

FREEDOM

anarchist fortnightly

VOL. 37 No. 8

17 APRIL 1976

TWELVE PENCE

HEALEY'S HAND-OUT

THE CHANCELLOR, Mr. Healey, has firmly placed the next round of wage limits into the trade union leaders' lap. Instead of the normal noises of reaction to a set of figures, the TUC have to decide how they want the wages for the forthcoming increase packaged. In this way the government places that decision and responsibility onto the trade unions who, if it fails, will take most of the blame from their membership. The package includes tax allowances if pay increases are limited to 3 per cent. The other offer consists of a straight £5 increase.

Mr. Healey knows full well that there is growing dissatisfaction among the craft members of the unions. Many feel that the £6 limit has narrowed their wage differential with semi- and unskilled workers. Such feelings have and are being expressed by workers at Leylands, but as anarchists we are not interested in wage differentials. We consider that all work of social good is of equal worth and that in the present society wage differentials and craft and non-craft feelings only serve the interests of the employers. Equal pay would bring a unity of purpose to workers' struggles.

But both the unions and their membership are divided and we are now witnessing the TUC submitting its own proposals. They in their turn have options of a £4 limit or a 5 per cent increase, leaving individual unions to choose for the purpose of negotiating which would

suit them.

The Tories have called Mr. Healey's proposals "taxation without representation". But really they are a realistic assessment of where power lies and the necessity of carrying the unions along with government policy. It is yet another step along the path of union-government collaboration which ultimately leads to the corporate state. Really both the government and the trade union leaderships have the same wish, which is to end the struggle between workers and employers. They wish to turn their efforts to increasing national production, which in turn increases the exploitation of the worker.

Of course, trade union leaders are saying the 3 per cent is too low a figure but the Chancellor obviously wouldn't offer his final amount for any settlement. It leaves plenty of room for horse trading and the trade union leaders will have a fine old time negotiating for their own particular interests.

It has also given the 'public opinion' pollsters a field day. But their loaded questions give very little indication of how people really feel on the Chancellor's proposals. The government can, according to the *Guardian*, take comfort from a poll that records that two-thirds of rank-&-file trade unionists supported the government's 3 per cent proposal. However, one in ten changed their minds when asked which policy would 'personally' suit them best, and favoured a return to free collective bargaining.

Many trade unionists accepted the first wage limit of £6 because there was a sort of rough justice in it. At least everyone got the same amount and it did give some badly organised and low paid workers a higher increase than they might have otherwise obtained from normal bargaining. But the danger is that each year the government will hand down options to the TUC who will then decide with the trade union leaders what to accept on behalf of ten million members.

This leaves the membership out of it without any real say in what wages and conditions they are willing to accept. It is one more step towards the Corporate State and away from rank and file control. Some might well answer that members had very little say previously as to what wage increase they wanted. With the present structure of the trade unions this is true for a lot of unions, but at least the leaders were still under pressure from members and could not hide behind the law as they do now.

Cont. on P. 2

I'M INNOCENT, O.K.?

IT IS A sad but true reflection on the nature of British "justice" that it needs the celebrity and influence of a man like Peter Hain to be acquitted of charges brought on 'dubious' evidence.

Legal reform groups such as *Justice* inform us that the number of people convicted on such evidence is much higher than people imagine. Not surprisingly, their evidence was ignored by the Devlin Committee of Inquiry which looked into the identification procedure.

Hain, thanks mainly to his reputation as a "political activist" was lucky enough to have widespread coverage in both Press and T.V. to appeal for witnesses. To the "ordinary" person, who are the ones mostly accused, this method is denied and is usually exclusive to the police. With a "rising" crime rate, if everyone was given a chance to appeal in this way, the papers would be full of appeals for witnesses. In this so-called democratic country, it just wouldn't do would it for people having to justify themselves, en masse. Hain was also lucky in that he was able to have his solicitor present at the identification parade. His solicitor also had a few tricks up his sleeve to match those of the police. Normally people don't get this choice: although they are legally entitled to it, usually they are given a solicitor as

part of the legal aid provision after they have been charged and are already in court. It is the widespread opinion that have having been made to look guilty in this way, already the chances of an acquittal are slim. Without delving too deeply into the whole messy affair of identification parades it is worth noting a few points.

Normally people who are completely innocent are much more likely to be their own worst enemy when it comes to ID parades, for they appear nervous and bewildered. Any witness who is unsure about picking someone out will usually notice such behaviour, for they usually pick someone, thinking the police would not have wasted their time by not including the criminal. The police on the other hand are well known for their dirty tricks at these ID parades. It is a well known fact that if they want to "fit" someone up for a crime they will go to some lengths to make it work. It probably helped Peter Hain considerably that he was an occasional lecturer at a police college and therefore knows the game more than most, hence by and large the police played it by the rules. The case of George Davis is somewhat different -- they couldn't frame his father but they got a chance with Davis Junior. Whatever the previous character of people like Davis or George Ince, from the shady world of

Cont. on P. 2

What you will pay if a limit on wage rises is agreed



"Don't have any more, Mrs. Moore, Mrs. Moore, please don't have any more!"

HEALEY'S HANDOUT *cont from P.i.*

But whoever decides wages, high or low, while workers are content or accept the wage system then we will remain wage slaves. The wage struggle forms but a small part of the total class struggle that takes place every day. Many more disputes take place over questions of managerial functions at the place of work. This concerns control of the job. It means that people are concerned about how they carry out their work and do not want to be subject to the whims of management and they continue to try and reduce the exploitive nature of the factory and work place. While the profit motive system can adjust and absorb wage increases, it could not do the same if workers consciously sought to take control of their work places and started producing for the needs of community. This is the real battle that has to be fought. Otherwise we will continue to be wage slaves content with financial handouts worked out by the trade union leaders and the government of the day.

P. T.

I'M INNOCENT, OK? *cont. from P.i.*

petty crime and violence (in most cases a reflection of the social environment) they should be treated the same as everyone else.

Most importantly for the innocent victims of wrongful prosecution (in an anarchist opinion--100%) there is the social stigma and rejection. It is a fact that even a person who has previously been a "model" citizen, the fact that they have been convicted results in rejection to some degree by friends or colleagues. Statements from people in this situation, e.g. Luke Dougherty, bear witness to the fact and no amount of financial compensation can ever compensate for the loss of friends and colleagues.

Having said all that, let us make it perfectly clear that as anarchists we should not have any illusions whatsoever, including the possibility of reforms, with an institutionalised legal system, based as it is on property and privilege. No man is good enough to be another's judge or master. A society that is based on true justice and social principles needs nothing as crass and debasing as the British legal system.

Moreover not only should we be the last to demand reforms from a society based on such irreconcilable inequality, we should also point this out to those like Peter Hain, who ought to know better but still strive to reform the situation. It is one small step for the authorities to move from framing an individual to framing groups of people who might well be charged together. It was more than coincidence that out of 8 defendants in the "Angry Brigade" trial, 4 were acquitted -- it is deliberate policy. Recently we have had a number of cases, including the BWNIC 14 and the 21 Iranian students who occupied the Iranian Embassy in London, where the charge was either not proven or was dropped before it ever reached the court. The present Conspiracy laws may be inadequate to get convict-

SQUATTERS THREATENED

A LETTER has been delivered to Mr. Tony Judge, chairman of the Greater London Council's Housing Management Committee, in which Hornsey Rise Squatters offer to vacate one of the 3 blocks they at present occupy conditional on their starting negotiations on the proper rehousing of all the squatters and with the expectation that rehabilitation work will start immediately on the block.

Together with this offer the GLC will also receive a full census of the residents of the estate, thus giving the GLC the information they will require in order to make plans for rehousing.

This is the latest move in a long line of attempts by the squatters to open negotiations with the GLC, all of which have been ignored.

Recent claims by the GLC that the squatters are keeping over 200 men out of work by not allowing them to start renovation work on the flats are brought into serious doubt by the fact that no work has been carried out on numbers 7-27 Elgin Avenue (another GLC site previously occupied by squatters) since mid-October 1975.

Bid to turn off gas supply defeated

On Wednesday, 7 April, early morning, the political harassment of the squatters in the 3 blocks continued with an attempt by the gas board to turn off the supplies in Goldie House, although most of the residents have paid up current accounts. The workers who came to dig a hole in the yard had been told by the management that the flats were empty. Residents called each other to the yard by blowing whistles and explained the situation to the workers. When the workers learned that the flats were occupied and that the residents were living in appalling conditions and subject to

ions but you can be sure they will be altered so that they can. The need of the authorities here is a political one, which is the root of all societies based on such arbitrary authority; the need to discipline and dictate to people who strive to free themselves from injustice. No matter how sincere people like Peter Hain in his J.A.I.L. campaign are, we will always find "innocent" people jailed (show trials are still show trials whether in Britain or the Soviet Union) unless we have revolutionary change, not reformist change.

For those who argue that Hain was acquitted and thus O.K., the police might well argue that (although admitting privately that it was a golden opportunity missed) the law also justifies itself because an innocent man was freed.

We know it never will.

Francis A. Wright.

persecution by the authorities for the sole reason that they are homeless people who have taken direct action to house themselves, they refused to go on with the cut-off. One of the squatters gave them a press statement of 29 March which describes the similarly politically motivated cut-off of electricity supplies to the estate, and the workers agreed to take the matter up with their union.

The accounts supervisor on being questioned by the squatters denied that the gas board were operating on instructions from the GLC but he was unable to explain why the board had lied to its workers by telling them that the flats were empty, or why they were cutting off people who had fully paid up current accounts.

Latest: The GLC won a possession order in the High Court today, 12 April, and also gained costs. It is now vital that the Hornsey squatters get every support. Evictions could come at any time.

Contact Donald Gardner, Scott Birnie, Sean Martin at Flat 32, Ritchie House, Hornsey Rise Estate, Sunnyside Road, N.19 or leave messages at 01-272 9568 (11 am to 7 pm).

BAIL BILL

THE BAIL Bill has been introduced into the House of Commons almost two years after the report of the working party on Bail Procedures in Magistrates' Courts. The following statement is issued by RAP (Radical Alternatives to Prison) as "first thoughts on the bill".

"The most notable feature of the bill is what is left out of it. It only deals with the question of bail before conviction. Yet a large number of remands in custody take place after conviction but before sentence, usually for the purpose of obtaining reports, the prisoner often spending eight days in custody in order to spend one hour with a doctor or psychologist. In 1974 there were 13½ thousand receptions into prison after conviction but before sentence, of which almost 6000 did not receive custodial sentences. It seems ludicrous that these people are totally ignored in the bail bill.

"The bill purports to make the granting of bail the rule, and remands in custody the exception, to be used only when the court feels that the accused would fail to appear, commit an offence while on bail or obstruct the course of justice. But how the court will decide who to allow to remain free and who to keep in custody is not specified. It would not, seemingly, differ greatly

LETTERS

and Replies

Jack Robinson's venom makes a welcome antidote to the antics of the contenders for the Leadership of the Labour Party, but, I suggest, he is guilty of greater faults than those he condemns ("Who Is the Winner?" 3.4.76).

What kind of democracy (if any) is Jack proposing, as an alternative to the counting of heads he refers to so contemptuously? How are we (or how is Jack) to decide just who is the "most talented" and "most fitted" to occupy a position of leadership - presupposing a belief in such things, of course.

It seems that I must also differ from good old Bill Blake, who Jack quotes approvingly as having said that "politics is something else than human life". No, no, no! Politics is part of human life, and a major part at that. Politics in its proper meaning is surely the domain of anarchists. Politics is about argument, debate and reason; about theory and practice; about society and the place of the individual within it.

Jack concludes with a plea for anarchy and freedom that compares with the similar cries of the conservative right for their freedom to make profit. The abuse of the word 'freedom' by the 'left' is as loose, and therefore as meaningless, as that of the 'right'. The simplistic solution is common to both.

The social anarchist opposition to government on principle is irrelevant because history and a realistic look at the world suggest, to me at least, the utter impossibility of society without government. The only question is: what kind of government? Some of us want to abolish the imperfect liberal democracy we have in order to see realised an impossible ideal -- in the process, bringing about an order of things quite impossible to forecast, but almost inevitably awful.

How can Jack or anyone else seriously expect support for beliefs based upon propositions of wishful-thinking? There are greater dangers in irrational thinking than in the institution of government.

Yours,
Brian P. Boreham.

