



The NOVEMBER Pilot Issue 30p

A booklet, providing all the background material and an analysis of the case has been produced. It costs 30p and is called Persons Unknown.

Information on the trial has also been published and is available (with the booklet) from: Box 123 c/o 182 Upper Street, Islington, London N1

The trial looks like continuing for several months and donations are required for food etc. for the defendents. However there is no bank acc. so do not make cheques payable to Persons Unknown! Send money to address above.

# SEDITIONOUS ?

Once upon a time, in a land marked by the pointed heads of its protectors, consternation had struck the local Anti-terrorist Squad (no relation). Business was slack, promotion rates low, morale appalling and the foreign nasties were being quite successful in their own quarter of the world. All in all, things were pretty bleak.

The standard practice in this sort of situation is the old "Anarchist Bombing Conspiracy" strategem. Used before, but then, the best ideas often are. First select your anarchists, not the difficult bit but it does help if they're all unemployed. An Irish conection is like a free transfer to the Merseyside police. Now arrest them. It's only now that you can build up a case. Keep people in prison long enough and they'll help you with this.

Ideally your case should first involve charges conected with bombings. Then you can get headlines like "Hunt for terror targets" (Mirror - type headline) and "Bomb-making equipment was seized..." (Telegraph - type headline). This maximises your impact with potential jurors. If you need to find some articles used to manufacture bombs, the following might do: fertilizer (not organic please), sugar

This makes you look really good and objective. In fact it does no harm to say you've really got nothing against anarchists - you can afford to look repulsively liberal. After all the jury already knows what an idle, drug crazed bunch they really are (it was in the Express M'lud).

It's a pity, all in all, that the police are unable to pick the jury. Ideally it would be good to

It would be nice to arrange for a bit of identification from witnesses, but this is not essential Remember- you can win a case on flimsy circumstantial evidence - if there is enough of it. A good example of the kind of thing I mean is pictures of the Queen or members of the Royal Family hanging on the wall. These obviously would serve as aids to identification as part of assasination plots.

In conclusion I might just mention that if the defendents really are guilty, then it makes your job even easier - not much easier, but a little.

"Politics have nothing whatever to do with this article"

Michael Worsley (Prosecutor)



## A REAL Urban Gorilla

**Xtra!** for a quiet laugh



Derrick Day and friend

**Inside:**

conversations with a Fascist....(bit) Exclusive!

an inside look at Excalibur House.

### JURY OR PERJURY ?

When fixed, adjusted juries voice  
The perjured truth by sifted choice,  
Then we - with anguish - wish to see  
Our justice just and freedom free.

© N. Racine-Jaques, 1979

(sweetex makes your case more difficult), wiring (that's the easy one) or wrist watches (timing devices).

You can capitalise on your initial advantage with massive security for court hearings (good training for the chaps) and harassment of the defendents' surppoters. Following all this you can quietly drop the bombing charges and concentrate on purely criminal charges.

run all potential jurors through the computers and keep out all those who might know criminal associates, and all those vindictive minded individuals who have complained about the police.

The primary point with the evidence is to make it complicated Drag it out for months, bring in everything from dry-cleaning bills to dust. I've always found that charts of "known associates" tend to impress the jury.



Persons Unknown Defendants

# CAN NUCLEAR POWER EVER BE A SOLUTION?

## and do anti-nukers have any viable alternatives...

When I was last in the supermarket, trying to find a toothpaste which doesn't give 20% fewer fillings I thought of the latest scrap of paper which had been thrust into my hands outside; "Can nuclear power give you whiter teeth? You bet your life"! Well I never do understand these political jokes, I thought, and carried on.

I'd seen the slogan before along with various others on the same subject which impressed me as being trivial almost to the point of being banal, and being irrelevant to the real questions of Nuclear Power. They give over the feeling that if you don't agree with the leaflet and want to stop all nuclear power, then you must be mad.

To read any anarchist press you'd get the impression that "No nukes" must be among the 10 commandments of anarchism, written somewhere on black and red tablets of stone. Nuclear power is painted by such as a plot to destroy freedom, and turn soya beans into beef crisps, worked out by Hitler and Stalin in 1939.

This article is not about why the libertarian left has such sanctimonious views on nuclear power nor is it pro nuclear power. It is not a scientific paper nor a researched book. It is merely an attack on the simplistic and shallow ideas of anti-nuclear power constantly put over in the movement, and also the social ideas which have produced them, (albeit a simplistic and shallow one).

My arguments are in three sections; first that arguments against the safety of nuclear power are based on the assumption that because things are not too good now, they will never be good, or can be, even though the arguments in support of alternatives are based on the idea that things are going to progress scientifically. Secondly, that the alternatives are not feasible in the late 20th century although they may have been 150 years ago or 50 years in the future, and finally I want to look at the political and social questions surrounding the issue.

Now what are the real objections to nuclear power? There must be basically three to do with safety, and questions concerning the political aspects of it.

Human beings make mistakes, and nearly everything we create is built to human standards, and so fails every now and then. This need not be the case; we have been conditioned into thinking that machines have human failings, from birth. Overcoming this conditioning is what anarchism is all about. A leak proof system CAN be built! If all else

fails, all the radioactive material could be confined within a massive steel and concrete basin to catch any leakage before it does any harm.

The second question above now becomes hypothetical if nuclear power stations are built logically. However, people are scarred of radioactivity, and it can cause cancer. But so can beef, and milk and dust in the air. Simply living is carcinogenic, and specific factors only become important when they are in large amounts.

The air is already full of gamma rays. Your body is being hit by dozens this very second, everyone of which might cause terminal cancer in your body. But there is, of course, no need to panic as the chances of such are minimal. Only in large concentration is radioactivity really dangerous and the chances of anybody being hurt by any leaks are tiny. The real danger in this area comes from radioactive waste.

This produced continually and no doubt is a problem. Waste from normal stations can be reprocessed in plants such as Windscale. This then leaves a highly radioactive liquid waste, which is currently stored on site due to lack of an alternative. However, the total volume is small and thus the problem is reduced.

The likely method of disposal will be to convert it into a solid glass-like substance and storing it under ground in steel containers. Once it is there it will be no more dangerous than the naturally occurring uranium from which it all came from in the first place. It could be stored in such a way that it could be regularly checked for deterioration and other problems. So just what is the objection? That some of it will remain radioactive for a long time is irrelevant if it isn't dangerous in the first place.

Alternatively, why not take the waste produced every month up into space in the space shuttle and shoot it off into the sun or anywhere out of the earths orbit. On a regularised basis this could cost less than burial under ground. Perhaps Freddie Laker would be interested?

Finally on safety, the possibility of a core meltdown due to failure of the cooling systems, possibly resulting in release of radioactive gasses. Again a failure proof system is not impossible; it only needs enough thought and money putting into it. If all else fails, a gas proof dome could be built over the top of the nuclear core, coupled with a high efficiency air changing and filter system.

The idea of fully encapsulated nuclear housing and the dumping of waste in space may seem a little far fetched to some people but it is much less so than some of the suggested alternatives to nuclear power.

### THE NEED FOR NUCLEAR POWER

If we aren't going to have any nuclear power we have to either find alternatives or have a much lower standard of living. It seems that many of the anti-nukers prefer to have a lower standard of living (inevitably resulting in a

TOMORROW THE GOVERNOR ARRANGES FOR THE OH-SO-NECESSARY POLITICAL CEREMONIES - BUT AS FAR AS THIS MAN IS CONCERNED THE PLANT IS READY FOR OPERATION NOW.....TODAY!  
THE WORLDS FIRST FULL AUTOMATED FAIL-SAFE NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT... QUITE AN ACHIEVEMENT




PROFESSOR I APPRECIATE THE NUCLEAR REGULATIONS COUNCIL - WE WERE FORCED TO ENJOIN THE OPENING OF THIS PLANT



BUT THIS IS ABSURD

DAMN! I KNOW HOW THE PUBLIC REACTS! IF THIS PLANT CLOSSES FOR ANY REASON, PEOPLE WILL BELIEVE IT'S DUE TO FAULTY DESIGN!

CIVIC GROUPS WILL PRESSURE THE GOVERNMENT TO KEEP THE PLANT CLOSED.....



AND ALL MY WORK WILL HAVE BEEN FOR NOTHING!

**“Whenever I walk down Fleet Street I am, like the vast majority of my fellow countrymen, amazed by the lack of an alternative trendy Anarchist rag.”**  
**“Other European countries have theirs. That’s why I set up XTRA...”**

## Goldenballs

A subscription costs £3.60 for 12 issues (£6.00 for institutions, £4.50 overseas) and we crave donations. Send your money to Xtra! Box 151, Rising Free 182 Upper Street, Islington, London N1  
Name \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_  
I enclose £ \_\_\_\_\_ for the subscription and £ \_\_\_\_\_ donation.  
(Please make cheques and postal orders payable to 'A little Bit')  
Areas you would like to see given more emphasis please tick. (Tick more than two and we expect a larger donation)  
Industrial struggles  
winmin's issues  
ideological debate  
foreign news  
arts  
others (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

# SPOTLIGHT ON POLITICS

## Our intrepid political correspondent looks at Labour's recent splits

So the Labour Party is being "taken over by the Marxist Left" as a result of last months conference decisions, eh? Well, that's nothing new. Ever since I can remember the Labour Party has been splitting and/or lurching violently Leftwards. Indeed, according to most history books, Labour has done little else during the entire period of its existence. And 79 years moving Leftwards strikes me as a very slow lurch.

