand up you noble diggers!
Stand up!
Stand up!

* * * * *
uygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstoneguygladstone

*
* p a r a n o i a c
* p i e c e
*

i object
to being charged threepence
to relieve my bowels
people forget
that states and councils
have appropriated
our natural living space
(and its protective facilities)
i will not pay
to lock a door on myself
that others
do not interrupt
a natural function

the individual
is positively owed this service
in vi w of
the state's
honorary tenancy
of everyman's land

therefore i crawled
under the door of a w.c.
and had
a bad fright
on letting myself out
for there
standing in my way
was a man in uniform
with a metal contraption
slung about him
not a policemen
but a tram
conductor doing up
his fly-buttons.

* * * * *
*
* f a n t a s y
*
*

If white buds could keep
their brightness
young and pure, i would sleep
in sunlight's
tips of pink, glistening white
as chips of ivory.
But, sun will turn, dul the sight
in shadow
vague as birth. Beauty reasons
to withdraw
from the points of a season.

*
* g a n t r y l a n d
*
*

What a diplodocus
Hobnobbing with its brother
Dipping a proboscis
Tipped with four wheels
What odd ostrils!

Now its like a pelican
neck angular, pensive.
Dribbling but serious
Standing for ages
Solemnley inquisitive

Could be a Martian
Into gravity stealing
Ludicrous, painful.
Soberly lifting
earthsalts by the grabful.

* * * * *

crowsmithjohnarrowsmithjohnarrowsmithjohnarrowsmithjohnarrowsmithjohnarrowsmithjohnarrowsmith

*
*
* t h e
* c e l e s t i a l
* c i t y
*

It was an ordinary grey city of ashes,
One of many grey ash cities,
With its torment twisted streets
And stiff stunted steps
And faces smiling and crying
And laughing and dying
In the city of grey ash.

Thats the way it is they said
Thats they way it was
Yes thats the way it was
And will be, with the warm
Wet cinders still smouldering and
The windows winking with wailing babies

The old broken beggar at the corner
The trams prams and prostitutes
Umbrella'd bowlers and brawling drunks
And gay children play
In the grey gutter

Ring a ring a roses
A pocket full of noses
Attischhoo attischoo
They all fall off

There were those low slow grey clouds
And it was raining grey ash
In a grey city of ashes
One of many grey ash cities
On hairless heads and running eyes
And fixed toothless smiles
A taby laughed and a baby cried in the grey sun

* * * * *

*

*

*

*

*

the

*

merry go round

*

*

Its stillness
 And its ecstasy
 The heat carves the air
 Into blocks of solid stone and turns
 The sky to hazy steel.
 Suckled by warmth the heather moor sleeps,
 The bemused adder basks on a stone
 And against a pedal-note of rasping grasshoppers, the lark
 Splashes its song over the rocks.
 And its stillness
 Hypnosis.....

C'MON EVERYBODY, LETS TWIST!

The present is a time for inconscient activity
 The double cins are dancing and behind
 Apallisade the matchstick men with bellies
 Fly-blown and hunger hollow
 Look on.
 'They must not presume to gather up the crumbs'.
 The sun smiles .
 A shadow stains the bracken
 the lark drops
 to its nest and the grasshoppers
 Stop.
 An agonizing stillness, the eye
 Of the storm, scalloped
 By the mournful dirge of the curlew.
 Car-lui, car-lui.....

C'MON EVERYBODY, LETS TWIST!

Dancing still the double chins sweat out their corpulence
 Wringing from life the last drop of sensual pleasure to suppress
 The boredom of disgust
 Beneath their feet the white wash and the stucco of the palisade
 Begin to peel and flake.
 A gangrenous foot appears, puckered, projecting
 from a rampart, atumulus
 of putrescent bodies intertwined
 Trout-bellied thighs, and flaccid, perished breasts,
 The hair falls out, the eyeballs ooze.
 In a ritual putrefaction
 They cut off the foot.

'Si votre oeil
 Vous deplait
 Permettez moi
 De l'arracher.'

The sun looks on

And smiles

The world spins
 And a frightened child
 Puts his shoulder to the mountain, but
 No use it will not stop
 He runs against it in search of better pasts
 But its a treadmill
 Too fast.....

C'MON EVERYBODY, LETS TWIST!

Dancing desperately, the last of them sinks
 Into the mound of rotting flesh
 All is silent
 Even the sun has left them
 In black, sand swelled heat
 The Vultures

*

*

*

*