I do not, nor does anarchism as I see it, embrace democracy. I did not suggest that leaders be appointed for reason and intellect, I merely mentioned this as a 'democratic' alternative in face of the unwarranted assumption that leaders chosen by ballot possess reason and intellect, and the choice is made on such grounds if one is to appoint leaders or 'authorities' for skills. What of a man who has been in the Navy, looked after money problems.

crime and punishment, and directed foreign affairs being chosen (not on grounds of conspicuous success at any of these jobs) as leader of party and government. He must be a Jack of all trades.

When I say 'politics' I am using it in the derogatory sense as did William Blake. It is a far cry from argument, debate and reason to Watergate, the horse-trading in the Labour party election, the financial scandals in Italy, the Chinese agitation and denunciations, the Japanese bribery scandals -- all these are politics. The 'polis' in politics was in fact only the city-state in which 'democracy' seemed to be possible -- founded on slavery!

What I appealed for was to realize it is "a matter of bread, of land, of work, of life or death". Truly the ends of all political groupings are the same but the means for realizing them differ. It is these that the ends perceptibly and imperceptibly change.

If friend Boreham cannot conceive of society without government then anarchism is not his belief. I hold that it is not wishful-thinking. Such societies exist, such relationships exist and have existed in the past where government did not exercise its deadly influence. It is wishful thinking to believe that by the counting of heads we shall arrive at wisdom or by the acquisition of leaders (no matter how enlightened) we arrive at freedom and responsibility.

Jack Robinson.

MARXISM. . .

Dear Sir,

After reading only one copy of FREEDOM I have already noticed that you like most older left-wing organisations have been confusing the system that exists in the Soviet Union with Marxism. I should like to help rectify this by giving you a correct definition of Marxism.

Marxist Socialism is based on three things 1) common ownership (not nationalisation which is state-capitalism); 2) production for use (production purely for human consumption and not for sale at a profit); 3) free access (each individual will receive free everything necessary for a free and secure life, the abolition of money finally freeing man's mind from petty financial considerations). As you can see this system does not exist in any of the 'communist' countries nor is it advocated by any left-wing political party be they Social democratic, Communists, Trotskyist, Maoist or any other fakes masquerading under the name of Marx. However, the Communist party and its Trotskyist offspring will try and tell you that state-capitalism on the Russian model is an essential transitional stage between Capitalism and Socialism, this is nonsense! A socialist society will come about when a majority of people want it, whether the economy at the time is mainly in state or private hands will make no difference. I would therefore be obliged in future if you would be more careful and not

confuse any of the aforementioned idiots with the theories of Karl Marx.

I also find anarchist philosophy in need of correction regarding your mistaken belief that the enemy of liberty is the state. The state is merely the instrument of oppression not the cause. The cause is the system which maintains the state, capitalism!

Yours fraternally,
Ian Greenslade.

. . . A REPLY

What you describe as 'Marxist socialism' is what we would call 'anarchist-communism'. We know very well that 'Marxist socialism'/'anarchist communism' does not exist in any of the 'communist' countries.

As a Marxist, you treat Marxism very un-Marxistically! That is, you idealise it, and write as though there were an 'essence' of Marxism, which could be separated from the practice of those who call themselves Marxists, such as Lenin, Stalin and Mao. You will find plenty of justification for the transitional stage under the dictatorship of the proletariat in the writings of Marx. As Castoriadis puts it, "The reality of Marxism is primarily - to an overwhelming extent which surpasses all the rest - that it is the ideology referred to by totalitarian regimes of exploitation and oppression which exercise their power over a billion men and women."

TAXATION IS THEFT

OFFICIAL STATISTICS published on April 5 indicate clearly that after the £6 limit was introduced the average worker and clerk was still worse off after paying tax and allowing for higher prices than she/he was in the fourth quarter of 1974.

The figures on expenditure and national income for 1975 show that after-tax incomes adjusted for inflation fell sharply between the autumn of 1974 and spring 1975. Between the second and third and between the third and fourth quarters incomes hardly rose in 1975. The figures crystallize out to demonstrate the futility of paying tax and allowing the increase of prices.

The real income from wage-dependence, after deduction of national insurance and tax, rose 22 per cent between 1974 and 1975. However, this increase was completely smashed by higher prices. The result: a fall in the living standard of the average employee. This figure shows strikingly the way in which the acceptance of taxation and the submissive allowing of price increases push people further into the profit orientated capitalist system and the state's tax net, and decrease their living standard even though they claim higher wages.

Therefore, smash the state and its taxation to increase your living standard.

Abraham.

PROTEST FOR MARINI

ON WEDNESDAY 7th April the Corte di Cassazione (Court of Cassation) re-confirmed the 9-year sentence on the anarchist Giovanni Marini, accused of having stabbed to death a fascist in Salerno on the 7th July 1972. As has been reported in FREEDOM many times in the past, Marini was in the middle of an investigation of a so-called "accident" where a lorry in Calabria (bearing a Salerno registration number) ran into and consequently killed the occupants of a car carrying five anarchist comrades. They apparently had found out something about the attempted "fascist" military coups in the early 70s. On the 7th July 1972 Giovanni Marini was attacked by an armed fascist squad. In the ensuing fight (or maybe after it) a fascist called Carlo Falvella was killed. Marini was accused of and convicted of murder and sentenced to 12 years (reduced to 9 years after a lengthy appeal). However, who killed Falvella is still a mystery. The knife wounds on the body were not any that could have been caused by Marini's pen-knife since the wounds were too deep and the knife with which Falvella was stabbed was never produced at the trial since the police claimed to have lost it somewhere. Therefore on flimsy evidence Marini was convicted of not allowing himself to be killed by a fascist squad.

His detention before and after sentence has seen him in court many times accused of slander against cruel and murderous prison guards and warders. In each case the Italian State has preferred to shelve the case and acquit Marini of calumny (by shelving the case they do not convict Marini of calumny but neither do they admit that Marini was right).

On Wednesday April 7th therefore the re-confirmation of his 9-year sentence produced protests both in Rome and in Milan. Involved in the demonstrations were the anarchists, members of Lotta Continua, and amongst others, adherents to Autonomia Operaia. One group broke away from the main body of the demonstration to launch an attack with molotovs on the equivalent of the Home Office in Rome (Ministerio di Grazia e Giustizia). The attack having been completed, several youths started to run away and were quite far away from the Ministry when a police agent who had followed the group aimed and shot three times to kill Mario Salvi, a 21-year-old student. The police agent was acting under the powers given to him (supposedly) by the Legge Reale (a shoot-at-will public order law brought in last year and which has produced numerous deaths, including demonstrators, by-standers, and 12-year-old petty thieves trying to climb over a wall). Mario Salvi was found to have been carrying a gun (in his pocket -- but supposedly he had drawn this when the agent fired) but there is strong evidence to suggest that the gun was planted on him by the

police.

The following day, Thursday the 8th April, saw further demonstrations, now protesting against the police murder of Mario Salvi the day before. Again a group went to attack one of the State's buildings. This time the molotovs were hurled against the Christian Democrats' headquarters in Piazza di Gesu in Rome. This was shortly before the Italian prime minister Moro was due to arrive there. Other incidents included a shoot-out in Campo dei Fiori where two policemen were wounded, the beating up of two plainclothes police, molotovs against carabinieri offices and so on. A bus was also set alight to act as a barricade near the Ministero di Grazia e Giustizia.

At the time of writing (April 10th) it is known that further demonstrations have been planned for this weekend in many Italian cities.

What started as a demonstration of support for Marini (at present suffering in health owing to the cruel treatment meted out to him in the prison of Caltanissetta, Sicily) has evolved into a confrontation between demonstrators belonging to several extraparliamentary groups (including the anarchists) and the State's forces of law and order. Further, many issues are involved -- freedom for Marini, the licence-to-kill provisions of the Legge Reale, and the Italian economic situation.

The Italian Communist Party (PCI) has been showing its blatant power-hungry tendencies in the manner in which it has responded to these incidents. The Secretariat of the PCI announced its position on the incidents on the front page of L'Unita (the PCI daily organ) on Friday 9th April. "Unitary vigilance against the fomentors of tension" read the title of the small article, with a small note claiming that this was the "taking up of a position by the Secretariat of the PCI". Referring to the groups involved as "enemies of the democratic regime" it calls them "obscure forces and groups well-noted for their adventurism". It then appeals to "all workers and to all democrats" to isolate the "groups of disorder". Next to this "taking up of position" there is another article announcing that three Communist senators (i.e. in the upper house) have proposed the abolition of several articles from the Legge Reale. Hence the PCI reveals itself yet again to be in favour of these politically repressive public order laws and only wants the police to refrain from being quite so trigger-happy.

Comrades in Italy fear that the almost inevitable ascent to power of the Communists in Italy will lead to exceedingly hard attacks on all non-PCI groups to the left of the PCI (especially the anarchists). It will not just be one Marini but many and instead of being presented in the media as anti-

fascist militants they will be known by the jargon dictated by the PCI as "obscure forces" and "members of groups well noted for their adventurism". It is interesting to note that the other papers in Italy went to further lengths to point out that the FGCI (Fronte Giovani Comunisti Italiani - the PCI's pseudo autonomous youth wing) did not take part in these "provocative" incidents described, than to explain why the protests were taking place.

In a country where the ruling party (the Christian Democrats) have for the past thirty years done absolutely nothing to redress the scandalous imbalances between North and South, between classes, between one part of a city and another and where these imbalances have actually constantly increased the rage of the demonstrators is even more understandable. When in the face of the innocence of Valpreda and of the murder of Pinelli, a comrade like Marini has his sentence re-confirmed for a murder conviction on exceedingly flippant evidence the incidents of the past week are an expected response. When it is obvious that almost every leading number of the Christian Democrats has been involved in either Lockheed pay-offs or CIA manipulation the throwing of molotovs at the D.C. headquarters is not the action of "obscure forces" and "groups well-noted for their adventurism" but of the victims of groups well-noted for their adventurism who are to be found inside the D.C. headquarters. Further, if we look at the people and groups involved in these incidents we will find that they are mostly the sons and daughters of the alienated, emarginated city poor -- what Marx would have called the lumpenproletariat. This last factor probably explains the antagonism towards them shown by the obviously "adventurist" Communists since Marx's contempt for the lumpenproletariat is well known.

Marini's conviction, as we know, is a strange affair with many different factors seemingly involved (he was obviously investigating something he should not have been looking into as far as the D.C., the fascists, etc. were concerned). Appropriately, the protests sparked off by the re-confirmation of his 9-year sentence involved not just the reconfirmation of the sentence but many varied issues. The only people likely to win in the present struggle are the Communists since they are now playing-off disdain for the "groups noted for their adventurism" with the glaring corruption of the Christian Democrats.

Let us not be fooled into thinking that the ascent to power of the Communists constitutes some kind of progress. The Communists, who claim that their "hands are clean" as compared to the Christian Democrats, also make public statements whereby they refer to the D.C. as a good democratic anti-fascist party. As our Italian comrades are able to tell you, if the Communists' "hands are clean" it means that they know how to use soap.

Francesco.

CONNOLLY AND EASTER WEEK

THE PERIOD at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries has been described by Albert Camus as one during which the revolutionary movement lived, like the early Christians, in the expectation of the end of the world and the advent of the proletarian Christ. This is evident from the early writings of James Connolly, a man who reflected the political thinking of his times like a mirror. His early period was one of doctrinaire marxism and this at a time when the marxists were preaching the impending doom of capitalism -- "All the houses, in our times, are marked with a mysterious red cross. The judge is history, the executioner is the proletariat."

Engels had been advising the German social-democrats to use the ballot-box and in Britain the same line was taken by Hyndman's Social Democratic Federation, with which Connolly had been associated since 1889. His first published anthology, bearing the appropriate title of The New Evangel, appeared in 1901, and reflects the mixture of crude economic determinism with the religious and utopian strains that remain characteristic of marxism to this day. . . firmly grounded upon our knowledge of the economic basis of all political action, we confidently await the day when the ever-increasing pressure of capitalist society shall bring the workers into our ranks -- and the destinies of the nation into our hands."

When his next anthology, Socialism Made Easy, was published in Chicago in 1909 new influences were apparent. He had been much impressed, as had Tom Mann, by the organising methods used by the Danish syndicalists in Copenhagen. Connolly had read an account of these methods which appeared in the New York Sun, but Mann had actually visited Copenhagen and recommended the Danish method as one that "deserves serious consideration by us in England where, like the Danes, we have refused to sever our connections with the old unions".¹ Much else that Connolly learned from the IWW in America had originally emanated from Europe where the influence of the CGT was predominant, so that the Connolly who returned to Ireland in 1910 was now preaching a "new evangel" which seemed to owe just as much to Bakunin as it did to Marx, as is evident from the article on "Industrial Unionism and Constructive Socialism" which bears a close resemblance, even to the phrasing, of ideas earlier expounded by Bakunin².