So what precisely does this Left-wing takeover consist of? Well apparently these frightful Marxist chappies seem to have taken into their collective skulls the truly preposterous notion that people who work for, and belong to, the Labour Party should be allowed to have a say as to what goes in that Party's Manifesto. Even worse, these rabid extremists want Labour Party members to be able to vote for the Party leadership. Think of it! Labour Party members running the Labour Party. As Jim Callaghan and the Daily Express have so correctly pointed out, internal democracy would lead inelutably to an East European State.


Of course, we can all trust the Daily Express - and the rest of the national press, come to think of it - when it comes to its prescriptions for survival of the Labour Party - indeed, the nation itself. The Express is naturally terrified of Labour moving to the Left. For why? I will tell you. If Labour adopts a Left-wing stance, it might lose the election. And we all know how much that would upset our free democratic press.

Mind you, its not just the press who are worried about Labour splits. Labour's own "moderate wing" (the ones that defect to the Tories when they reach the age of about 50 or join the house of Lords whichever is the sooner) is terrified of infighting, warning that Labour should fight the Tories rather than each other. Why? There is no earthly reason why Mrs Thatcher should risk an election for at least four years, and since the Tories have a sufficient majority in Parliament to steamroller all their measures through, Labour might just as well sit back, relax and have a jolly good fight. At least it keeps the rest of us amused - especially for the duration of the ITV strike - and provides a welcome distraction from the horrors of Thatcherite Britain.

The decision by Thatcher & Co. to carry out most of their election manifesto (all the nastiest bits, anyway) has come as quite a shock to most of the Left. Not that anyone expected the Tories to usher in the socialist millenium or anything, but nonetheless few seriously believed it would be quite as reactionary as this. The Left's reponse so far has been strangely muted. Considering what a hard time the Labour Government had with the unions last winter, even with its (by this Governments standards) fairly moderate policies, the Tories seem to have got off pretty lightly. Ringing declarations from the TUC about fighting this Government to the death have been notably absent.

Mrs Thatcher, in her turn, has openly eschewed any of the old "beer and sandwiches at No. 10 round a table" business. Probably just as well, since such sessions in the past have not been notable for their success. And in any case, what is there to discuss? The Tories' policy on the economy has been one of: walk softly with a big stick. Just look at what they've managed in the last 6 months alone: doubled VAT; the lowest rates for top tax payers in 50 years; huge cuts in government spending, with more to come; proposals for hiving off large sections of public industry to the private sector... the list goes on. It seems that Thatcher is consciously behaving the exact opposite to the last Tory government: fewer public platitudes and more action. And whatever happened to that Heathian nostrum called growth?

Not that the government is motivated by 'ideology', as Labour leaders love to say. Far from it. At last month's Labour Conference it was fashionable to talk of hating Mrs Thatchers policies...but... well, you've got to admire her intellectual drive. But intellect never enters into the matter. Mrs Thatcher is a woman who holds very definite, very simple beliefs which stem from the guts rather than the head. In this sense she is very similar to the Tory rank-and-file, which probably explains why she is the darling of the Tory Conference.




Andrew Ward (REPORT)

She is also a shrewd tactician: when forced to change her policy because of Political Realities (eg Rhodesia) she avoids getting tied up in the fine details. Thus the average Tory diehard will blame Lord Carrington for the Rhodesian "betrayal", not Maggie.

So at least four years more of the stern, unbending Tories is probably what lies ahead of us. No doubt some members of the Left think that they can rely on the trade unions to oppose the Government, just as some will rely on that hoary old dinosaur called Labour. Illusions like these have a paralytic effect: we needn't do anything - leave it to our leaders. In the case of the Tory Party such faith in leaders is usually justified; for the Left it can only be fatal.

### Dave Complex.






QUOTE from a TGWU Home Study course:


'How often does the Biennial Delegate Conference meet?

- a) At least once every six years
- b) Every year
- c) Once every two years'



The National Front now bank with the East Croyden Branch of Barclays Bank (20-28-15 Account no. 30688185) The bank's address is Essex House, George Street, Croydon, CR9 1NG (tel 01-686 7651).

Well, I just thought you might like to know.



## ETA: NEW SPLIT

Recent developments in the ETA (the Basque Separatist Movement) have meant the imminence of a new bombing offensive. With the 'Political/Military' Wing preparing a settlement with the monarchy. The 'Military' wing are likely to reject the sell-out to Madrid.

ETA is divided into five groups and it is the 'Political/Military' wing which is the more traditionally terrorist, with its contact with the IRA and some Palestinian groups. The 'Military' wing consists of autonomists cells with support from such groups as Anarchists and gays. Their demand is total independence. The Basque have a tradition of cooperative forms of organisation and in the search for individual identity and culture the Military wing will continue the fight against Madrid centralism.

One of the leaders of the 'Political/Military' wing is the President of the Basque council of autonomy. This represents a significant compromise but while the 'political/military' ceasefire led to the calling off of the bombing campaign which was to have hit football stadiums, it seems likely that the Military wing will be organising their own offensive.

## March success for Front

One of the biggest ever marches to be held by the National Front took place on October 6th. Winding through the heart of London in their efforts to "smash the IRA" the march was marked by the paucity of the opposition. Roughly 200 anti-fascists were too dispersed and small in number to make their presence felt.


Even given the press blackout and the masses of police the anti-nazi league must take some of the responsibility for the lack of opposition. The march was only announced a couple of weeks before, yet the NF still managed to rustle up almost a thousand goons. The Home County ANL branches were notified, to seemingly little effect.

ANL local branches are strongly criticising central ANL for what Sue Lawrence (Hackney ANL organiser) called "their incredible inefficiency".




Comrade Tyndall addresses the massed flagpoles of the National Front.

**A L I E N X**



At Your Local Nick  
No one can hear  
You scream



XTRA! PRODUCTS

# SEX CHOICE IMPLICATIONS

When abortion offers the potential to a male-dominated society of satisfying its craving for boy children it poses a problem for feminists.

This dilemma, already being faced in America, is likely to become an important issue as soon as predetermined of a baby's sex becomes a widely available facility.

In the USA some women are using their freedom to abort to choose which sex babies they have. The implication of this is worrying, and not just because it plays into the hands of the anti-abortionists. Not surprisingly there is a tendency for parents to choose to abort female children.

As yet, even in America, amniocentesis (pre-natal screening of the foetus, which also provides information about the sex of the child) is not freely available.

What is more it carries a small but nonetheless real risk of death to the foetus and injury to the mother. In controlled studies in the United States and Canada it was shown that the risk of foetal death was less than 1 per cent. On the other hand a British study found the risk to be 1.5 per cent, although this has been challenged on the ground that the selection of controls was biased.

But what are the likely long-range consequences of sex pre-selection? At first sight it would be easy to assume that there would be a definite imbalance in favour of boys. In fact the picture is rather more complex than that.

A study based on the 1970 National Fertility Survey in America showed that the major consequences of sex determination would be planning the order of children (male first, female second) rather than increasing the number of boys. Another study of child sex preferences among American couples showed that wives are much more likely to prefer a son to a daughter and are also more likely to prefer one sex than to want to have an equal number of boys and girls. The only exception to these findings were Hispanic women who preferred girls.

In other words it seems that if a safe, inexpensive pre-conception method of sex-selection were available, first-born children would be increasingly male.

This fact is in itself a worrying one. When psychologists have looked at the consequences of birth order in families they have frequently come to the conclusion that parents tend to give a disproportionate share of their economic and emotional resources to their first child. The second child is often more introverted and self-dependent.

At the same time this has been found to be less so where girls are born first - because there is also a tendency for parents to make a fuss of their first son.


If in the future it became possible for most parents to choose to have a boy first the outlook for girls looks pretty bleak. However, to some extent this is a hypothesis because much more study needs to be done in this area to come to any concrete conclusions.

The question that remains is whether abortion on the grounds of the sex of the foetus is frivolous. At the moment most of the American women asking for amniocentesis to determine the sex of the foetus are women who already have a family of children of only one sex and want to have a child of the opposite sex too. If our aim is the ultimate reduction of the population than abortion on these grounds may not seem frivolous - at the moment many parents continue to have children until they have one of the desired sex.

On the other hand amniocentesis is a costly business and women who opt for it have to be wealthy enough to afford it. In America money can purchase for women the right to abort in order to go on holiday. Am I alone in finding this morally objectionable? The idea of women planning their

families in more detail - sitting down to plan the exact sexual composition of their families - will also make many people indignant.

The point is, how valid are moral objections? Certainly women who wish to abort a foetus on sexual grounds have first to be aware that an abortion is not like having a tooth extracted. It can be a very depressing procedure for both parents, it can cause future psychological problems and can also be dangerous to the mother physically. Once a woman is fully aware of these problems she is better equipped to make a decision.



But what of the doctors asked to perform the actual operations? Dr John Fletcher a bio-ethicist at the National Institute of Health in Bethesda, took part in a Hastings Center study group on the subject. He had been against abortion for sex choice, mainly because he felt it to be irresponsible. Now he writes;

*'In my revised view, it is not ethically required that physicians withhold amniocentesis from fully informed parents who may use the results in deciding to abort for sex choice.'*

This change of view is not because Dr Fletcher has changed his moral objections. It is based on the realisation that his position was hypocritical. He could not make such a distinction

*'if one holds, as I do, that the woman's right to decide is the overriding consideration in the abortion issue'. He continues; 'one must be willing to accept the fact that some abortions will be performed for trivial reasons.'*

Feminists have long realised that the fight for freedom for women rests to a large extent on the destruction of a cycle of yearly childbirth. Abortion is therefore a fundamental right. But it is not merely a safety net - it is the first step in the process. Evidence about primitive societies has in the past suggested that abortion

# MANOR HOUSE

Two months ago, delegates at the TUC Conference passed a motion condemning the growth of private health care and Government plans to reintroduce pay beds. Hardly surprising, you may think; but what was of interest was that the motion also included a proposal for the NHS to take over all private and independent hospitals - including the Manor House Hospital at Golders Green in North London

Now, Manor House is frequently - but inaccurately - referred to as "the trade union hospital". In fact, it is not owned by the unions but by the Industrial Orthopaedic Society, a Friendly Society. 90% of this Society's income comes from the subscriptions of its members, who do not have to be union members.

Total direct cash support from the unions is less than 1% of the Hospital's income.

It is true that most subscribers to the Hospital sign up through their union at work. But the opportunity to become a subscriber is open to anyone "engaged in industry or commerce", as it says in the rule book. According to Manor House Hospital's General Secretary, George Bignell, this means almost anyone: "You don't have to be wealthy to get treatment here". Unlike some private schemes, you have to be in good health when you join the Hospital, and you cannot get treatment until six months after you join.

As one who works in Manor House, I can confirm that the vast majority of patients are ordinary working class people who are almost invariably suffering from serious ailments caused by their everyday working conditions. Manor House only treats patients suffering from orthopaedic problems (back trouble, hernias, piles and varicose veins are among the most frequent complaints).

Moreover, the internal setup of Manor House is very similar to that of NHS hospitals - though perhaps a little more old-fashioned. The food is certainly no better than elsewhere, there are very few individual rooms, and hierarchy is rampant. However, patients tend to stay longer for convalescence - in the NHS nowadays people are usually kicked out as soon as they can walk.

So what, you may wonder, do subscribers gain for their 20p a week? It is here that the charge of hypocrisy can be levelled against certain trade union leaders who publicly attack "private medicine" but support Manor House (a good example is Sid Weighell, the railwaymen's union leader who was being treated there when I was working there).

What the subscribers gain is that most precious of commodities - time. The waiting list is very short - where the ordinary NHS patient may have to wait months or years, the Manor House patient will only have to wait weeks or even days.

Sidney Weighell said recently that he 'didn't agree with private medicine in general, but this (Manor House) is a very different case from the organisations which enable the wealthy to jump queues.' Maybe - so Manor House is an organisation which enables the working-class to 'jump queues.' And queue-jumping it certainly is, if one goes along with the Left's argument (and in case you hadn't already guessed, I don't) that the existence of private hospitals must necessarily deprive the NHS of resources and staff (which to my mind is uncannily similar to the argument that black immigration deprives the white population of jobs - both arguments depend on the fallacy that resources and people are fixed, immobile quantities). OK, so most of Manor House's subscribers are ordinary workers, and almost anyone can join. But the principle behind it is not fundamentally different from that of, say,

(and certainly exposure of infants) exists before contraception. Effective contraception is the product of a more mature society. More mature not just in the sense of its technological achievements, but also in the sense that it becomes a more responsible society.

It is precisely because responsibility is only learnt through freedom that Dr Fletcher is right in his approach to the question of foetal sex choice. But for feminists it means a long hard fight against the horror not only of the reactionary, but also the liberal camps. But then liberals have never been prepared to take a desire for freedom to its logical extremes.

References and quotes from 'Ethics and Amniocentesis for Fetal Sex Identification' by John C Fletcher in the New England Journal of Medicine, Sept 6 1979.




BUPA. So union leaders who believe that independent hospitals constitute queue jumping, yet support Manor House, are simply hypocrites.

Manor House has 420,000 subscribers - not far short of half a million. Though it is hard to take seriously, George Bignell's claim that "our principles are socialist", I cannot personally see any great evil in Manor House. 20p a week subscription is hardly a cumbersome financial burden. And 243 beds there mean a corresponding reduction of pressure on the NHS. With the Tory cutbacks in health spending, closure of Manor House would mean that most of the 350 staff there would not be reemployed (at least for the foreseeable future) within the NHS. Bearing in mind that last year Manor House looked after 5,000 patients and performed 3,500 operations, its closure would inevitably lengthen NHS queues still further.

None of which lessens the hypocrisy of union leaders who rail against private hospitals and then use one themselves. But then hypocrisy is not, after all, uncommon amongst such people. Incidentally, in case you are wondering; I am not a subscriber to Manor House or any other private health scheme!

Andy P.



# THE POLITICS OF PARTICIPATION

## Do The Workers Really Want Control?

Libertarian Socialists will naturally be familiar with the arguments for workers' control. But whatever happened to the mainstream ideas on Industrial Democracy? We look at Bullock; before and after.

**I Participate, Thou Participate, He/She Participates, We Participate, You Participate, They Profit.**

This slogan, first sighted on a Paris wall in 1968, makes a crucial point. Control in industry may need participation, but participation does not necessarily mean control. But until the late 1950s this distinction had hardly ever been made in labour circles, except by Anarchists or Syndicalists who succeeded in having only temporary influence. Until that time debate tended to centre on workers taking minor decisions, sitting on management boards, joining in formal joint-consultation but not attempting to wrest control from management.

The greatest stumbling block to any extension of workers' control has not come from management resistance, but from a deep-seated suspicion within unions of getting involved in management at all. Management is seen as something to be opposed. Hostility to participation has meant industrial democracy has been sought through an extension of collective bargaining. Trade union channels are considered to be the only route whereby workers can hope to have more say over their working environment.

### Doctrine

A further theoretical stumbling block also exists. Socialist thought has always contained doctrines involving control over the means of production. Workers have been envisaged as direct participants in the control of productive enterprises. But on the other hand, and as meaningful to many socialists down the years, is the doctrine of central control on behalf of the entire community. Both doctrines concern themselves with how industry should be controlled, but while the former opts for decentralisation, the latter opts for centralisation. This conflict has usually been resolved in favour of central direction and this necessarily limits the amount of control allowable to workers at plant or industry level.

Despite long periods of Labour Governments with supposedly socialist programmes, including plans for extensive nationalisation, concern for consumer protection and the national interest has triumphed over a desire to increase industrial democracy. The Labour Party and Trade Union movement are still committed to giving workers more control - but only through widening and extending trade union functions, and not by any fundamental restructuring of the processes of industrial decision-making.

### Planning

But then this is partly due to the path of British socialism. Socialism is no longer the goal, instead the goal is a planned economy. For this socialism is a technique but not an end in itself. In an inter-dependent economy and a highly integrated society, economic autonomy would endanger the overall plan. Thus a Government committed to a plan-

ned economy cannot allow workers' control in strategic sectors of the economy. It is also a triumph for traditional institutions: the supremacy of Parliament remains intact and so does the doctrine of Ministerial responsibility.

In the nationalised industries, it was hoped that the rank-and-file might be encouraged to contribute from personal experience. However, these expectations have given way to disappointment. The status of the worker has not improved nor is there more participation. The workers relationship with the manager may have deteriorated, as the ultimate boss is now even more remote.

To make matters worse many of the appointees to boards of nationalised industries are men with no sympathies with nationalisation. Blatant political appointments would have left the Government open to criticism and set up a double edged precedent to be used by the Conservatives. But workers could quite justifiably have been chosen. As Openshaw of the AEU put it, "we have always argued in the Socialist Party that brains are not a monopoly of any particular class. I certainly believe and am convinced that there is sufficient brains within the Trade Union and Socialist movement to warrant a far greater proportion of seats on the governing bodies of nationalised industries".

If workers have little say in nationalised industry, the future for workers control in the private sector must look even bleaker. Trade Unions are acting defensively and not taking the positive action workers control requires. Management prerogatives can be circumscribed but are not questioned.

### Bullock

Certainly some industrial democrats would like to see a partnership between managers and workers - but to increase efficiency, productivity, and profitability rather than to transfer power to the hands of the workers. Hence both the Conservatives and the liberals pay lip service to the idea of industrial democracy. But their motive is purely one of profit-seeking, with no thought of altering the workers' position to anything other than a productive force to be bought and sold along with machinery and plant.

Interest in workers' control has been generated recently by the establishment, and the output of the Institute for Workers Control, and the debates surrounding the Bullock Report. But the IWC is a forum for discussion, and much of what it has published is contradictory and incoherent unless looked at on an individual basis.

It is through the IWC that prominent Labour MPs and Trade Unionists have entered or re-entered the debate - namely Audrey Wise, Hugh Scanlon, Jack Jones and Tony Benn. All have spoken at its Annual Conferences and have published pamphlets. Yet it should not be implied from this that their ideas are having a significant impact on the thinking of the Labour leadership.

The official hierarchy is still

John Sturrock (REPORT)



Workers at the Meriden Co-operative, Works, Coventry.

extremely dubious about workers' control and this accounts for the way the Bullock Report was quietly shelved, after it had proved embarrassingly radical.

The advocates of workers control provoked a commitment to greater industrial democracy in the Labour Party Manifesto in the 1974 elections. Then in 1975, Peter Shore announced the setting up of a Royal Commission under Alan Bullock to see how a radical extension of worker involvement might be facilitated. The Report concluded as follows:

Legislation was necessary, but should be flexible enough to allow experimentation. Employees should be allowed representatives on the Boards of Companies employing 2,000 or more workers and worker-directors would share equal responsibility

They would be elected via the trade union machinery and would not have to relinquish their Union offices. Boards under this scheme would comprise an equal number of workers and shareholder representatives plus an extra element, chosen by the other two groups, of an odd number of other directors.