But these new ideas that he brought back with him from America found little response in backward Ireland. Dublin was no industrial hell with the lid off, as Pittsburgh has been described, but was mainly a centre of trade and commerce, with a large army of

unskilled and unemployed being constantly added to by influx from the surrounding countryside. An American-trained electrician working in Limerick in 1896 had been unable to find a helper as few Irish workmen could be induced to overcome their instinctive fear of electricity³. Politically, the star of Irish nationalism was beginning its climb to ascendancy. The death rate among the urban poor in Dublin in 1911 was higher than that in Calcutta where plague and cholera were rife.

Connolly himself had lived in the disease ridden tenements of Dublin when he first arrived in the city in response to a request from Dublin socialists. He had soon discovered that the "socialist movement" in Dublin existed mainly on paper, and when the promised wage of a pound a week was not forthcoming he had been glad enough to avail himself of the free breakfasts doled out to paupers in the Mendicity Institution.

I have long been convinced that Connolly's inner motives for participation in the Easter Rising could best be explained, as T. M. Kettle has suggested, along the lines of that little poem "Anarchists" by Francis Adams, and that Connolly felt deeply the intolerable outrage of the triumph of the husk-hearted Gentleman and the mud-hearted Bourgeois. The living conditions of urban slumdom as briefly sketched by Francis Adams were literally true of Connolly's own experience -- the homeless homes where sin and shame and disease and foul death comes. And how bitter he felt after the outbreak of war in 1914 when the recruiting officers of the British army were assuring the Dublin workers that the trenches in France were safer to live in than the Dublin slums:

"On every recruiting platform in Dublin you can see the faces of men who in 1913-14 met together day by day to tell of their plans to murder our women and children by starvation, and are now appealing to the men of those women and children to fight in order to save the precious skins of the gangs that conspired to starve and outrage them. 'The trenches are safer than the Dublin slums.' We may yet see the day that the trenches will be safer for these gentry than any part of Dublin."

Taken in conjunction with his own experiences in the disease ridden Dublin tenements that statement seems to provide adequate explanation for his presence in the GPO, even if he did provide convincing rationalisations for his actions. Less than three months after he wrote it he was dead and today he is part of a legend; but the Irish have never really understood Connolly chiefly because, as Sean O'Faolain has noted, they have always seized upon the

emotional content of Revolution and not on its intellectual content and, as a result, Irish political thought is, to this day, in its infancy. We can leave the last word on him with Robert Lynd: "Syndicalist, incendiary, agitator -- call him what you will: it still remains true that his was the most vital democratic mind in the Ireland of his day." Whatever else, that remains.

H. B.

Notes:

¹We nearly always associate syndicalism in Scandinavia with Sweden but a programme of direct action was agreed to at a syndicalist conference in Christiania in September, 1912. A newspaper, Solidaritet, was published and propaganda clubs formed in Copenhagen, Kage, Aarhus and Kastrup.

²Bakunin was so prolific of ideas, many of which he never developed, that the following can be easily overlooked:

"The co-operative workers' associations are a new fact in history. At this time we can only speculate about, but not determine, the immense development that they will doubtlessly exhibit in the new political and social conditions of the future. It is possible and even very likely that they will some day transcend the limits of towns, provinces and even states. They may entirely reconstitute society, dividing it not into nations but into different industrial groups, organising it not according to the needs of politics but to those of production. But this is for the future." Quoted in p. 170 of Bakunin The Father of Anarchism by Anthony Masters, London 1974.

³A Penny to Nelson's Pillar, by J. Quaney, Voltura Press, Eire 1971.

RADIO LIBERACION

NEWS HAS reached us, via Frente Libertario, that the Spanish Libertarian Movement (M. L. E.) has started making clandestine radio broadcasts in Northern Spain. The broadcasts can be heard in Catalonia, Aragon, and Valencia. The opening broadcast gave information about the M. L. E. and its basic positions on the current situation in Spain. There were also items about anarchist prisoners, the reconstruction of the C. N. T. in Catalonia, and protest songs.

We hope to be able to give more detailed information about these clandestine broadcasts in future issues.

** "WOB OFFICE SHOT UP"

"OFFICES SHARED by the Stockton group of the IWW and the United Farm Workers were shot up on February 5th. Seven .22 caliber bullets struck the front of the storefront building on the UFW side. On the inside a local member slept through the incident in a cot located in the IWW portion of the building toward the rear. Since the building is less than 30 feet from a railroad track, it is theorised that the shots were fired as a train passed to cover the noise of the reports."

---Industrial Defense Bulletin

March-April 1976

B A I L

from how the decisions are made under the present system, except that under the new law the court would be required to give reasons for not granting bail. One assumes that homeless, jobless people will still be considered bail risks and will be remanded in custody even though the crimes with which they are charged are often minor ones.

"Although we consider that much of the current bail situation will remain the same, one major change is that now the failure to turn up for trial will be an offence which will carry a fine and/or prison sentence. We would strongly oppose the introduction of this new offence of absconding. The bail decision will always be fallible: there is no way of being sure who will abscond and who will not. Some will, whether absconding is made an offence or not, and we must accept this as we accept borstal absconders. Persistent absconders would in any case be less likely to get bail if brought to court on further offences. At a time when we ought to be clearing the statute books of unnecessary offences, we should be very careful about creating new ones which serve no one.

"Even with the presumption in favour of bail, it will continue to be true that people will be remanded in custody who will later be acquitted or given a non-custodial sentence. The Bail Bill does not consider the need to reimburse people for loss of earnings, perhaps loss of job and home. We think it should be required by statute that employers keep jobs for people remanded in custody, and that people can not by law be evicted or have their goods re-possessed for not meeting payments while on remand in custody."

RAP's forthcoming Newsletter will contain members' comments on the Bail Bill. Readers who would like to be kept informed of or help with RAP's work should contact them at Eastbourne House, Bullards Place, London E.2. (tel. 947 0489)

PROFIT BEFORE ECOLOGICAL NEED

THE NEED for an ecologically balanced environment is again challenged by the profit-orientated existing economic system.

Again profit dictates and goes before health.

The cost of reducing the lead content of British petrol from 0.46 grams per litre to 0.40 g. would be between £16 million and £35 million. This, according to T. Skeet, M.P., would mean "inconvenience and problems with Britain's balance of payments to the tune of £44 millions." Hence, the ruling class has decided that it will be done in three stages: down to 0.45 g. by 1978 and down to 0.40 g. per litre by 1981.

But, we demand down to 0.40 grams now. And immediately the graduated abolition of petrol-run cars. And instead the production of electro-cars.

ECOLOGY

■ EARTH, WATER . . .

ONE OF THE attractions of the British climate is its unpredictability. Spring 1975 was cold and wet, followed by a hot, dry summer --bad for some crops but for cereals excellent. This year has been so open that all cultivations are well in hand and the sowing of cereals was virtually finished by 1st March. There has however been an unusually low rainfall which is threatening water supplies in many eastern areas of Britain. Many modern farming practices now require irrigation to ensure that crops can be profitably grown. The natural forces still play a central part in the agricultural scene which can, paradoxically, by its agro-industrial methods of nature conquest, produce increasing dependence.

The circulation of water in the biosphere is a very important facet of the human environment and in those areas where it is positively in short supply this is recognised as the most limiting factor in the agricultural production. In Western Europe where we have been in the habit of profligate use of water, we are now becoming aware, through rising costs, regular shortages, and growing reliance on chemical treatment to make it safe, that we are dealing with yet another threatened resource. There are of course adequate reservoirs of water in the oceans; the value of water as resource depends upon a small proportion of it dropping on land and thereby supporting the environmental conditions required for life. In some areas of high temperature one can support a tenuous life very susceptible to human interference; in others where the climate is temperate such interference appears less dramatic.

Much of the drier parts of East Anglia is very dependent on bore holes which tap a vast underground reservoir of water. In England it is this reservoir which is slowly being depleted by the growing demand, and also by the slower replacement.

The latter day agro-industrial revolution is dramatically changing the structure of the soil, which now requires much more systematic drainage than it used to. There is a much larger area of land in which vast areas are eroded and water led more quickly to water courses and the sea. The structure of the soil has been changed in two ways. The first is that the organic content is very much smaller and the subsoil has been impacted by the constant use of very heavy machinery. Soils with high organic contents are spongelike and retain a reservoir of moisture which is both resistant to drought and enables water to seep slowly into the subsoil. Impacted soil is resistant to the passage of water and renders the soil above it, particularly in its low organic condition, either waterlogged or dry. This necessitates large drainage schemes which in turn leads the surplus rain rapidly to the water course, often polluted with chemical fertilisers and pest control chemicals.

It may be asked what has all this to do with anarchism, to which I would answer: a lot. The breadth of anarchist vision must encompass the whole of the environment of man. Prior to the rapid growth of population the impact of man on his environment has been localised, usually temporary, and small. The attitude of authoritarian, privileged societies to resources has been myopic and exploitive. Such a chaotic approach to the complex interrelation of resources must be re-

placed by an anarchic not an exploitive one, for in parts of East Anglia is receiving a dusty answer.

Alan Albon.

■ .FIRE, AIR.

THE POLLUTED TINDERBOX

OXYGEN, AN essential element to life. But, an increase of only one per cent in the proportion of oxygen in the atmosphere would turn our planet Earth into a tinderbox.

The exact balance between oxygen removal and oxygen replacement could be upset by draining the wetlands. And in an atmosphere containing 30 per cent oxygen (the present level is 21 per cent) forest fires and industrially produced heat would be horrible holocaust. And lightning definitely would provide a source of ignition. Before long, all life and standing vegetation on land surfaces and in water would disappear.

However, up to now, unknown mechanisms keep the oxygen level nearly constant. And these mechanisms have successfully done so despite solar variations throughout the past millions of years. But danger lies in our human ignorance of ecological harmony. Daily we allow the ruling classes' industrial pollution pass by without raising our voices in criticism followed by deeds to stop the destructive capitalist system and its effects. If we do not stop this self-destructive tendency we may accidentally upset mechanisms in the natural order of the universe, and find ourselves in a blazing inferno.

At present the oxygen produced in the photosynthetic cycle is theoretically in balance. However, oxygen is permanently removed from the atmosphere by the exposure of reducing materials, by rock weathering, and the proportion of oxygen would steadily decrease if there were no mechanism producing a net oxygen gain.

This net oxygen gain is achieved through the burial of carbon in the sediments during the decay processes of algae and plants. And the marshes, wetlands and estuaries are the regions of greatest carbon burial. And wetlands are also the regions of methane production. At present the earth's methane production by bacterial processes is around a thousand million tons a year. Hence, nearly twenty times as much carbon goes into natural methane production as into burial.

The question arises, what happens if methane is not made in the wetlands, which are under massive pressure for development by the vultures of speculation and profit. If methane is not made in the marshes, estuaries and wetlands, twenty times as much carbon would be buried with the effect that the concentration of oxygen in the atmosphere would rise continually, rendering the planet uninhabitable within the space of 100,000 years which is a very short time indeed, on the planetary scale.

Our responsibility is to ensure that the handiwork of nature is not undone by the greedy ignorance and profit motivated capitalist systems of modern man.

Today's unbearable pollution and ecologically unbalancing conditions can be tomorrow's death. The cause today has its effect tomorrow.

Abraham.

IN BRIEF

"Britain's Jews"

Mr. Frank O'Brien, an Irishman who was detained by the police under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, has been forced to leave the factory job he held for twelve years because his workmates refused to work with him after he was cleared and released. For hundreds of years the Irish have been treated like sub-humans by the British and their persecution still continues. Willingly the factory workers at O. and M. Nairn, in Angel Road, Edmonton, North London, a subsidiary of Thorn Electric, fulfil the role of British "Herrenmenschen" who have put so much misery onto the Irish for so long.

Can't these reactionary workers realise that what they are doing is to prop up the ruling classes' principle of divide and rule?

Germany--The past isn't dead

Non-EEC members can be barred from settling in German cities. Any German city whose unemployment rate has reached a certain percentage can automatically ban any non-German and non-EEC member from working and living within its boundaries. Racism comes in many disguises.

The privileged puppets

Hundreds of people are homeless but police officers live in rent- and rate-free houses, "for the better performance of their duties". And according to a High Court ruling, the "notional annual value" - i.e. the estimated economic rental - of a police house should not be included when calculating a police officer's income because "a free house is part of a policeman's emoluments".