Nevertheless the report went

further than was palatable for the business community. It provoked hostility from the CBI and individual employers' associations. This was tantamount to refusal to co-operate with any such schemes. But more important the Government reaction was luke-warm and the subsequent White Paper 'Industrial Democracy' politely but firmly rejected the report, saying it had illuminated the major issues but had aroused sharp divisions of views. In fact, having no ideas of its own, the Government had hoped that through a Royal Commission of Inquiry a consensus would emerge. This failed to materialise so the Government had to pick out those elements least likely to offend.


### Ownership

Collective bargaining is now seen as the only practical weapon for the industrial democrat, because it can make extensions and inroads into management prerogatives. But this fails to resolve the fundamental problem of ownership. The extension of collective bargaining does not give workers the ownership of firms plant and industries. Moreover the workers themselves perceive collective bargaining as

an industrial weapon and part of the traditional protective role of trade unions. There seems no general desire to take it one stage further as a political instrument. Objectives are limited and when official unionists talk of an increase or improvement in industrial democracy it tends to be based on a desire to improve the lot of the workers in a particular industry, with little regard for the wider social or political context.

The major political parties and leading trade unions are antipathetic to the idea of any major shift towards greater workers' control, so centralisation has triumphed over decentralisation. Similarly the trade unions have resisted pressure to go beyond their traditional defensive roles. Collaboration with management would involve having to defend members against policies which they have to implement. Gains to be made through collective bargaining can only be slow and gradual. And, taking place in a predominantly private enterprise economy, are ultimately limited. The confrontation of the ownership issue is vital if advances are to be made.

WHERE IS IT?



What exactly's in this 'warehouse' then?

## Basement

At the moment the **Basement** is the floor the Front would prefer to forget. It is supposed to be used by the National Front Youth as a social and meeting area. The theory is that give them a few blank walls to scribble on and they won't get above ground and scare the adults. Unfortunately so much money was spent on the offices that it is likely to remain as the floor where they dump the rubbish.

## Ground Floor

The **Ground Floor** also needs developing. The focal point of the Security Box which is by the main door, is the neat pile of pick-axe handles and iron bars. At the back of the building there is a loading bay, which slopes back from the double doors to the dispatch office where most of the leaflets are kept. This is a small smelly room, which handles the work which the NF claim is done by the main building; that is, storing literature.

The whole atmosphere of this floor is one of ruin, with no light, holes in the floor and broken duplicators littering the corners. On the East side of the building there is a rope operated lift, and members are forbidden to play on it.

## First Floor

The **First Floor** consists of two large rooms which are designated as meeting rooms. The largest (rear) one can only hold 40, but that is sufficient for anything short of the AGM. It is here that the night security puts its sleepy head down for the night. The picture of the Queen on the wall appears to have come from the back of a cornflakes packet.

## Second Floor

It's the **Second Floor** which is the really interesting one, for it is here that the Directorate has its offices. There's a reception, complete with switchboard, receptionist, and certificates of incorporation - the carpet in there is reputed to have been ripped off by one of the members. There's a room where the Directorate meets and then you come to the really interesting section - the leaders' offices.

First of all John Tyndall's office: functional desk, couple of chairs, small (you couldn't swing a Union Jack), really quite boring. The shelves of books look as if they have never been touched. Next there is Richard Verrall's office. Same sort of thing, but in this office the bookshelves are more extensive and look as if they might be used occasionally. There is half a shelf of books about Goebels: comparisons would be invidious. You can tell it's the Spearhead editorial room by the second-hand set of drawers labelled 'Spearhead'. Finally you come to Martin Webster's office. You can gauge the degree of trust between the leaders by noting Martin's private safe. There are no bookshelves in Martin's office.


The second floor is completed by the General office, presided over by Beryl Mitchell. It's dominated by two things: firstly the map of the United Kingdom marked (in rather military fashion) to show the position of all branches and groups. Secondly there is a large German made safe. Derrick Day claims this is where the tea is kept, but this could be a judicious understatement.

## Top Floor

The **Top Floor** is the relaxation centre for the jaded Hitlerite. Let your heart swell to the sound of German marching songs in the convivial atmosphere of an 'olde Englishe' style bar. If they're playing at being Panzer crews it can probably hold about a hundred. The floor is completed with a large kitchen, store and toilet facilities.

Set squat in the East End, Excalibur House represents a considerable triumph for the National Front. It's not voters which are important, but cadres, organisation, publications and a base - Excalibur House will help to provide all of these.

# EXCALIBUR HOUSE



A problem assails the anti-fascist movement - what exactly is Excalibur House used for? We are torn between two conflicting statements. On one hand we have Richard Verrall who is (among other things) Company Secretary of Leash House Ltd., the National Front printing company. He claims that EH is used merely to store printed material, with a few filling cabinets and a safe. If I may quote: 'The press and others have given the impression that this property is the Headquarters of the National Front, which it is not'. The definitive statement one asks?

On the other hand (five fingers?) we have the sworn statement of Mr Derrick Day; 'We have a rota system of security and night guards at our Headquarters at Excalibur House 73, Great Eastern St., EC1. We are non-plussed. Confused even. Who are we to believe? Is this a case of confusion in the upper echelons of the party or perhaps insufficient rehearsing?

At the moment Hackney Council's legal department is grinding on its weary (and rather secretive) way with all the paraphernalia of 'stop' and 'enforcement' notices. However, the National Front's solicitors are

experts at delay and prevarication, and I cannot see Jane Ridley overcoming this. Hackney Council is now waiting for the Department of the Environment to fix a date for an enquiry. Hackney Peoples' Press reports that the feeling against Excalibur House illustrated by last year's 2,000 strong petition, has now largely subsided. The promised major demonstration looks unlikely to take place.

All in all then, Derrick Day and his fellow 'voluntary' security guards look securely ensconced. Even so, this will not lead to a relaxing of their precautions. The three of them (there should be a fourth reserve) work a 24 hour shift system (6am-2pm 2pm-10pm, and 10pm-6am). At night the permanent security guard is supposed to be supplemented by a number of trusted members from a local branch.

There is a roster of these branches and these are supposed to send four members. However, such is the state of organisation in the branches that very few can actually muster more than one member. One look at the duty rosters kept in the security box reveals that less than one branch


in seven, actually turns up. Even when the branch does turn up there are quite often problems.

Take Harringay Branch, for example - one of the more active. One night some of the guards were mucking about upstairs and one of the men downstairs thought he was under attack (there might have been anti-fascists about). This individual then picked up a pick-axe handle and attacked a member of the public who was cycling past. The cyclist required a considerable number of stitches to his head.


It was generally recognised in the branch that the attacker was psychotic but Day was shocked that the branch organiser only visited him in prison once. Soon after Harringay were put on duty for two nights a week as opposed to one. I think a special point should be made about Albert, who is also one of the permanent security staff. He has a regrettable tendency to conduct guided tours through the leaders' offices. I think he's hoping some of the glamour will wear off. John - you really should get rid of him. Pathological anti-semitism is no substitute for intelligence.



The Rear End of Excalibur House



Now remember son, the password's 'Britons First'



# Derrick

# DAY

**Politician**  
**Scrounger**  
**Jew-hater**  
**Leader**  
**Racist**  
**Thug**

There is one man who tells us more about the real nature of the National Front than any socio-political analysis of its members - Derrick Day. Anti-Fascists have generally concentrated on John Tyndall, Martin Webster on Fontaine, looking too much at the structure, rather than the reality of the party. Derrick has always been one of the party stalwarts right from its inception, but the recent changes mean that he must now be ranked as number two in the party.

I remember once the Night Security Guard were perusing a copy of Mayfair which had been left behind. Derrick was reading it out aloud with a kind of horrified enjoyment. The startling thing was the halting, stuttering way he read it - he appears to have a reading age of about seven. It is this, I believe, which has meant that he has never sat on the Directorate or taken his place in the official structure of the party.

To say this, however, is not to question his intelligence, merely his education. He has a command and grasp of the ramifications of local party organisation which would (and has) defeated lesser men. He is also gifted (if that's the word) with an exceptionally suspicious mind. For example, he tells loyal party members that the expensive safe is used to keep the tea bags and crockery in and prevent them from being pilfered. While this has a ring of truth - I suspect it's not the whole truth.

Mr Day has a bluntness and vulgarity which the activists find endearing. When it comes down to simple racist abuse he's a past master. His speeches lead to a kind of foot-stomping chanting, where you can only hear the odd obscenity from the speaker. This is the kind of rational argument the NF love. Mind you after JT's interminable speeches, any other sort is a relief.

Derrick Day is the grand-daddy of the skinheads. He has an empathy with the kind of vacuous thug which makes up the majority of the activists, like the Hoxton skins (SPG are wonderful!). One night Derrick and I were passing the time in Excalibur House in the security box, listening to police radio (there's bugger all else to do). There had been a stabbing and a group of skins were being pursued by the police. Derrick was jumping up and down with excitement, willing them to get away - they did.

Even his appearance seems to encourage Derrick's populist role - his sheer ugliness. A British Movement member I chatted too attributed Derrick's razor scars to earlier criminal activity. But then, they don't love him much either. Also he must be the only person I know who enjoys obscene phone calls. Excalibur House receives an average of three threatening calls a night and when Derrick's on duty they're the highspot of the night. In fact I tried (unsuccessfully) to get him to share them. His responses generally seem to dwell on rather explicit racist, sexual imagery.

(NB Note how Trotsky was right and how this article brings out the petit-bourgeois composition and nature of the Front).