So... they even get rewarded this way. It's time that we sacked all policemen, because we as non-voluntary taxpayers, employ them to oppress us. Let's get rid of them!

SUBSCRIBE

Send this form to Freedom Press, 84B Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX

One year (26 issues) £4.30 (\$10.00)

Six months (13 ") £2.15 (\$5.00)

Three mos. (7 ") £1.16 (\$2.50)

This rate is for U.K. Subscription & surface mail all over the world. Air-mail rates on request.

I enclose Please send

FREEDOM for to

.

.

.

THE NATIONAL Bus Company, which is cutting its services in rural areas, where there are no trains, has put on the inter-city roads an Executive Coach, complete with fully equipped office, secretary with electric typewriter, a video tape recorder for recording television programmes, a hostess to serve refreshments. Hire fee £160 a day.

DIEGO ABAD de Santillan, the veteran anarchist and former secretary of the FAI during the Civil War period, recently paid his first visit to Spain since Franco's victory. As reported in "La Vanguardia Española", the visit was to find out first hand the situation of his native country, and possibly to consolidate contacts with CNT leaders.

J. MURPHY & Sons, one of the biggest construction companies, was fined £675,000 for tax fraud. The firm had "cheated" nearly £1½ million from the Inland Revenue in unpaid taxes by employing "lump" workers. They also have to pay £52,000 prosecution costs. Four of its directors

were given jail sentences plus individual fines three of which were £10,000 each. A subsidiary firm, J. W. Piling, were fined £75,000. Both firms have three years to pay off the fines.

Sign On!

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development have at last understood the necrophile structure of capitalism. They admit that the "high level of unemployment is a product not only of the world recession and simultaneous inflation, but also of some [?] deep-seated structural changes in industry." And these changes have taken place since our present capitalistic system moved away from the socio-economic ecologically balanced structures of "Fields, Factories and Workshops".

And the OECD reveals further the necessity of recession in the capitalist structure in its statement that a return to "acceptable levels of unemployment" would, if governments tried to expand their economies too fast in an attempt to tackle the unemployment problem, entail "a very real risk of a resurgence of inflation and a return to the traditional cycle of boom and bust, with quite possibly even higher levels of unemployment in the next recession."

NEW from FREEDOM PRESS HOUSING -AN ANARCHIST APPROACH by COLIN WARD

PAPERBACK £1.25(post 1.45)

IN THE FIVE sections of these 182 pages Colin Ward gathers together his thirty years of advocacy of an anarchist approach to housing.

DIRECT ACTION includes his classic account* of the post-war squatters' movement and he here relates it to the current significance of the squatters in Britain and elsewhere.

HUMAN NEEDS identifies the missing component in public housing policies: dweller involvement and points the question of "building for human beings as they really are instead of for the abstract men conceived by the state".

SELF HELP includes accounts of do-it-yourself housing in Britain and abroad, including the 'cities the poor build' in the Third World.

PROFESSIONALS OR PEOPLE? asks What went wrong with architecture and planning? Can we transform them from being the concern of a bureaucratic elite into a populist and popular activity?

DWELLER CONTROL argues that the only future for public housing, whether in our decaying cities or on new estates, is the tenant takeover.

ORDER YOUR COPY from

FREEDOM PRESS

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

Please send me . . . copy/ies of HOUSING : an anarchist approach.

I enclose cheque/PO value to cover cost of book + postage.

Name

Address

.

.

AND SOME OF OUR OTHER TITLES ON ANARCHISM

Collectives in the Spanish Revolution
Gaston Leval tells in detail of the direct action and self-help of anarchists in Spain 1936-39. 366pp. Cloth £4 (post 48p) Paper £2 (+48p)

About Anarchism by Nicolas Walter what anarchists believe, how anarchists differ, what anarchists want, what anarchists do... 15p (post 6p)

ABC of Anarchism, Alexander Berkman. 86pp. 25p (post 11p)

Anarchy, by Errico Malatesta 54pp 25p (post 9p)

And many others of interest in our own publications and our bookshop stock.

Bookshop open: Tues.-Fri. 2 - 6 pm
(Thursdays until 8 pm)
Saturday 10 am-4 pm
Sunday 1.30 - 5 pm

BUT CLOSED ON SUNDAY 18 APRIL

TINY CHINESE MINDS

OUR CORRESPONDENT in Dow-Ning reports the latest stage in a struggle for power which has ended with the apparent victory of Kala-Han Chim and the defeat of Chen-Kin Woy who it is rumoured will be exiled to Blu-Sells at the insistence of Fut Mik Hal who has attained a powerful voice behind the scenes.

Hee-Lee Den-Nis was unsuccessful in his struggles yet he has control of the purse-strings but he is not popular with the industrial workers, who are supposed to be supporting Fut whose nephew imagines himself to have the ear of the workers. Fut was in the ministry which is supposed to look after the workers but only succeeds in increasing the unemployed. His nephew insists upon their right to work -- a hollow mockery since what the workers want is the fruits of work, not work itself.

Kala-Han is rumoured to be a man of the Right although it is possible that his bland, almost Taoist indifference and adherence to the Middle Way ensured his achievement of power. His disposal of Ka-sel Bah Baha and Tshaw and Mel-Ish is said to be on grounds of their general unpopularity

although their venerable age is put forward as the reason. Even Kala-Han himself is older than his predecessor Weel-Sun, whose sudden disappearance from the political scene is still a matter of speculation.

It is possible that Weel-Sun is possessed of information unknown to Kala-Han whose term of office will be shorter than Kala-Han thinks, making it possible for Weel-Sun to return to office without responsibility for the forthcoming calamity.

On the other hand it is possible that there is a scandal about to break over Weel-Sun and Kala-Han insisted upon his resignation at the price of Kala-Han's assumption of office. The workers (including the unemployed) rallied by Fut's nephew played a part in the overthrow of Weel-Sun and the substitution of Kala-Han. However Fut himself has not emerged successful from this struggle; his reward is a nominally responsible post but we are reliably informed that his powers are more apparent than real.

Well-informed sources in the House of Heavenly Transports report that

Chones Chak is the real power behind the throne. The secret societies he controls are said to be influencing ministerial decisions.

As was written in the thoughts of Chairman Ha-old "The pound in your pocket is better than a tax reduction in the bush."

Jack Spratt Wo-King

PRESS FUND

25 March - 7 April

STROUD: S.L.R. £1; WOLVERHAMPTON: J.K.W. 20p; J.L. £2; MAIDSTONE: M.F. 35p; LONDON E16: P.W. 90p; GOTHENBURG: V.K. 50p; HELSINKI: M.K. £1; In Shop: G.P.H. 20p, Anons 94p; MIAMI GROUP per J.S. £30.; BRISTOL: P.K. 10p; MINNEAPOLIS: A.P.S. £3; CARDIFF R.A. £5.70; LONDON NW3: K.O'M. 84p; GLASGOW: W.B. 30p; KAGE Sweden: L.W. £1.50; FULBOURN Cambs.: A.R. 35p.

TOTAL £48.88

Previously acknowledged: £342.15

TOTAL TO DATE £391.03

MEETINGS

EAST LONDON Libertarian Group next meeting Wednesday April 21 at 123 Lathom Road E.6. Start 7.30 pm. Discussion on May Day activities.

SOUTH-EAST London Libertarian Group meets Wednesdays. Contact Georgina phone 852 6323.

HYDE PARK Speakers Corner (Marble Arch). Anarchist Forum alternate Sundays 1 pm. Speakers, listeners & hecklers welcomed.

PEOPLE/PUBLICATIONS &c.

Schooling

Anyone in Richmond/East Sheen/Putney areas got any ideas/information about educating at home/free schools etc. As an alternative to Secondary Schools for an 11-year-old girl. Please write Jill, c/o Joan Harmer, 6 Melbury Hse., Fentiman Road, London S.W.8.

We are a Swedish/English family with children 11, 7 and 1½ years old, living at present in Sweden, sick of Swedish state school authority and hoping to move to Britain. We need to find a school which believes in the right of children to decide, where they have the freedom to grow and learn together, and where work makes sense. Anybody willing to help us please write to: Edwards, Box 6, Vansbro, 78050 Sweden.

IS ANYBODY interested in commemorating the 100th anniversary of Bakunin's death? Any ideas? Contact Karl Cordell, 40 Elm Rd. Chessing-

CONTACT

NEXT DESPATCHING DATE for FREEDOM is Thursday 29 April. Come and help from 2 pm onwards. You are welcome each Thursday afternoon to early evening for informal get-together and folding session.

WE WELCOME news, reviews, letters, articles. Latest date for receipt of copy for inclusion in next issue is Monday 26 April (receipt by Thursday 22nd is more helpful).

ton, Surrey KT9 1AW.

NORTH WEST Anarchist Federation newsletter. Copies & information about the NWAFF send SAE to 6 Stockley Ave., Harwood, Bolton, Lancs.

DIRECT ACTION No. 11 out now. 5p from Freedom Bookshop or c/o Grass Roots, 109 Oxford Rd., Manchester M1 7DU (postage 6½p)

GROUPS

BATH anarchists & non-violent activists contact Banana, c/o Students Un. The University, Claverton Down, Bath

BIRMINGHAM anarchists contact Bob Prew, 40C Trafalgar Rd., Moseley, Birmingham 13.

BOLTON anarchists contact 6 Stockley Ave., Harwood, Bolton (tel. 387516).

CORB anarchists write 7 Cresswell Corby, Northants NN1 211

COVENTRY Peter Corne, c/o Student Union, Univ. of Warwick, Coventry.

DUNDEE Alistair Dempster, c/o Students Union, Airlie Place, Dundee

DURHAM Martin Spence, 17 Avenue Road, High Shincliffe, Durham

EDINBURGH Bob Gibson, 7 Union Rd. FIFE - see West Fife

GLASGOW group c/o A. Ross, 17 Bute Gardens, Hillhead. Libertarian Circle last Tuesday of every month.

HARROW write Chris Rosner, 20 Trescoe Gdns., Rayners Lane, Harrow HA2 9TB

IRELAND Libertarian Communists contact Alan MacSimoin, 4 Ard Lui Park, Blackrock, Co. Dublin.

LEEDS anarchists contact Cahal Mc Laughlin, 15 Brudenell Grove, Leeds.

LEICESTER anarchist group contact Peter & Jean Miller, 41 Norman St. (tel. 549 652).

LEICESTER Libertarian Circle Thursdays at Black Flag Bkshp, 1 Wilne St.

OXFORD c/o Jude, 38 Hurst Street.

PORTSMOUTH. Caroline Cahm, 2 Chadderton Gardens, Pembroke Park, Old Portsmouth.

STIRLING write Nick Sherington, 25 Churchill Drive, Bridge of Allan.

WEST FIFE write John Denning, 164 Apin Crescent, Dunfermline.

Overseas

AUSTRALIA Canberra anarchist gp. 32/4 Condomine Court, Turner Camil 2801. Melbourne Martin Jones Peters c/o Dept. of Philosophy, Monash University, Melbourne.

NEW ZEALAND Steve Hey, 35 Buchanans Rd. Christchurch 4 (496 793).

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

POLEMIC

HAS ANARCHISM CHANGED?

PART ONE

GEORGE WOODCOCK'S ANARCHISM has been the most widely read book on the subject throughout the English-speaking world ever since it first appeared as a cheap paperback in the United States in 1962 and in Britain in 1963. The three impressions of the Pelican edition which appeared in eight years must have sold tens of thousands of copies and been studied by hundreds of thousands of people. Last year a fourth impression appeared (at exactly twice the original price), and it is worth special notice because it includes a new twelve-page Postscript justifying the thesis of the original Epilogue, that the historical anarchist movement had ceased to exist, by offering a new thesis, that the new anarchism which emerged during the 1960s is essentially different from the old anarchism which had died in the 1940s. In this article I shall describe the development of this double thesis, and in a further article I shall discuss its validity.

The new Postscript is not actually all that new. For one thing, it is dated July 1973; for another, it closely resembles a rather longer article called "Anarchism Revisited", which was printed in the American magazine Commentary in August 1968 and was reprinted in Woodcock's collection of essays, The Rejection of Politics (1972). I was not convinced by the old thesis of 1962-1963, and I am not convinced by the new thesis of 1968-1975; I think that Woodcock is wrong and should be shown to be wrong (especially in view of the popularity of his book); but I also think that he is making a serious thesis which deserves to be met by serious argument rather than by mere abuse (which is what it received from Stuart Christie's review of the new impression of the book in Time Out 273 last June).

Woodcock said in his original Epilogue:

I have brought this history of anarchism to an end in the year 1939. The date is chosen deliberately; it marks the real death in Spain of the anarchist movement which Bakunin founded two generations before. Today there are still thousands of anarchists scattered thinly over many countries of the world. There are still anarchist groups and anarchist periodicals, anarchist schools and anarchist communities. But they form only the ghost of the historical anarchist movement, a ghost that inspires neither fear among governments nor hope among peoples nor even interest among newspapermen.

Clearly, as a movement, anarchism has failed. In almost a century of effort it has not even approached the fulfilment of its great aim to destroy the state and build Jerusalem in its ruins. During the past forty years the influence it once established has dwindled, by defeat after defeat and by the slow draining of hope, almost to nothing. Nor is there any reasonable likelihood of a renaissance of anarchism as we have known it since the foundation of the First International in 1864; history suggests that movements which fail to take the chances it offers them are never born again.

Woodcock did say that "we must distinguish between the historical anarchist movement" and "the anarchist idea that inspired it", and that "since ideas are more durable than organisations and causes, it is possible that the theoretical core of anarchism may still have the power to give life to a

new form under changed historical circumstances". But he also said:

So much for the historical anarchist movement. Lost causes may be the best causes -- they usually are -- but once lost they are never won again. And that is probably all to the good. For causes are like men, and they should be allowed to die peacefully so that room can be made for the new movements that will take their place and perhaps learn from both their virtues and their weaknesses.

This romantic thesis was predictably accepted by all the non-anarchist reviewers of the book and even by some anarchist reviewers; but other anarchist reviewers rejected it. When I reviewed the original edition of the book (in Anarchy 28, June 1963) I said that this thesis was "unacceptable", and I went on: "Woodcock ends his story in 1939, but things have happened since then... Anarchists have in fact taken part in all sorts of resistance to the state since the war, both in this country and abroad... Ironically enough, the arrival of Woodcock's book in this country coincides with a revival of interest in anarchism in this country... Despite his parting message, George Woodcock may have helped to turn a fashion into a movement again."

Indeed the appearance of Woodcock's book coincided almost exactly with what may now be seen as the public reappearance of anarchism, though it took another five years for this to be publicly acknowledged, and in the meantime his thesis was generally accepted. It was offered again by James Joll in his more romantic and much inferior book The Anarchists (1964), which is probably the second most widely read book on the subject throughout the English-speaking world although it entirely omits the history of the native British and American anarchist movements, and it was accepted again by most reviewers. When I reviewed the book in Anarchy 46, (December 1964) I criticised it again, and by that time it must have been obviously absurd to anyone who had eyes to see and ears to hear.

Yet the thesis persisted up to and indeed right over the brink of total absurdity in 1968. It was repeated in Adam Roberts's ignorant article "The Uncertain Anarchists" in New Society (27 May 1965) and in several other journalistic surveys of that time. It was repeated when Richard Boston's BBC radio programme about anarchists (which was broadcast in January 1968 and printed in Anarchy 85, (March 1968) was called "Far from the Barricades", despite the protests of some of the contributors who didn't feel very far. Of course a few months later anarchists appeared not far from but right on the barricades in Paris. I asked at the time: "Will the part played by anarchists at last convince people that anarchism is still a revolutionary force." (Anarchy 89, July 1968). Well, the answer was Yes and No. At last people were convinced that anarchism was a revolutionary force, but instead of the thesis being rejected it was repeated with the addition of a new one -- the old anarchism had indeed died, in Spain in 1939, or anyway a long way away a long time ago; and a new anarchism had been born, in Paris in 1968 or in London in 1963, or anyway somewhere near and sometime recently.

This new thesis was already being offered before the French "events" were quite over, especially by liberal and Marxist commentators who had confidently written anarchism off and were having some difficulty in confidently writing it up again. Thus Edgar Morin argued in the French Magazine Littéraire (July 1968) that there was an "old" anarchism which was "traditional" and anti-Marxist, and a "new" anarchism which was

"revisionist" and more Marxist. It was in the same context that Woodcock offered his version of the new thesis in his Commentary article: "Anarchism, as a doctrine rather than as a movement, has had a revival during the last few years of the kind I thought possible. The old revolutionary sect has not been resurrected, but in its place has appeared a moral-political movement typical of the age." He fixed the beginning of this revival in Britain in 1963, "when newspaper accounts began to reach me describing the Easter demonstrations in London" (a picture of which had appropriately illustrated the cover of the issue of Anarchy in which his book was reviewed!), and he went on to comment:

Perhaps I had been rash in so officiously burying the historic anarchist movement. But this was in fact no knock in the coffin. The anarchists of the 1960s were not the historic anarchist movement resurrected; they were something quite different, a new manifestation of the idea.... They represented a trend which had appeared from outside Old Anarchism.

He did admit that, "in a loose way, the new anarchists maintain a link with the remnants of the old Anarchist Left", but he insisted that the new anarchism was somehow essentially different from the old -- that it had a different social composition (middle-class instead of upper-class and lower-class), a different age composition (young instead of old), a different national composition (developed instead of undeveloped countries), and above all a different ideological composition (non-violent instead of violent, pragmatic instead of dogmatic, evolutionary instead of revolutionary).

In 1970, Woodcock's old thesis was criticised by Richard Drinnon in a speech which opened a session on anarchism held by the American Historical Association in Washington (and which was printed in Anarchy 109, March 1970); it was defended by Woodcock (in Anarchy 114, August 1970), who repeated his original statement that the surviving anarchist movement was "only the ghost of the historical anarchist movement", insisted that it "was true when it was written in 1960", and insisted further that the new anarchism "lacks continuity with the historic movement" and that the new anarchists "have very often little knowledge of and less concern about the 'historic movement'".

At the same time, however, James Joll implicitly rejected the old thesis when he said at the end of his contribution to a symposium on "Anarchism Today" that "in one form or another, anarchism is, in the second half of the twentieth century, still very much a living tradition" (Government and Opposition, Autumn 1970, reprinted as Anarchism Today in 1971). He never explicitly repudiated the views given in his book The Anarchists (the paperback edition of 1969 added no new material and merely corrected a few minor errors), but his contribution and several others in the same symposium took for granted the historical continuity between "Anarchism Today" and anarchism yesterday, and he apparently told Daniel Guérin that "he had to some extent revised his views".

Conflicting views about the old thesis may be found among much more expert commentators in France. Jean Maitron, the author of the authoritative Histoire du mouvement anarchiste en France (1951 and 1955), stated that anarchism had died not at the beginning of the Second World War but at the beginning of the First World War, in 1914 -- thus excluding the experience of both the Russian and the Spanish revolution! On the other hand Daniel Guérin, the editor of Ni Dieu ni maître, the best anthology of anarchist writings, and the author of L'anarchisme, the best summary of anarchist theory and practice, both of which were published in 1965, stated that the break between "old" and "new" anarchism occurred not during the 1960s but during the 1890s -- when anarchists turned from theory to practice by re-entering the working-class movement. Guérin criticised the thesis of Woodcock, Joll and Maitron, and went on to predict the revival of practical anarchism; and in a Postscript added to the English edition of L'anarchisme (Anarchism, 1970), he claimed with reason that his prediction had been fulfilled. Luis Mercier-Vega, the author of L'incroyable anarchisme (1970), saw no break at all.

Similar disagreements appeared in the various studies of anarchism which appeared across the Atlantic during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Irving Louis Horowitz referred in

his anthology The Anarchists (1964) to "the virtual disappearance of anarchism as an 'organised' social movement"; yet Leonard I. Krimerman and Lewis Parry assumed in their anthology Patterns of Anarchy (1966) that there was an essential continuity between classic and contemporary anarchism, and the same assumption pervaded Marshall S. Shatz's anthology of The Essential Works of Anarchism (1971) and Paul Berman's Quotations from the Anarchists (1972). On the other hand Gerald Runkle in Anarchism: Old and New (1972) distinguished between the old anarchism of the historical movement, and the new anarchism of the student left, the radical right, and the existentialists in the contemporary United States.

This of course is the double thesis of George Woodcock, and it is repeated again in the new Postscript to Anarchism. Woodcock begins with a reconsideration of the events since his book first appeared. "In the decade since then the ideas of anarchism have emerged again, rejuvenated, to stimulate the young in age and spirit and to disturb the establishments of the right and the left." Yet he insists once more that what has happened is not the reappearance of the old anarchism but the appearance of a new anarchism:

What we have seen in the last decade on an almost world-wide scale has not been the revival of this historic anarchist movement, with its martyrology and its passwords all complete.... a movement which, like the political parties it claimed to reject, had developed its own orthodoxies of thought, its own rigidities of action, a movement that became divided into sects as sharply opposed as those that parted early Christianity.... The significant contemporary phenomenon has been something quite different, an autonomous revival of the anarchist idea, whose extraordinary power of spontaneous renewal, as I remarked in the Prologue to the original edition of this book, is due to its lack of any fixed forms of dogma, to its variability, and hence to its adaptability.

He suggests that anarchism "does not need a movement to carry it forward", and summarises the growth of what he calls "neo-anarchism" as follows:

What has happened during the revival of anarchism in recent years is an explosion of ideas which has carried the essential libertarian doctrines, and the methods associated with them, far beyond the remnants of the old anarchist organisations, creating new types of movements, new modes of radical action, but reproducing with a surprising degree of faith -- even among young people who hardly know what the word anarchism means -- the essential ideas on the desirable reshaping of society that have been taught by the seminal thinkers of the libertarian tradition from Winstanley in the seventeenth century down to writers like Herbert Read and Paul Goodman in our own time.

He then goes back to describe "the interlude between 1939 and the early 1960s" -- the "nadir of anarchism" -- which was the period when he was himself active in the anarchist movement. He says that "the breakdown of anarchism as an international movement, a process that had begun in 1917", was completed during the Second World War. He adds that "the dormancy of the movement extended even to the Spaniards", and he refers dismissively to "a brief guerilla struggle" and "a few raids" and to "a movement of refugees encysted in memories of the past".

He says that during the war there was a survival rather than revival of anarchism "in the English-speaking countries", and that "the most creative insights... came from libertarian writers outside the organised movement" in London, New York and San Francisco. Indeed "Britain became for a period the real centre of seminal anarchist thought", especially in the revived paper Freedom and the new magazine Now. The leading figures are listed as Dwight Macdonald, Herbert Read, Alex Comfort, George Woodcock, Kenneth Rexroth, Paul Goodman, Robert Duncan, and Denis Levertov; the main preoccupations, apart from literature, are given as psychology and education.

(to be continued)

N.W.

ANARCHISM versus CORPORATISM

THE MOVE towards a more authoritarian régime, even a dictatorship, is much talked of nowadays. As an anarchist paper FREEDOM has also approached the issue on more than one occasion. A recent article entitled "Creeping Fascism" saw the Conservative party's Thatcher-inspired, true-blue trade union activism as a new step towards the corporate state.

But if the origins of corporatism in Britain have been traced back to Conservative rule in the early sixties (and they could be traced back further) it would be misleading to attribute corporatist tendencies specifically either to left or right. Wedgwood Benn here distorts the issue on two counts - firstly by attributing corporatism only to Tory premiers and the "generals" of the CBI and secondly by stating that the path towards the corporate state was successfully blocked by the unions (the "troops") when the miners brought down the Heath regime. Indeed, it shouldn't be forgotten that if the ex-natural party of government wishes to invest unions with the Conservative spirit, certain supporters of the present one have been heard openly to advocate - and particularly before the £6 a week pay limit - the total abolition of those unions which didn't recognise socialism when they saw it. From the state socialist viewpoint this is, after all, logical.

Left-wing fascism and state socialism have much in common. The former can, in fact, without due exaggeration, be described as a particularly tough and plainspoken and self-conscious version of the latter. While during the Ventennio the "liberal" right wing of Italian fascism sang the praises of private enterprise, left wing exponents of fascist corporatism were waging war against Capital. The break down of the old socialist CGL into fascist "economic unions" providing the substructure of 22 corporations of workers and management under the control of the state and appealing, if need be, to a special tribunal of the Court of Appeal, was seen by them as an excellent way of destroying the capitalist system. The fascist "sansepolcrista" programme of 1919, advocating universal suffrage (extended to women), the eight-hour day, progressive taxation, sequestration of war profits and workers' control of industry, would have seemed extreme to a Labour party conference. Gentile, in the famous dictionary entry against fascism, defined it as anti-socialist and anti-materialist, but at the same time he exalted the state as the spiritual entity to which the individual sacrificed his own particular interests, in much the same way as the bureaucracies of Eastern Europe today give a predominant place in their criminal codes to "crimes against the State". In both cases the "general will" of the people is, as it were, spiritualised within the framework of the State.