Day's contact with the local population goes even deeper than his association with the local thugs. I remember once during a speech in Hoxton market he pointed to a piece of waste land and told us how the first doodlebug to hit London had exploded there. To some extent his politics derive from his analysis of the local situation. He sees a community which has developed into one of London's ghettos with appalling housing, a dearth of amenities, and more than its share of problem families. He sees a community decimated, demoralised and destroyed by the action (or non-action) of local government. It is this belief which determines who he sees as the real enemies: the Jewish/Red clique which run local government. This Leftist conspiracy which seeks to destroy the indigenous British community. These are men of evil; bureaucrats, developers, politicians and media people. His command of local politics is good and he knows most of the local politicians by sight. The labour clique which runs Hackney deserves nothing but condemnation for its attitude to the real problems which create this type of thinking.

Day's beliefs leads to a rather odd attitude to blacks - they are not the primary enemy, merely the victims of manipulative forces. He's fond of saying; 'I've nothing against niggers - in their own country'. There's an element of truth in this, in that he would merely repatriate the blacks; he would destroy the left/Jewish element.

There is a dichotomy in the NF attitude to blacks. The youths see them as a real threat, a violent force, which needs to be combated. The older generation seems to have a different image, drawn from 'Empire' propaganda. In this

At a young NF Social a youth complained about the price of beer (60p a pint). Derrick Day grabbed the offending individual by the lapels and lowered him to Derrick's height; "it's British beer innit"!

the black is seen as quiescent, passive - sleeping in the sun all day, when he should be working. He is deferential, lazy and physically he is no threat to whites. Derrick adopts the latter attitude. He describes the eating habits of blacks as being akin to those of a gorilla.

Mind you, a visit to his home will not confirm the civilising influences of a belief in white superiority. I remember one evening in Excalibur House, (after listening to one of Tyndall's 'hang 'em up for sheepstealing' speeches) hearing Harry Roberts (ex-security guard - always in short trousers) receive a lecture by phone from Derrick's wife - He'd clipped her son around the ear for scrawling on the walls. It's good to know the Young NF is attracting the best of British youth.

Incidentally, Derrick, do you remember how your wife said I looked like a commie when she first saw me... and how you laughed.

Apart from guarding the Headquarters, Derrick directs his attention to the young members. He's concerned with the way they're losing their youth to the British Movement, who can offer more in the way of violence and trips to the country (for pseudo-military activities). At the moment he's attempting to get the money for a few fields where the YNF can hold camps.

Derrick feels that elements in the Directorate do not pay enough attention to the young members and he suspects (quite rightly) that some leaders find the skins

oint Derrick. He reserves his hatred, however, for Martin Webster, or 'chunkybollocks,' as he calls him. I remember at the last AGM, where Webster had called for the exclusion of all Freemasons, Derrick came on next and said that if they were going to exclude Freemasons constitutionally they should do the same to 'queers' (his word). He was cheered to the echo and Webster lost that vote.

The recent widely advertised schisms (or the 'atmosphere of internal party loyalty and unity' as the members bulletin puts it) was the result of an attack by



Derrick Day removed a heckler during an election meeting in Islington. Afterwards JT asked him why he'd done it. "Well he swore, didn't he". Upon receiving a surprised look - "There's a fucking time and place for everything".

Webster on Derrick Day's wife. Webster may have survived, but he's keeping in the background. He was not on the latest march. All this means promotion for comrade Day. Usually after a march Webster conducts the Dutch auction for cash - but after the last march it was Day. Day's (rather slavish) devotion to Mr Tyndall seems a real guarantee of his promotion.

It may interest you to know the police aren't fond of Derrick either. At City Road Police Station (his local) his mug-shot is included among the local 'villains' which adorn one wall. He is listed as 'local agitator' and his suspected crimes are listed as (if I remember correctly) burglary, assault and criminal damage.

repulsive. Money allocated for Excalibur house was wasted - he could have got the materials far more cheaply (fell off the back of a lorry, guv') and could have carried out the renovations in half the time.

The recent eclipse of Fontaine and Kavanagh will not dissapp-

One of the most horrifying features of the NF recently has been Derrick's conversion to pacifism. Nowadays he can be seen on marches, in his off-white mac, trotting up and down trying to ignore the Reds, just a quick word to the stewards here and there. Mr Tyndall tells him what the Party need and Day puts it to the national stewards - 'not in front of the cameras, lads'. These days a lot of Front violence is from the stewards: kicking the hordes back into line when they attempt any move towards the anti-fascists. Mr Day as the East End thug is bad enough; Mr Day as politician is horrific.

PETER.



# SELF-HELP

## How to beat the Law at its own game

So you're in trouble, you need help, but don't want the straight-jacket of the legal system to leave you behind. What's the answer? The Newham Alternative Project, a branch of Radical Alternatives to Prison, has produced a useful guide to self-help, which we publish below.

### Why not defend yourself?

Obviously when most people find themselves in court they hope to get off, altogether. Alternatively they will aim for the lightest sentence possible. But in many cases professional lawyers are a dead loss. Very few lawyers are sympathetic enough to devote enough time and imagination to their cases. As a result cases are often fought, leaving an endless chain of bewildered or 'sent down' defendants in their wake.

This leaves two choices; either to employ a lawyer whilst at the same time retaining control over the case, or self-defence.

Lawyers have a professional habit of encouraging defendants to play down their cases and often insist on at least one plea of guilt. It is a good idea to handle this advice with care as there are ways of conducting a defence.

### Points to remember:

1) Most lawyers want to conduct the case their way not yours. They are more concerned about pleasing the court than supporting the client.

2) Most lawyers are completely out of touch with how the other half lives. They come from a world of saviour suits and public schools. They are defending people about whom they are unbelievably ignorant. They belong to a legal 'club': good for deals but bad for justice.

3) If you defend yourself you immediately alter the atmosphere of the courtroom. You are a challenge to the legal robots; the prosecutors, the defence lawyers, the magistrates and judges. They are used to the same performances day-in day-out. You are a strange intruder in the legal jungle. Intruders can cause a few upsets and a few surprises.

4) You and only you know the facts of your case. Your lawyer can only guess when the prosecution is lying. You know because,

unless you were framed, you were there. In this way the confrontation is more real and not just based on your lawyers second-hand knowledge. This gives you more chance of showing the natural bias of a prosecution witness, which invalidates his/her evidence in law. No lawyer can do this in quite the same way.

5) If you defend yourself you can ask the sort of awkward questions that lawyers avoid or which they would not dare to ask. All lawyers are shackled by the discipline of bar bigotry and legal training, most are scared stiff of standing up to the judge. The lawyers first loyalty is to the court, not to the client. If you are your own lawyer, you can't be intimidated.

6) A bigoted magistrate may well find it embarrassing to pass his usual sentence on you. Remember magistrate's courts are not used to opposition to the police. It causes them to lose a bit of their aristocratic nerve if you put up a fight (in the legal and moral sense..)

7) When your case is not being tried in a magistrate's court the only way to overcome the legal barriers is to communicate with the jury. When you have a lawyer you appear merely as the accused object of the legal arguments. Defending yourself you come across as a real person. The issues will involve the jurors more directly and their consciences are more likely to be jerked a little by efforts to expose the truth. If the jury likes you, you will have a fantastic advantage. Jurors often also appreciate the man or woman who is prepared to stand up against all the odds of class justice.

### What is a McKenzie?

When you defend yourself, you should make full use of the 1970 McKenzie Court of Appeals decision, which gives you the right to have any friend

sitting with you in court, to act as your legal advisor.

### How to choose your friend

Rather than choosing just anyone you should pick on someone you know and trust who has plenty of commonsense. This does not have to be a qualified lawyer, but it helps if it is someone with some knowledge of the law as you will have to work out the law on your case together.

### Before your case you and your McKenzie should go down to the courts together:

- 1) to work out your relationship to court procedures.
- 2) to learn a bit about how procedures work so that you are not taken by surprise.
- 3) to start planning your own little scheme for dealing with upitty judges.

If you know someone you can work with who happens to be a solicitor's clerk, lawyer or involved in a law centre, this a good choice. If you are stuck for a McKenzie, try finding other people in the same boat and organise a bit of self-help - perhaps acting as McKenzies for each other. This is possibly the best arrangement. To find out who is on trial and defending themselves, contact local trade union branches, community newspapers, TIME OUT agitprop in London and of course the Newham Alternatives Project.

### What a McKenzie does.

A McKenzie firstly helps to plan the case. This is a lot of work even with a solicitor and solicitors are not terribly efficient. Statements have to be taken from witnesses and points of law have to be unearthed from dusty textbooks and law libraries. You should also prepare yourself by rehearsing cross-examination with your friends.

### Inside the court

At court you will be surrendering yourself to bail. That is assuming you were lucky enough to get bail in the first place.

While you are in the cells a McKenzie advisor is entitled to consult with you. Every court is forced to allow a solicitor's clerk to visit a client and this applies to McKenzie lawyers.

In R v Greenfield and others, the McKenzies went down to the cells everyday. They also attended all the legal conferences with the briefs and made solicitors' visits at the prisons every weekend.

### IN CROWN COURT CASES IT IS DESPERATELY IMPORTANT TO PUT YOUR MCKENZIE UNDER THE AUSPICES OF A SOLICITOR UNDER THE SOLICITORS' ACT, SOLICITORS HAVE THE POWER TO APPOINT ANYONE NECESSARY FOR THE EFFICIENT CONDUCT OF THE CASE AS A TEMPORARY SOLICITOR'S CLERK.

Defendants must give clear instructions to their solicitors about this. Solicitors then have a professional duty to comply.

During your trial your advisor is there to give you feedback on how you are faring; can the jury hear you, are you rabbiting on a bit too much, is your style too aggressive, are you making a strong enough impression on the jury?

If you get interrupted a lot by the bench, or generally lose your thread, turn immediately to your McKenzie and, even in the middle of proceedings, ask for a quick conference in order to clarify a matter for the jury, or because certain rules of evidence or points of law need to be clarified. Any old excuse goes for their adjournments, the same goes for yours.