As for the promise to bring social

peace and harmony in place of strife, it is as familiar to the British voter as it was to the Italian. Now, as then, the abolition of conflict between government, management and unions is seen as the prerequisite of a stable and prosperous regime and of a meek populace.

Making parallels in history is a dangerous occupation. There is, however, little doubt about the rise of the corporate state in this country. It has been excused as the inevitable result of a high-technological society with a bad economic record and a continuing growth in industrial concentration. In such circumstance, it has been said, the government can do little but take on an increasingly directive role in control, allocation, distribution, coordination, protection, regulation etc., etc. But from another point of view, corporatism can only be seen as a deliberate attempt to eliminate industrial (and with it, political) conflict.

The plans to establish "social harmony" are many, varying from the traditional electoral deals and compacts to the new party activism of the Thatcherites. There is, of late, even the suggestion that the House of Lords be supplanted by a second economic and industrial chamber, in which union leaders and the "captains of industry" become the new industrial parliamentarians. There is also the policy of straightforward intimidation through inflation/unemployment. Wilson saw the cooperation (or taming) of the unions as one of his two greatest victories (the other being the entry by "consent" into the EEC).

*

Anarchists take a precisely opposite view to that which advocates corporatism. For them the state is not the arbitrator between opposing sides, but in itself the generator of tension and violence.

According to the introductory article in *L'Anarchismo degli anarchi** "the anarchists have deduced that conflict, opposing interests between men, are not due to causes inherent in human nature, but to the will of men a minority of whom wish to continue to live parasitically and dominate others, by angrily defending with laws, with violence and brutality their ill-acquired privileges; on the other hand the large majority of men, being ever more more aware of the causes of their ills, misery, suffering, humiliation and great sacrifices, search for the ways and means of freeing themselves from exploitation, deception, tyranny."

This passage, of course, underlines the classic anarchist view that nothing is inevitable and everything possible. But to my mind the following lines raise a more questionable point:

*Collana Vallera, Iglesias, 1975, "La base fondamentale dell'anarchia e la ragion d'essere degli anarchici"

"The causes of conflict, of contrasting interests between men, are therefore due to the human will and (human) possibilities and precisely because due to these, are capable of elimination through the will and through (these same) possibilities."

Anarchism is full of arguments of this sort, questioning the concept of native aggression, stressing cooperation, mutual aid - which is its value in a competitive world. But to suggest even the desirability of an eventual elimination of conflict among men is surely as facile and potentially dangerous as to cling to the corporatist solution. To suppose, and hope, that a more anarchic society would also be homogenous - that it would, or could, or should, bring an end to conflict (as it were, trapping freedom like a beautiful specimen in some post-Revolution preservative) is to suppose and hope that that society would somehow arrive at a destination. And those who believe anarchism should arrive at a peaceful and united society, or anywhere else for that matter, risk making the same mistake as the politicians.

After all, for them, once in power, political tension is no longer seen as an instrument of liberty - no more than violence and defiance is normally seen as an instrument of love. The idea of political struggle as a source of energy, the continuing process and condition of freedom (well beyond anarchy, who knows?) is replaced by the sponge-like symbiosis of authoritarian/fascistic rule in the interests of social unity and the "general good".

As Bakunin said, "In a free society there will be much dissidence and difference in outlook." There will be an elasticity permitting of the really free play of the dialectical forces within it. On the one hand, a free, pluralistic society would reduce the warfare that is the bloody coin of statism, and its preoccupation with unity. Through its rejection of authority over the will of others, it would be able to provide a safety valve for the different aspirations within society. On the other, because it cannot dominate others without losing its meaning as the vehicle of freedom, anarchism will almost certainly continue to encounter opposition of some kind or another, in my view it is futile to look, as so many anarchists (and marxists and socialists) do, to a non-political (and non-violent) world, and to a situation in which anarchism will not remain an actively combative, and therefore political, force.

There is a sense in which this could be called a "revolutionary liberal" approach to anarchism as the term was first used by Pieoro Gobetti when defending the need of the dialectic for a free society. Leaving aside a detailed critical discussion of Gobetti's work (and there is much in it to criticise from an anarchist viewpoint) it suffices

(cont. on P. 12)

for the purpose of argument to say that his analysis of the Liberal state of the post Risorgimento period in Italy is still one of the most relevant and valuable when considering corporatism today.

For Gobetti the "transformist" policies of the Liberal state (the sucking into the government machine of all political opposition) had corrupted the will to fight. They had actively paved the way for the fascist dictatorship, which represented the renunciation of political struggle. Gobetti saw his task as the establishment of an "honest intransigence suggested by the sense that antithesis is necessary and that the (political) struggle coordinates rather than suppresses it." His war was against the ruling class' "sterile dream of social unity", a falsely based Mazzinian concept that had ultimately

led to the fascist degeneration. And in the Turin factory council movement, as in the Russian soviet, he saw the weapon of a new and revolutionary liberalism that would restore conflict (in Gobetti's terms, especially the class war) as a force of liberty rather than hatred. That liberty was not so much an aim as a method.

Gobetti was bolder, more sincere, more clear-sighted but also more ingenious than his comrades in the new Pci. (Already the young Torinese communists and the Bordigists of Naples were looking to an ending, or at the most, to a trimming down of the dialectic within the cadre of a party-led proletarian state). He died at the age of 25 just 50 years ago, his health broken by fascist thuggery before this had become fully institutionalised, and before the real implications of Lenin-

ism in Russia had been realised by the western world. Who knows what his reaction would have been?

For us it no longer matters. But in 1976, in Britain, as the corporate state approaches, and as sociologists and lawyers come from overseas to study its workings at first hand, we might remember this idea. Transformism, corporatism, the desire to end political conflict, is not the peculiarity of a particular brand of -ism, but of all power-conscious parties, and ideals that seek a destination.

In such parties and ideals the fear of extinction can be paralleled only to that same irrational fear in the human species.

Nevertheless, it should be resisted.

G. F.

UNWANTED GUESTS

IN NORTH-WEST Europe "foreign" workers have made possible the economic recovery of several of these countries in the post-war era. It is a fact that one out of seven manual workers in Britain and in Germany is an immigrant. In France, Switzerland and Belgium an estimated 25% of the industrial labour force are foreigners. *Fortune*, the American business magazine, stated that migrant workers "now appear indispensable to Europe's economy. What was initially a temporary expedient has become ... a permanent necessity".

The vast majority of these migrants did not arrive in north-western Europe under their own initiative exclusively. Nor did they invade according to some predetermined plan to cause gross unemployment for the indigenous labour force. At the time they arrived there was work for all, except that the employers did not want to pay a decent wage for the job.

Therefore, it is not surprising to find that in the 1950s textile manufacturers from north-west England engaged in a fairly extensive advertising campaign in far away Calabria where economic conditions were desperate enough to make it seem viable for people to leave everything they've ever known and come to work in a damp, dreary Lancashire town for fantastic wages (in 1959-60) of £7 per week for a man or £3.50 for a woman. The fact that women could be employed (or exploited) was a prime motivation towards making the final decision.

In Turkey the German Federal Republic's industrial magnates used the Recruitment Centres in Istanbul where prospective workers were put through similarly degrading tests as those for joining the army. For a certain period of time therefore the *Gastarbeiter* was indeed a wanted guest (even if he and his family were treated like animals in Germany and Switzerland especi-

ally).

In Britain the Mediterranean guest worker has not been made as unwelcome as his counterparts in Germany because he and his family are not as strikingly different in appearance as the Asians and the West Indians. Hence most of Britain's immigration policies have concentrated on initial exclusion (of coloureds mainly) and the calls for repatriation by the likes of Powell have so far remained the wishes of fanatical would-be Aryans only.

In Germany, however, not only has the Federal Republic revealed part of its still present Nazi influence through the McCarthyite measures of the *Berufsverbot*, but its racist past has now become an integral part of the electoral (and possibly legislative) programme of the Social Democrats, Christian Democrats and Liberals. The Christian Democrat Filbinger is typical in his views. He maintains that "in the interests of foreign policy" he must be in favour of a voluntary return by the *Gastarbeiter*. According to Filbinger the situation of the German labour market becomes increasingly worse in Germany and it is likely to continue declining, especially as regards young employed. "It will be impossible to employ the newcomers onto the labour market this year because there are too many foreigners in Germany."

A reduction in the number of guest workers, maintains Filbinger, is the only chance left for the employment of Germany's youth, taking into account also that since the youngsters are so desperate they would be satisfied even with manual labour (Wow!): those jobs in fact held by the foreigners.

Georg Benz of the metal-workers union IG Metall points out, however, that the unemployment of young people is basically a structural problem which is

bound to increase as the economic crisis develops. The lack of co-ordinated and planned investment has, in his opinion, produced a difficult situation of over-production the risks and consequences of which are always borne by the workers.

Both the federal government and the massive union enterprise of the D.G.B. have shown (as we would expect) two faces on the question of foreign workers. Plans to rid Germany of the "guest workers" were presented on 23 October 1975 by chancellor Helmut Schmidt as "proposals", thinking that they would not give rise to negative reactions. Indeed with growing unemployment it was intended that Socialists and Liberals would also try and gain votes through policies of reducing the number of guest workers and replacing them with Germans. Much "pro-foreigner" lobbying however caused great embarrassment to the government, and party leaders, especially the Socialists, who always proclaimed to be the defenders of the rights of the foreigners. Of much heavier impact than these smaller groups was the position taken by the D.G.B., which really alarmed the minister for employment Walter Arendt. In fact the D.G.B. had initially strongly condemned the proposals, so much so that in the protest letter sent by the Gelsenkirchen committee they claim to share the opinion of the D.G.B. on this matter.

On the same day, however, the Press office of the D.G.B. published a note in which it tried to present the government's proposals as being unimportant since they are merely "theses" on which should be done and will probably never come about. Not a very strong position to hold, to say the least! The next stage, no doubt, will be support for the proposals.

Herbert Leuninger, a member of one of the solidarity committees with "foreign co-citizens" (Initiativau-

schuss Ausländische Mitbürger in Hessen) sees the contradictory statements of the government and the unions as attempts to firstly calm down the electorate and secondly to keep face with the Gastarbeiter. Further, the government is fully aware that a policy of repatriation of the Gastarbeiter to their countries of origin will not be successful, neither from Germany's point of view nor from Italy's, Turme y's, Jugoslavia's, Greece's, etc.

Neither need the guest workers bother to look towards their consulates and embassies for support. Mario Luciolli, the Italian ambassador in Bonn, has fully co-operated with the Berufsverbot to the extent of forbidding any of his employees from taking part in any "political" organisations, especially a self-help committee attached to the unions and organised by the Italian workers in Germany. It is believed that the fact that the committee did not allow representatives of the fascist-union (I. S. N. a. L.) to participate is not unconnected with the ambassador's position. Nor are the Turkish workers blessed with an understanding government!

The proletariat "à la Marx" is therefore still in existence and most prominent in Karl Marx's own country of origin. The guest-proletariat did indeed have no choice but to sell their labour to the highest bidder (as far as they could see in their countries of origin) but were in fact selling their very lifestyles, culture, climate and their labour to the lowest of bidders in the host country. For "helping" the Mediterranean countries with their post-war unemployment problems (i. e. cutting down their own labour costs) the hosts demanded and obtained through the E. E. C. convenient one-way trade facilities. Typical of this was the furore caused less than two years ago when the Italian government threatened to introduce import controls. It was Germany and France who had also constantly complained of Italy's lack of seriousness in its economic policies. However, when Italy's policies did become serious these two "partners" were the first to howl against their biggest commodity market in Europe.

The outstanding feature about this exploitation on a huge geographical scale is the way that it is rendered possible. It is only possible to make people sell themselves to a strange unknown employer far away if governments co-operate. This co-operation entails the spreading of certain economic myths in the country of origin -- e. g. a bad balance of payments position can only be solved by the workers in that country tightening their belts and making other sacrifices. The fact that Italy, for instance, imports food from France which it could have produced itself for home consumption is neatly ignored. Other cretinous arguments include the myth of the disciplined German worker. Apparently, Germany became an economic success after losing the war (did anybody win?) because of the discipline, application etc. of the Aryan superman.

The efforts made by the Germans to

attract the Gastarbeiter in the post-war era hints at the fact that the German super-prole was not quite enough for the success of that country's economy. Lazy, garlic-breathing, pleasure-seeking Mediterranean peasants were for some reason required in great numbers. What did the rulers of the emigrant countries have to gain by this one way relationship, however? The Italian bourgeoisie is noted for its "chic", and a life-style which the German and British bourgeoisie can only envy.

Hence we are led to consider a less

sophisticated economic hypothesis than the mystifying jargon of journalists and professors would have us believe. It seems obvious that one country is economically successful because several others around it are economically unsuccessful. Further, the rulers of the economically unsuccessful countries are rendered both incapable and unwilling to alter the situation since their work is highly paid by their beneficiaries.

The answers comrades seem obvious.

Francesco.

LETTERS

Machajski

Dear all,

D. L. M. is not going to believe this ("Through the Anarchist Press", Freedom's Anarchist Review, March 20th) but people in Liverpool have also recently been discussing - guess who - Jan Waclaw Machajski!

We have in our possession a photocopy of an article by Paul Avrich entitled "What is Makhievism?", which appeared, I think, in the East European and Slavonic Review, many years ago. (I'd hazard a guess that Paul Avrich will be writing to you himself to inform you of this source.) We could duplicate this article, if enough people are interested. But it would be good, first, to hear from any people with other documents or information about Machajski.

Incidentally, let me take this opportunity of saying that I think FREEDOM has greatly improved since changing to the fortnightly format. I have found the review sections particularly useful. I have cut out and filed many of the articles, something I never would have done with the previous FREEDOM. The Dolgoff-Richards dispute, and the recent articles reflecting on the May Events, I have found extremely interesting and thought-provoking. Wonder what other reactions you have had to the change-over?

Best Wishes,

Bob Dent,
48 Manchester St.
Liverpool 1.

In fact, Equality did give a short list of articles on Machajski, which I unfortunately did not have the space to include. The list gives the Avrich article as appearing in Soviet Studies, July 1965. Then there are two by Marshall Shatz: "Conspiracy of the Intellectuals", in Survey, January 1967; and "The Machaevists and the Russian Revolutionary Movement" in International Review of Social History, 1970, part 2; and finally one by Anthony d'Agostino: "Intelligentsia, Socialism and the 'workers' revolution": the views of J. W. Machajski." in International Review of Social History, 1969, part 1.

As N. W. pointed out in the review section, p. 15 last issue, the major source of information on him in English is the various writings of Max Nomad, and Paul Avrich devoted space to him in "The Russian Anarchists". There are also a couple of pages about him in the old Stalinist "History of Anarchism in Russia" by Yaroslavsky but this presumably has to be taken with a huge dose of salt. The only other source on Machaj-

ski that I have been able to track down is a 146 page book, "Słowo a Waclawie Machajskim", written by a Zygmunt Zaremba, and published in Paris in 1967.

It should be possible to get the English documentation together, but the real problem is access to the writings in Slavonic languages by and about Machajski. Until we can read the primary texts, we have to rely on second-hand retellings, which are rarely good enough.

D. L. M.

MORE ON MOYSE

Dear Freedom,

Your correspondent Richard Warren should meet me who am, if not enraptured always, at least always interested in the "Round the Galleries" articles. I haven't missed one for years and nowadays pass them on too, so Arthur Moyse gets around in these parts and is betimes much appreciated. All of which doesn't actually do anything of course, and I agree with some of Mr. Warren's remarks re art, but still -- for this reader, your good paper does need an Arthur Moyse to sweeten sometimes the general stodge.

Remaining with good wishes in all directions,

Yours etc.,
Lionel.

IN BRIEF

ALBANIA The "first atheist state in the world" has ordered all people whose names don't conform to the "political, ideological and moral standards" of the Albanian regime to change them. Since the publication of the decree citizens have been reporting to local government offices throughout the country. Anti-Albanian names include Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Muslim and gypsy names, and at least one woman had the surname Hitler. An official is reported as saying "We have so many nice Albanian names such as Alban, Ilyr or Mimosa. They are certainly nicer than Hitler." If the Chegs and the Tosks of Albania do not voluntarily apply for their names to be changed new names will be assigned them by the authorities.

Incidentally, the name of the head of state, Enver Hoxha, is Turkish for "priest".

E=MC²

ON THE FIRST of July 1936 Maxim Litvinov in a moment of mental aberration informed the assembled delegates of the League of Nations chairbound in Geneva that "Peace is indivisible". Like devious, pragmatic and unilateral, it was a phrase that few people genuinely understood yet it could have strong men fighting in bars and its effect was to act as a unifying call to the intellectual left who in country after country were paying with their lives for believing in and advocating the brotherhood of man. Like all truths it was a simplistic statement of fact that if a single man is starving you have starvation, if a single man is homeless then you have not solved the housing problem and the world is not at peace until every sword is beaten into Swiss watch cases.

I am no devotee of Brecht for I hold that he reads badly on the printed page and like Orwell he proclaims the obvious, to the faithful, in a naive finger-courting style that their sophisticated audience accepts as primitive revelation. In 1960 the Mermaid Company played Charles Laughton's translation of Brecht's The Life of Galileo with Bernard Miles in the name role. Miles chose to copy the original Berliner-Ensemble production -- because of costs without Caspar Neher's eye-catching copper settings, but it was a fair production and the hollow truths landed in the laps of the eager audience. At that particular season Kenneth Tynan was the Boy God of the London theatre and carrying the banner for Brecht with the same fervour as his forebears carried the banner for John Osborne's Look Back in Anger a few years previous and Tynan wrote of Brecht's Galileo that "Brecht keeps reminding us that life is indivisible; science, politics, economics are roped together for the upward climb; and if one of them slips, the rest are in peril. When Galileo caves in before the ecclesiastical politicians, the future of mankind is plunged into jeopardy." I honestly doubt that the future of mankind depends on one man refusing to recant for having proposed an intellectual solution to a particular problem and circulated that solution, and one owes no one an obligation to burn at the stake because those in forceful authority order that the established opinions must prevail. One has only a responsibility to burn when one has deliberately chosen to lead others; the strike leader, the military officer, the priest or the politician, but for the rest let us all be bar room philosophers shrugging our shoulders if the landlord rejects our reasoned analysis of why his beer is flat.

In fashionable Mayfair is the Curzon Cinema, a place of deep seats and elderly blue-tinted dowagers clutching their old age pension books between jewelled fingers and the Curzon is offering a short season of filmed plays. They are no more than that, in that on the original stage-set with the original players we can see and hear what the London or the New York audience witnessed. Art is indivisible comrade as the Berliners knew, for the poster drawings for Herman Hesse's Steppenwolf film were first seen on the walls of a Soho art gallery, the gallery with its paintings that occupies much of the action in To the Devil - a Daughter is the Piccadilly Gallery in London's Cork Street and in the filmed play A Delicate Balance a huge painting by Kline dominates the background. So never play the Johnny-come-lately with a sour rejection of what you are forced to accept at second hand by reason of geography, for even the posters for your (we paid for it comrade) National Theatre are by an artist whose work was on the walls of that same Soho gallery only a year ago. But we sit and watch Joseph Losey's 1974 version of Brecht's Galileo and as always the stage by its physical limitations becomes a pit of intellectual debate, deep or shallow according to the wit of the author, and a filmed play forces the Curzon audience and distributionwise others later to follow the argument.

Brecht as a good political marxist despises Galileo for recanting before the authority of the Church yet in the darkness of the Curzon Cinema I feel that I have heard the Church of Galilei case reaffirmed in our own age by humanitarians and liberal minded men. The medieval church spoke for the society of its age and based its teachings and its authority on the Holy Bible. Cast doubt on one part of that teaching and the entire framework of that society became in danger. Speak out, cries Brecht; Circulate your work only among scholars but do not inform the laity or you will burn, tolled the Church, and Galileo said "The earth turns round the sun which is central to our universe but who's

arguing". At the time of the Second World War Einstein doodled the equation that $E=MC^2$ and the fact that energy equalled mass to the square of light forced honest men to have sleepless nights for they foresaw the destruction of their society when this scribbled doodle became known. And we had the situation of Galileo and the Church acted out in reverse order, with men of good faith arguing not only that certain weapons of destruction should not be built but that the printed knowledge of how $E=MC^2$ should be suppressed, and this in the name of freedom and liberty. And if they were right then by the same token the Church who forced Galileo to recant was also right for both camps claimed to act in the saving of their society. Brecht's Galileo was meant for the stage and in that claustrophobic environment when murder was the politics of the day it would have been necessary and relevant but it translates badly into the free-ranging film medium. The posed groups and the chorus of singing boys chirping, the script goes ill in 1976 Mayfair but Brecht presents his argument and I do not doubt that all those who died in the $E=MC^2$ atomic horror of Nagasaki and Hiroshima would have agreed with the Church that the knowledge that could destroy a particular society should be suppressed while the Situationists, the nihilists, the political militants and the Irish leprechauns who are at this moment, it is claimed, preparing to send flying bombs into London to celebrate Easter would have agreed with Galilei's followers and Brecht that the truth should be publicly defended even if it destroys its own society. For myself I hold that Galilei was right when he stated, in effect: here is an intellectual truth, do with it as you wish but do not expect me to die for your principles.

These film/plays will circulate comrades in the art theatres of the large towns and do not read into them what the author never wrote. Yesterday the world but yesterday I and the blue tinted dowagers sat through Edward Albee's A Delicate Balance, a film/play of two sets directed by Tony Richardson. This is what the escapist theatre is about. Soft gentle pap played out by good actors. Katharine Hepburn like an ageing captive bird, Scofield the adult infant, form part of a solid sextet of players who know their job. Of the play, it is the play that has been performed and will be performed a thousand times on the Town's stages. The solid united family and its break up when an outsider moves in in the name of friendship. It is always back to Shaw but one must assume that he wrote the quintessential story line with his play Candida when he has the poet Marchbanks moving into the home of the tough, sensible Christian Socialist Morell and in the final curtain Shaw has the wife deciding that she will stay with the weaker man who needs her, and she stays with Ol' Morell who in three acts has degenerated into a bladder of lard. And this is what we have in Albee's play, and as we are not committed because we are all strong and brave we can lay back against a background of blue-tinted dowagers and enjoy good acting for the price of a cinema seat.

One should always question what one is offered and always apply the old political test of who paid for the hire of the hall.

At Tooth's fashionable Bond Street gallery is the work of a new and exciting painter, Tony Adams. Painted in the style of the Beggarstaff Brothers wherein the rounded pattern is built up by layers of flat tonal colours, Adams has elected to take the whip to our society in the manner of the later Wyndham Lewis by flaying the economic creatures of our corrupt society. Philby the Russian spy being interviewed by Alan Whicker and the boys and all the drunks and the phonies of our entrepreneur age, and it is all good visual ranting stuff à la Muggeridge but it is completely ineffective for the very people under attack will buy it of their tarnished wealth, and they will buy it because it amuses them and they do not fear the work of the artist. Let any fashionable Bond Street contracted artist paint a large canvas praising the I.R.A. bombing with the I.R.A. given military type hero status and the maimed and bloodied victims filling the foreground and no Bond Street Gallery would dare show it, offer to show it or be able to sell it for, comrade, you see the film, the play and the painting only when its effects are completely ineffectual to change a social evil; only the poets went to prison for insisting on being heard. We live in an hour when the Architectural Association offers us an idea of the Village but strictly for middle-class commuters and half the villagers of Woodmancott are to be evicted. When the American Embassy and the A. of B. T. T. mount an exhibition of theatre

design, next door to the King Street CP H.Q., in which the plans are so complicated and so technically involved that, like the National Theatre, it becomes almost impossible for the playgoer to find the players so it is to the Questers and the bare boards and the new rising star Andrew Wheaton, for comrades the danger is believing what we are told to believe and not what our eyes and our mind relate to us.

With Ken Kesey suing the producers of his book the Cuckoo's Nest because he claimed that "the script he wrote for the film was thrown away and the whole emphasis of the story changed".

Prison reform is not about the abolition of prison but about reforming prison and the Cuckoo's Nest was a protest against mindless bureaucratic bullying. The patients were voluntary inmates -- they did not have to escape, the door was open for them. The man who needed their help was McMurphy, and he is the man we all know who cannot exist except as the leader of a group. He galvanises the rest of the patients in exactly the same way as an electric shock galvanises the leg of a dead frog. The audience applause was for the oldest ploy in the entertainment game, namely seeing the bully beaten up, but comrades the sad McMurphy's of this world need us more than we should need them. It is not about anarchism but about protest and using others to make your personal protest.