Throughout the ordeal in the dock, your McKenzie's job is not just about legal advice but also about moral support. If you need a glass of water, HMSO statistics on crime in Inner London in 1978, or press cuttings to document prejudice in a particular case, your advisor is the one to see to it.

There is plenty for your advisor to do, especially in a heavy case. This is why it is a good idea to get a solicitor; claim legal aid and employ your McKenzie as a fully paid solicitor's clerk. Your solicitor might not like the idea, but then it's your head on the block and anyway you have a fundamental right to have things done your own way.

Remember in any big case, like those at the Old Bailey, legal aid has to cover the exorbitant costs not only of a solicitor's clerk but also of two barristers and a silk or QC. When the judge begins to grumble about giving you legal aid with a McKenzie, you should not lose the opportunity of pointing out that your McKenzie is saving money, both for the courts and the taxpayers.

### For the record

Here are a few cases where legal aid for solicitors was continued with McKenzies employed and defendants defending themselves. R v Howe Beese Gordon Kentish Mangrove 9 trial Offenbach solicitors.

Rv Oz Magazine, Richard Neville Offenbach solicitors

R v Greenfield Angry Brigade Siefert & Sedley

These cases should ensure you get legal aid. Don't be put off.

NB. Your McKenzie lawyer has no right to speak for you in court. However, if he or she is very good on a point of law then it is possible to apply for permission to address the court on this matter. This is entirely at the court's discretion. It has been done a few times in magistrate's courts and if legal aid has been refused there is then the legal argument to be a full advocate if that is what the defendant prefers.



© The Newham Alternatives Project ©

This article came from the Newham Alternative Project, which (in its own words); 'aims to reduce the number of people sent to penal institutions in the East London area'. NAP aims to support participants (people on deferred sentence) whilst they try to overcome the problems of housing, work, finance, isolation and education. It has a Home Office grant but has continually to search for extra money.

Seventy-five per cent of prisoners (who serve over eighteen months) are ultimately reconvicted. However, eighty six per cent of people on deferred sentences who visit NAP are found not to reoffend.

56, Dames Road is a close, warm, friendly place where participants are encouraged to help and to be supportive to each other. It needs helpers, particularly local ex-cons, to give some of their time to the centre. You can contact the Project at 56, Dames Rd, E7 ODR (tel 01 - 555 0289).

'Breakout', a prisoners' and ex-prisoners' news-sheet and information guide is published from the same address. It is intended for working class people in related struggles. Policy meetings are held every two weeks on Wednesdays at 7pm.



Well, everyone else has used it





# Occupation: Disabled!

Those of you who have been unfortunate enough to see this creature on demonstrations will find it interesting that he officially lists his occupation as 'disabled'. A good case could be made for cerebral damage, but physically he seems a relatively fine specimen of Anglo-Saxon manhood.

He (very modestly) lists his age as 'over 21', but then he's probably forgotten it. However, I think it's fairly safe to say that he's below pensionable age. If this is the case then it seems likely that he is receiving money from the Department of Health and Social Security (and I hope the defamation trial will agree with me on this).

If I may digress from my theme for a paragraph or two, Derrick's female offspring (a real flower of the Nation) once made disparaging remarks to some members of the local black community, who responded in the same spirit. Upon being informed of this Derrick loaded up a car with pick-axe handles. They intended to impress upon the local coloured citizenry concerned, the superiority of British civilisation.

This incident is merely illustrative, but it brings me to one of my two main points. Firstly, how can a man who is capable of such violence, register himself disabled (and presumably receive money on the strength of it).

My second point is rather more fundamental. There is a team of three permanent security guards for Excalibur House, who work a shift system. It is generally believed in the Front that these guards are paid for their work and I have seen money exchanged between Richard Verrall

and Derrick Day. The guards are supposed to be voluntary, but the payments and the regular shift system lead one to suppose that Derrick is a 'SCROUNGER'.

Now, this paper has nothing against those people who attempt to reduce the DHSS's massive surplus of unpaid benefits. However, we wonder how all this fits in with the Front's policy. We can go to no higher authority than the National Front's Manifesto, which is the Front's most definitive policy statement:

...the rewards for the professional loafer are considerable. An indiscriminating welfare state hands out benefits so bountifully that the margin of advantage in doing a regular job is reduced sometimes to no more than two or three pounds a week. This has led to many people going on social security as a permanent way of life and then supplementing their state benefits with odd jobs 'on the side' which in fact bring their income up to a level well above what they can earn by full time employment.

The National Front is resolved to put a stop to these abuses.' (page 23)  
Right on!

A perspicacious analysis, but where does that leave Derrick and his fellow 'work-shy' scroungers? Well, on page 55 (where they outline their proposals for workcamps for the work-shy) they make a special exception for the disabled, so Derrick can breathe a sigh of relief.

## Allah, God ~ and Brian?

Through the wonders of influence, nepotism and pure arse-licking, XTRA is able to bring you sneak a preview of Monty Python's Life of Brian.

Its appearance in London will provoke a great deal of controversy.

The Life of Brian is an irreverent look at the life of a mistaken Messiah who endures a number of adventures not far removed from those experienced by a famous person 1,979 years ago. It is very blasphemous if you take it seriously, the language is coarse to say the least, and there is some full frontal nudity (which in fact is the funniest scene in the whole movie). Nothing is sacred and politics comes in for quite a bashing as the opportunity and setting is used to make a joke of the Arab-Israeli conflict and contemporary Left wing/terrorist practices. It is perhaps not as consistently funny as the Holy Grail but there are sufficient surprises, hilarious sequences and incisive set pieces to leave everyone satisfied, entertained and provoked.

## In the name of Allah most merciful and compassionate

Following the revolution in Iran, reports of women being beaten for refusing to wear veils, the TV shots of women demonstrating against a regime which refuses them even basic rights of self-identity, bring home to western women the plight of over 200 million of their sisters in the less-developed world.

The irony of the Iranian revolution has not been lost on most of the British left. The revolution which promised so much has been swamped by the power of the Islamic religious leaders. For the women, at least, it might even have been better if the revolution had never occurred.

In 1967 the Iranian government passed the Family Protection Act. The Act was partly designed to raise the status of Iranian women. It became illegal for girls to be married before they reached the age of 15 and it outlawed the practice of 'sighe' temporary marriages - a religiously sanctioned form of prostitution: Even before this men were prevented from polygamy without the consent of their existing wives - although the high level of illiteracy amongst women meant that they were frequently cheated.

It is not as though the government put forward these measures because it really wanted sexual equality - but they were a start. The path of Iranian women is now pointing in totally the opposite direction.

In the Muslim world women are even worse off than elsewhere in the less-developed world. Urban employment figures, for example, show that while an average of 25% of women in the less-developed countries work, the figure is only 5% for Middle Eastern women.

Being female in a Muslim world means almost total submission to either husband or father. Women have no say in the choosing of a husband and are passed from hand to hand like property. Sexual repression is such that in some countries the loss of virginity is punishable by death and the barbaric custom of female circumcision is still the norm in several countries.

Not surprisingly early marriage is common. But marriage offers only limited security because divorce is an easy process for the man. Neither is there much security involved in being one of four wives.

As time goes by western attitudes are being filtered into the system. Urban women are considerably freer than their rural counterparts and the spread of education is often followed by a relaxation of the stricter rules.

earlier societies a woman was really seen as unclean, especially during her menstrual cycle. Women were seen as naturally promiscuous, in need of tight restraint and as a distraction to a pious man. But although according to the Hadith (traditions based on the sayings and doings of the prophet) the majority of those in hell are women, women can still reach paradise - through extremes of piety.

Inequality is a structural part of the Islamic faith, but despite that in the 6th century it meant a better deal for women. It was as the religion of the establishment that it came to be a force of reaction. And ingenious ways were soon found to contain the new found rights for women.

Even among the liberal Muslims of the 20th century sexual equality is not acceptable. Seyyed Hossein Nasr writing in 1965 believed "The rebellion of Muslim women in certain quarters of Islamic society came when men themselves ceased to fulfil their religious function and lost their virile and patriarchal character". He could not accept that women might be reacting against centu-

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

Birth control may be frowned on but it is fast becoming popular. And veils are gradually being lowered.

Sexual repression is still rampant. In Iran, for example, when men have tended to adopt the freer sexual attitudes of the West, women are still kept tightly in check.

So there is repression of women in Islamic society. But how far is this due to the religion itself? Study of Islam reveals that it began life as a champion of women's rights.

Muhammed represented a fundamental challenge to the social mores of 6th and 7th century Arab Society. Nowhere is this more so than in his attitude to the family.

Muhammed emphasised kind treatment of women, but, perhaps more importantly, changed the dowry system so that it became a gift rather than a down payment for the wife. The 'gift' had to remain intact throughout the marriage and, if there was a divorce, it became the basis of the women's economic security.


Islam was a religion in which women could participate - albeit as unequal partners. As in other

ries of repression.


The first time this came home to me was during an argument with an intelligent and fairly westernised Iranian. Unable to answer my persistent question Khomeini's attitude to women, he turned to me angrily: 'Western women only have the freedom to be prostitutes!' But acceptance of traditional sexual values is not just found among men. Try arguing against fixed marriages with many young Muslim women and you will see what I mean.

The Islam reaction can be attributed to some extent, and certainly in Iran, to a desire to remain culturally independent of the West. It can also be attributed to the extraordinary strength of fundamentalism. Islam is now a curiously inflexible religion.

All of this helps to stifle any resistance. And where, as in Iran, fundamentalism is the ascendancy, the route to freedom seems unusually steep and rocky.