And Sue writes that "Now the Indian kills McMurphy to free him, and he himself escapes into freedom!" With friends like that who needs enemies, Sue. If the Indian chief had felt really charitable he could have slaughtered the entire ward. In 1945 political doctors were placed on trial as criminals for murdering the old and sick and in 1970 on British doctors began to boast of the number of elderly people they had murdered. In 1976 the New Jersey Supreme Court have ruled that 22-year-old coma victim Karen Anne Quinlan can be legally murdered by disconnecting her breathing tube. We are moving into a world when castration is to become official Indian government policy and Karen Anne is to die. This is not anarchism Sue no matter how friendly the thought.

Arthur Moyses.

DADAMAX

MAX ERNST, the German born Surrealist, has died in Paris on the eve of his 85th birthday after a long period of illness. Ernst, who was born at Bruhl near Cologne in 1891, was a man of many parts including painter, sculptor, poet and even "actor" (in Bunuel's L'Age d'Or).

Ernst, like many other young men of this period, fought in the First World War, his regiment being the 36th East Prussian Regiment. It was ironic that at one point in the war he was not very far from French troops among whom was, to be in later years one of his closest friends and collaborators, Paul Eluard. Like so many others of that period, they thought it a war to end wars, the great war for civilization; strange then how countless millions were slaughtered in a conflict that no one seemed able to stop. "No one believed it possible, yet there was no alternative. We have not yet buried that reasoning," commented one writer.

From within the First World War (1916) and in the aftermath flourished the Dadaist movement in which Ernst played a major role, founding with Jean Arp the Cologne Branch. The activities of the Dadaists were to shock and insult the crumbling order, the bourgeois values of culture and nationalism that were responsible for the debacle that just finished in Europe but dragged on in Asia Minor.

Many important things have come from the Dadaist and later the Surrealist movement, but within them they contained the self-destructive element, not only of physical objects. Their emphasis of the multi-dimensional role of objects, Duchamp's urinal, Arp's bus tickets, suggests that everything can be considered as valid and/or "works of art". Such logic could be considered in the turbulent years after the First World War; it takes on a different meaning with the bricks at the Tate.

From 1919 onwards Ernst was to become well known for his collage work whose finished works such as Le Semaine de Bonte 1934 were pure Gothic horror, years later to be used to irritate in underground magazines like OZ. Ernst's collages differ from the scissors and paste jobs on Victorian rainy afternoons and also the "papier colté" of the Cubists such as Picasso. They even differ from the savage "photo-montages" of Grosz and John Heartfield. His collages were the results of juxtapositioning commonplace objects so to produce dream-like but contradictory images.

Ernst also developed a technique called frottage - rubbings from textured surfaces like woodgrain, leaves, fossils, and string. All commonplace methods of modern art. Ernst has worked continuously right up to his death, stimulated no doubt by his wife the American surrealist painter Dorothy Tanning, whom he married in 1946, in later years concentrating on collage rather than paintings at which he is technically not very good anyway. In later life he had become very concerned about pollution. As he said in 1975 from Paris, where he had lived since the end of the Second World War, "Even here in Paris where I like to walk along the Seine it's impossible to be out for more than an hour without feeling poisoned by the air. We shall have to stop making motor cars finally because there won't be any more people left alive to make them."

Francis A. Wright.

MUTUAL AID

MUTUAL AID, often used catchword by anarchists, offers the libertarian philosophy an effective alternative factor to the egocentric thoughts of private and state-capitalist systems. Mutual aid harmoniously acquiesces in the anarchist thought structure, the primal scream for true freedom and self-realisation.

However, what does practical mutual aid look like? Has the libertarian notion: mutual aid, become a mere lip service?

If one desists from demonstrations, economic support and appeals for solidarity, the actual mutual aid is confined to groups within the anarchist movement. At that group-solidarity and mutual aid are not only theoretical expression but also manifests itself in practical terms, e.g. the psychological aid by the members of a libertarian group for one group-member who experiences transient emotional upsets while struggling against the daily oppression surrounding her or him. This form of mutual aid will be found, I am quite sure, partly, but unfortunately not always, within the group of friends.

However, can one really regard this kind of aid as a definite anarchistic phenomenon, or is it just an expression of activity which can be found in all kinds of groups. If one looks into the events of our daily life, into our struggle for mere existence, one will again and again see practical examples of mutual aid, which are taking place in classless and class stipulated spaces. At that the grade of aid depends on the very situations and the willingness to help a person in need of aid.

Because the anarchists claim to be the only alternative for the liberation of the individual, therefore, to be for the individual, not against her or him, it is rather to be wondered at that the mutual aid of anarchists mostly is limited to friends. And not as their theory proclaims, onto all the others who are outside their specific circle.

The article "Death in Jail" (FREEDOM vol. 37 no. 5) underlines in its ending paragraph "the pressing need of creating a free social system in which people who experience transient emotional upsets are not unfeelingly caged in preposterous cells but instead receive the warmth and help of a concerned comradely populace".

That's exactly what's missing amongs the present anarchist movement. Lip service for mutual aid is not enough, the deed is important. And who hasn't experienced how anarchists fall each other. Anarchist practice should follow from anarchist theory. Therefore, mutual aid amongst anarchists and outside the libertarian movement should go without saying.

Abraham.

THROUGH THE ANARCHIST PRESS

In "Through the Anarchist Press" in the 7th February issue of FREEDOM, I mentioned the Italian bimonthly magazine, *Anarchismo*, edited by Alfredo Bonanno. The latest issue of it, no. 7 for January/February 1976, has recently reached us.

The magazine is edited and printed in Sicily, and the lead article this issue (by Bonanno) is entitled: "Mafia, CIA and fascists in Sicily. The bases of a proletarian reply. Anarchism and national liberation struggles." The first part of the article detailing the links between the CIA, the Mafia, and local fascist "independence" movements, and their efforts to maintain the status quo of exploitation, is fascinating, and the theoretical discussion of anarchist positions on national liberation movements is interesting.

Other articles include a short description of the origin of the 'Nuclei Armati Proletari' in the oppressive Italian prison system as a defensive response to that oppression; a translation of a section of the ICO book on "capitalism and class struggle in Poland, 1970-71"; an article on expropriations as a means of gaining funds to improve anarchist propaganda; an article on the Spanish collectives during the revolution; an interview with Roberto Mander, a young anarchist who is constantly being imprisoned by the authorities "on suspicion" of having committed every political crime that occurs in his vicinity; and various other book reviews and documents.

Anarchismo, is published by Edizioni La Fiaccola, and in addition to the magazine, they are also embarking on an ambitious programme of publishing the classics of anarchism. Their major project at the moment is a translation of the Lehning edition of the complete works of

Bakunin, of which the first volume (his writings on Italy 1871-2) has been published. Also already published are Italian translations of Kropotkin's book on the French revolution, and of Proudhon's "Philosophy of Poverty". In further prospect are translations of Godwin's "Enquiry concerning Political Justice", and Rocker's "Nationalism and Culture".

Alongside this collection of classics, La Fiaccola produces two other series of pamphlets and books - including original books by Bonanno, a translation of Tellez's book on Sabaté, short works by Kropotkin and Malatesta, etc.

This is perhaps the place to deny a smear on FREEDOM, which has recently surfaced in the latest issue of *Black Flag*. A letter from one R.A.P. on the back page accuses Freedom of "snide attacks on Meltzer, Graham, Bonanno and others which now punctuate it from time to time".

Freedom has been printing justifiable attacks on Albert Meltzer for some years now, but we defy R.A.P. to produce any evidence of an attack on Bonanno. The only recent mention of him in the paper was in "Through the Anarchist Press", which gave information about his magazine, and informed readers who wanted to sample his style, that an article of his had been printed in *Black Flag*. The only previous mentions of Bonanno in Freedom were several years ago when we reported his hunger strike.

Snide attacks on Graham (Marcus of that name, we presume) would be equally difficult to produce, though Graham's attacks on us are reproduced by *Black Flag*, and various American publications which do not have the decency

to send us copies. In fact, "snide attacks" on Freedom occur in *Black Flag* like some kind of nervous twitch. On the very same page as the letter by R.A.P., we find the gratuitous sneer, "...Lenin claims to be for the disappearance of the State while a Marxist in the materialist sense; he denounces some Anarchists like Kropotkin solely for their compromise on the issues of the time (substitute 'Freedom')..."

Kropotkin's compromise is presumably his position on the First World War, but it is ancient history that the editors of Freedom at that time broke with Kropotkin over this issue and denounced his pro-war stand.

So, we can only assume that the compromise is being committed now, but what are the issues? As far as I can see the only possible candidate is support of urban terrorism as a means of anarchist struggle, and Freedom has never compromised on that. We reject elitist groups such as the Red Army Fraction and the Symbionese Liberation Army as counter-productive and mistaken in their analysis of present-day society. We leave it to the Meltzers of this world to discern the anarchist tendencies within the actions of the Baader-Meinhof group, and the homicidal activities of a gang of pornographic models, petty thieves and millionaire's daughters.

After all this it hardly comes as a surprise to discover a defence of Gerry Healy (not Healey Mr Meltzer), as having "ability and honesty. Authoritarian certainly..." in the pages of this same issue of *Black Flag*. Anybody who has seen that arch Trotsky-fascist in action, or been kicked off a WRP demonstration by one of his heavies, will "certainly" agree with that "authoritarian".

D.L.M.

BOOKSHOP NOTES

ARTHUR MOYSE - a long standing and often controversial contributor to the anarchist press especially FREEDOM, *Industrial Worker* and the Japanese *Radical*, is the author of "More in Sorrow" - six short stories just published by Kropotkin's Lighthouse Publications (60p plus 11p postage) - these hilarious, totally libellous and possibly even fictional adventures of various long-standing friends in the anarchist movement show Arthur as a totally unique prose stylist; profusely illustrated in his imitable way, the irascible humour does not conceal many valid and relevant points about the things going on around us.

Mention of *Radical* reminds me that the latest issue of that English language Japanese anarchist periodical is available at 10p + 9p. Also just in is the latest issue of Sydney Libertarians' *Broadsheet* (No. 86) (5p + 9p). Recent back issues of this are also available in a set - Seven issues for 50p post

free.

Anarchists and libertarians have often sought for and found in recent Mexican history valuable parallels to and illustrations of anarchist theory and practice. Sadly, most of the literature available is biased towards a more Marxist interpretation of Mexican history, including Robert S. Miller's *Zapata: The Ideology of a Peasant Revolutionary* (£1.50 + 16p) and John Reed's *Insurgent Mexico* (£1 + 21p), but neither is without interest in this sparsely covered field. Perhaps more reliable are John Womack's *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (£1.25 + 26p) and William Weber Johnson's *Heroic Mexico: The Narrative History of a Twentieth Century Revolution* (£2.50 + 42p). Also of considerable interest if one can read Spanish is Ricardo Flores Magon's *Epistolario Revolucionario e Intimo* (£1.95 + 19p), the more so as there is virtually nothing else by this neglected and important figure in Mexican history available as far as I know.

In this age of growing awareness of the need for self sufficiency, perhaps I can mention two titles, possibly (owing to their legal contents) of more interest to readers on the other side of the Atlantic. The first is Ken Kern's *The Owner-Built Homestead* (£2.50 + 21p) - profusely illustrated with photos, plans and diagrams, it explains precisely how one can surv-

ive on the land and build one's own home, by someone who has done it. Also by Ken Kern, together with Ted Kogan and Rob Thallon, is *The Owner-BUILDER and the Code: The Politics of Building Your Own Home* (£2.95 + 24p), which includes an examination of the legal aspects of house building, social and sociological aspects, as well as interesting case studies of a series of people who have done it already, their experiences, lessons, successes and failures.

Latest in Thames and Hudson's valuable "Documents of Revolution" series is *1848 in France* - edited by Roger Price (£1.95 + 24p). As before, these are nicely illustrated and contain extracts from over 130 contemporary accounts of that monumental year in France from a vast variety of sources.

Lastly an oldy but goody available after a long absence: *Rebel Voices*: an I.W.W. Anthology edited by Joyce L. Kornbluh (£3.00 + 42p) - articles from the Wobbly Press, Documents, Songs, Cartoons, Photographs and much more, it's all here, a fascinating compendium of working class history in America from 1905 until 1964.

J.H.

(All the titles in this article are available from Freedom Bookshop at the prices - plus postage - indicated.)