Sarah



# HALL OF INFAMY: one

Are you underpaid? Overworked? Not allowed to join a Union? In a word, exploited? If so, XTRA would like to hear from you, as we are planning a series on this subject. This week: HAYMARKET PUBLISHING LTD.

In the last five months, Haymarket Publishing in Frith Street has had two bomb scares. At first sight this might seem surprising given that the publications such as Computing and Accountancy Age do not seem overtly political publications. On the other hand, Haymarket also publishes two Irish medical magazines, and Mr Michael Heseltine, golden-haired Tory whizz-kid and playboy, was founder joint member of the firm 14 years ago and he and his wife control the company today.

Talking of Heseltine, he would certainly approve of the way it is run today. Last year it made a profit of well over £3m. Over £4,000 per employee. And how? Well, the wages of most of its employees is certainly a factor. In the production department at Frith Street, for instance, the basic wage is just over £57 per week for the bulk of employees. The union rate for similar work elsewhere is upwards of £90.

But production workers at Haymarket are not allowed to join a union. Typically, the Tory idea of 'freedom' only extends as far as the right not to join a union (as Grunwick employees discovered to their cost last year). And without a union, such an elementary concept as employees' rights fly out of the window. Divide and Rule is the order of the day. Another case is Keep Changing the Rules.

The question of overtime provides a good illustration. Four

people in Production have to work very long hours on a regular basis - or, to put it another way, if any of them decide not to work overtime, three magazines would rapidly grind to a halt. These people have to work to all hours for two or three nights a week - anything up to the small hours. (Recently one person worked untill 4 in the morning and had to be in again at 8 that same morning. Now the rate for overtime was originally £1.50 per hour plus a lump sum of £3.50 'subsistence' when working after 7.30pm. Hardly generous, even given the fact the sums were tax-free (a tax dodge, something in which Haymarket seems to specialise - still, what can you expect from a company which publishes Accountancy Age?). But recently, concerned at the amount of overtime that was being paid out to certain individuals (ignoring the fact that they were sometimes working almost round the clock to get it), it was announced that subsistence could not be claimed if overtime was also claimed between 5.30 and 7.30pm. In other words, employees could be working till all hours for £1.50 per hour!

That's to say, it actually costs Haymarket no more per hour to pay overtime, than during the day (although employees benefit from the fact that overtime is tax free). And the Haymarket Employment Contract is sufficiently vague to let the employers get away with it.

To secure a rise, one has to negotiate individually. Haymarket seem none too concerned if their staff leave after only a few months, and as the employment situation is so bad, they have little difficulty in finding replacements - after all, they can be trained fairly quickly. So the workers' bargaining power is practically nil.

Now, what was that being said about Unions not being necessary in this day and age?

# DENATIONALISE 'EM!

(Please)

BY OUR COMMON STAFF

Plans unveiled in the Queen's Speech to "denationalise" the Church of England and the Monarchy caused uproar in the House of Commons last week.

The shock plan is regarded as yet another indication of the Government's determination to reduce what Mrs Thatcher has graphically described as "the overwhelming burden of the State on ordinary £20,000 a year company directors".

Defending the decision, Sir Keith Joseph described the C of E and the Monarchy as "the seventh of Britain's six poisons" (the others being trade unions, the working class, Arabs, Socialists - "especially this neo-socialist government and myself in particular", unmarried mothers and Mr Wedgewood Benn). He described the institutions as "outdated monolithic bureaucracy-laden institutions whose demands on taxpayers have become increasingly great", and attacked the "cossetted inflation-proofed incomes and blanket job security" which their employees enjoy. Moreover, he alleged, one institution perpetuated the existence of the other - "it was, after all, the Socialist Henry VIII who nationalised the C of E all those years ago; I would argue that that was the root cause of Britain's economic, social and moral decline which we witness today".

Rumour has it that Sir Keith Joseph is planning to "hive off" the industries to private industry. He indicated that he would like them to be run by "a buccaneering, enthusiastically industrialist who has the profit motive as his prime concern". It is believed that this was reference to Sir Freddie Laker who has previously expressed interest in "breaking down these ancient monopolies and introducing some competition in the '2 Rs' - Religion and Royalty".

For example, there was "absolutely no reason why Britain should not have several Queens - or Kings for that matter. That way, consumers could express their preference; at the end

of each year we could have a competition on TV for 'Monarch of the Year'." As for the Church, Sir Freddie believed that he could "dramatically increase attendance on Sundays by livening up the proceedings". For example, "Communion could be made a far more joyous proceeding with a whole variety of drinks and sweetmeats, rather than the miserable little portions handed out today. Cabaret, folk-singing and maybe some punk-rock bands would make a welcome change from outdated dirge-like hymns. And let's brighten up the Churches - bash down all that stained glass double glazing and make them far more cosy.... And of course special transport laid on - SkyChurch...."

Labour MPs have naturally attacked the proposals as "just another vicious attack on the working class today. Traditionally, Royalty and the CofE have been supplied free to all, regardless of race, creed or personal wealth. Now we're back to the 14th Century and the Means Test. Pensioners, single-parent families, the un-employed and the sick-minded will be hit hardest. With regard to the Church, Britain will be forced to rely increasingly on cheap imported Italian livestock. And with possibly dozens of Queens and Kings, Billy Smart's Circus and 'The Sound of Music' will inevitably be forced off TV on Christmas Day to make way for a plethora of Queen's and King's Addresses, forcing the masses to resort even more to drinking huge quantities of alcohol, thus lining the pockets of the barons of the drink trade...."

The Tribune Group has demanded that when Labour is returned to power in 100 years time the Industries should be "renationalised without compensation" and that meanwhile Labour should fight with every unconstitutional means available to kill off this threat to our treasured National Heritage". It is not yet clear whether Mr Callaghan's plea to Prince Philip for support in the campaign will be successful.



The Xtra Structureless Tyranny consists of four anarchists and two individuals who vote Labour if it's sunny. We want to produce an intelligent, provocative paper which appeals to something wider than the anarchist movement. We need money, to be specific we want your money. This paper cost about £500 to produce (we're not sure yet) and distribution takes half our cover price. It also seems likely we shall need some of your money to pay our legal costs when Derrick Day (bless his cotton socks) begins to sue us. Subscribe, send us a donation write us a nice letter, we're not particular.

We need contributions: images, artwork, photographs, stories, letters, articles, features - you name it and we want it. Anyone who sends anything to us must expect that it might be altered, shortened, snubbed etc., but then what else can you expect from a tyranny?

This is a pilot issue and we're only going to get better. Organisationally we're stable, so any donation will be well utilised. Our second issue will be coming out for January so copy-date is mid-December. We'll be appearing monthly after that.

# NO, PRETTY BABY, NO!

Film censorship has been a perennially thorny problem for the British establishment, with its political and moral implications, and rather than confronting the issue it has been hived-off. It is a typical British compromise in that legally the local authorities have the responsibility to vet films, yet for 60 years have largely been content to allow a small independent professional body, with neither legal status or powers to exercise it.

As far back as 1909 local authorities were given the powers to licence cinemas because of fears for the physical safety of cinema-goers. However a number of subsequent legal decisions extended their scope and they became the guardians of the cinema-goers. However, inconsistent decisions by individual authorities caused problems for the industry as they had to guess what would be acceptable and in which areas. Hence on the industry's own initiative the British Board of Film Censors was established in 1913 to make nationally acceptable judgements, independent of the industry, and power to enforce such judgements would lie solely in persuasion.

Since 1913 the Home Office has endorsed the system under the BBFC and has at no time become directly involved in censorship issues. The Cinematograph Act of 1952 gave local authorities the legal responsibility for the censorship of films for children but as with their powers to censor films for adults, the local authorities, with the recent exception of the GLC and their viewing committee under Enid Wistrich, were largely content to allow the BBFC to continue unhindered and unrivalled.

This is the institutional status of the BBFC today, except that its jurisdiction lies only with film performances in publicly licensed cinemas to which the

public gains immediate admission on payment of a fee. Different conditions apply to clubs, societies and festivals, which do not directly concern the BBFC. Hence films refused certificates can still be seen, although private prosecution on a variety of grounds might ensue, as happened when Pasolini's Salo was shown at the Compton in London.

Abolition of film censorship for adults would allow individual preferences to be satisfied as the individual wants, as compared with the present situation where the choice is circumscribed on what is called an objective basis, but which can only be considered unsatisfactory and very arbitrary.

The BBFC's greatest failing



has been its inconsistency, which has tended to reflect the character of its Secretary. Relatively progressive Secretaries such as John Trevelyan and Stephen Murphy have actively promoted liberalisation, but James Ferman, the present incumbent has recently instituted a major retrogressive step. Namely, in the name of conforming with the new Protection of Children Act he called in all copies of Taxi Driver and excised a scene where Jodie Foster presses her head against the fully clothed crotch of Robert de Niro; Pretty Baby was cut as some scenes in the brothel with Broke Shields were considered too explicit.

This indefensible and totally illogical piece of retrospective censorship is an alarming precedent and does not bode well for the untouched future of Lolita or Dearest Love, nor for the Tin Drum by Volker Schlöndorff which shared this years Best Film award at Cannes. Children should indeed be allowed some protection from exploitation both in films or by them, but the same barrier is hardly necessary for grown people quite able to decide for themselves what they can tolerate and what they cannot.

The famous butter/sodomisation scene in Last Tango in Paris was rendered less explicit by cuts but it was still impossible to mistake

Copyright © Xtra! Structureless Tyranny.  
Published and typeset by the Xtra! Structureless Tyranny.  
National Distribution by Full Time Distribution, 27, Clerkenwell Close, London EC1  
N Racine-Jaques designed and drew our Xtra! logo.

what was actually going on. Similarly the refusal of a certificate for Oshima's Ai No Corrida has not prevented it from being widely shown, seen and appreciated in London without the city being turned into a hot-bed of sacrificial sex. Increasing liberalisation may be a step in the right direction but cannot hope to satisfy the demands for total abolition of censorship for adults. 'Protection' from unsavoury films or sequences also amounts to depriving and limiting the individual from judging for him|herself, a task which is thought possible by the BBFC but not for the rest of us.

# NATURAL NUCLEAR WASTE

higher death rate) than nuclear power (possibly resulting in a higher death rate).

In a highly populated country like Britain, a vast energy supply is not a luxury but essential for virtually all aspects of life. No power means no jobs, no production no industry, no heat, no light no cooking; (remember what caused the three day week!)

A reduction in the availability of power would result in much lower rates of production of goods, depressing the whole of industrialised society. This in turn will cause severe cutbacks in research and development of all kinds causing a decline in such things as the health service due to a lack of high technological input. Thousands of people would die because of such a lack of energy.

Instead of machines replacing human labour we would have to go back to the 60 or 70 hour week of strenuous work. The whole quality of life would be drastically reduced.

Controlled energy and power is what has created the society we live in. When the only controllable energy was human labour and muscle power it was all people could do to scratch out a living from the ground. Animals harnessed to ploughs increased the production of food per farmer, releasing others to become craftsmen and the like.

The quality of life changed little for centuries until energy was harnessed to useful work on a large scale. To the working people of this country, the industrial revolution was the most beneficial event ever to occur. All aspects of peoples lives were drastically improved. The effects of the wrought iron bedstead alone, on theumatic and back diseases, is comparable the achievements of the whole labour movement in history. The overall result was a massive increase in life expectancy. Put more dramatically; the use of energy gave people life!

The answer to the above, of course, is that the anti-nukers don't want to stop energy use but merely to control the increase in usage and develop alternative sources. My reply to that is two fold:

Firstly, as stated above, the more artificial energy is used, the less human labour is necessary. The 35 hour week (or the 20 hour week) is possible now because machines utilising artificial energy can replace human labour. An abundant supply of energy means abundant production. Abundant production of necessary items is an important part of the solution to raising the living standards and life expectancy of the people in the third world to acceptable levels.

## THE ALTERNATIVES

Secondly, what are the alternatives? "The worlds coal reserves will last us for centuries" comes a cry from the back of the room! Us!!

What about them?, the billions who haven't any coal? What about the 60 or 70 people a year who are dying now just to provide the British with coal? What about the unseen effects of coal dust which takes years to kill and maim people? What about the environmental effects? Over in the USA there are just as many of the 'T-shirt and jeans brigade' clam-

mering to have strip mining of coal banned, as there are anti-nukers.

Windmills! (Ah! now we're getting to the nitty gritty!). I used to look out of the lounge window when I was a kid and count the mill chimneys in the centre of Bradford. I'd loose count before I'd even turned my head. Now, they're all knocked down and the sky line looks a bit more natural. But some people are suggesting that we put a windmill on every roof, on waste ground and in our gardens, in fields and just about everywhere, making the whole country look like a squashed hedgehog.

On most days in this country, to supply enough power for everyone we'd need so many windmills, that to build them all we wouldn't be able to leave any trees standing. Forests of windmills is not my idea of progress!

Windmills or course could only ever be used as a suppliment to a main power supply which lacked the general inconsistencies of wind. So what is going to be the main source?

Wave power is a little more consistent as there is always some movement of water. However, the scale of any wave energy collector needs to provide a significant percentage of our power, would make the pyramids look like lego.

A hundred mile long boom of wave collectors in the North Sea, has been surjested, to supply a fair proportion of Britains needs (as of the 1980's). However, the cost of construction in lives and money, coupled with the hazards to shipping and the likelihood of breakages in the boom, along with the unreliability and uncontrolability of the machines in question, let alone the cost of maintenance, is quite horrifying.

And as far as high brow technology and centralisation goes, this must be one for the totalitarian state.

And now, last but not least, solar energy As all energy sources on earth originate from solar energy tapping it directly seems pretty logical. However, wind, waves and coal are the result of solar energy striking the earth over vast areas, Solar panels on the roof of a home could supply light and hot,water for all year round. But what about heat during the winter?

Solar cells on the roof of a house would not be adequate for all the requirements such as fridge, cooker, T.V., Hi Fi etc. Also a factory is likely to need many times its surface area of solar cells. So where are we going to put them all? For every square mile of urban cohabation, we might need another square mile of solar panels. And that's just during the summer.

There is, of course always the political arguement against nuclear power; that of the nuclear state. Nuclear power is so important and dangerous that a totalitarian police state will be built up around it. The state will have total control of a few big power stations and could cut off whole ares in times of crisis.

These arguements are at least good anarchist ones, but far from complete. The state already can cut off areas, small or large, from the national grid. Any system based on large energy production centre linked into a national grid is liable to state control and interference. Nuclear

"Gross inequalities" in the global distribution of nuclear waste, was the main subject of discussion in last week's meeting of the friends of Radioactivity (FOR) group.

The group, whose aim is to "bring nuclear power into the hearts and homes of everyone", has produced figures showing that a mere 7% of the world's population owns 84% of all unprocessed nuclear waste. Furthermore, there is strong evidence to show that the "Third World is "severly deprived", with over 90% of the population receiving less than what is normally regarded as the necessary level of radioactivity. Admittedly this is partly due to the fact that many "underdeveloped nations" have old-fashioned taboos about cancer (some of them even regarding it as evil), but as FOR have pointed out, it is mainly because the West has

"exploited the Third World to such a degree that they are now unable to develop nuclear waste producing industries of their own and are dependent on the West for expensive imports".

QUOTE from the Daily Mirror (5/10/79), from the widow of a murdered police constable:  
**'Desmond did not like violence and felt that it needed to be stamped out'. she said.**

power, coal, oil, gas, and wave power all fall into this category and just one of these can not be singled out as being the only one.

Clearly, this is not the question of federalism verses centralism but rather involves the balance between autonomy and federalism, and the scale of both. All individuals cannot have their own power supply fulfilling all their needs. All the machines in a factory will share a common power source.

Now if these sources are variable, e.g. solar, wind, then back up continuous supply systems must be used. An area grid based on say a coal fired station (or nuclear power) could supply an area, with a myriad of auxiliary wind and solar units suplimenting the central source when conditions are appropriate.

Now the area supplied by the main power station is an autonomous unit, but with the auxiliary units adding power capacity, a currently operating power station may supply millions of people; the entire populations of small nations or states. Hence this arguements against nuclear power disappears.

Con versly, unlike coal, wave, and oil power stations, nuclear power stations can vary in size without significant loss in efficiency. Nuclear engines on ships and submarines, albeit for military purposes, are far superior to turbine engines. Each home or factory could have its own nuclear power generator with a biannual refueling cycle. How much autonomy do you want?

In the USSR, (according to the Soviet Childrens Weekly) life is being brought to barren areas of wasteland by the building of nuclear power stations where no other form of energy production is feasible. Now there may be objections to developing virgin wasteland, but the current social situation requires either

At the meeting the bulk of Friends of Radioactivity delegates agreed with the Chairperson, Mr Guy Ger, that the problem was not one to be "solved in years, even centuries, but could only be dealt with by education of public opinion". Mr Ger expressed the hope that the new Government would be cleverer than the last on this matter, and urged Mrs Thatcher not to be "frightened by an unrepresentative minority of cranks, neo-Luddites, Reds, Fascists and trouble-makers". Nuclear waste, he went on, was the foundation upon which Britain's economy could be built.

However, the 'ultra-left' or 'militant' faction of FOR condemned Ger's statement (even before he had begun speaking) as "reactionary, wishy-washy platitudes" and demanded a "far-reaching alternative strategy and a 500-point plan" which included:

\* community based Soviets which would allocate nuclear waste to those in greatest need - notably single parent families, pensioners and the unemployed;

\* a campaign to "rehabilitate nuclear waste in the public mind" by means of "free samples" delivered to millions of homes throughout the land that, vast overcrowding, or compulsory birth control.

Here, there is no real alternative to nuclear power. The same could be said of colonies on the moon and on other planets and space stations. One could not afford to lose power every time the sun went below the horizon.

## CONCLUSION

Now the answer lies with the politicians. Safety wise, there are no unsurmountable problems, apart from those in peoples minds. To say that the politicians will never enforce such ideas as those outlined above, to make sure nuclear power stations are safe, is irrelevant. If they won't do that then they certainly won't close down all nuclear plants and start developing radical new energy sources, just because of a few demonstrations they heard about on the T.V.

Everything can be made safe if there is enough desire to make it so. It usually costs a lot to make something better, but in the long run it works out cheaper. The cheapest designs are always the simplest, and the simplest are always the safest and most efficient.

Politicians of course love complexity and inefficiency. Politics itself is the essence of waste, incompetence and stupidity, and the problems caused by the mere existence of politicians (and power seekers of all kinds) should never be underestimated. Nuclear power without a government would never have been dangerous in the first place.

What it all boils down to is this: If we can reach a social and political system, in this, or any other country where we can do without nuclear power, without loss of standards of living and progress; then that society would be sane enough to develop nuclear power in complete safety.

**The Mad Scientist**

accompanied by stickers, leaflets, TV commercials promoting such "catchy slogans" of "Nuclear waste is fun!", "Nuclear waste - are you getting enough"? and "Nuclear waste - you know it makes sense"; \* a "systematic attack" on the EEC so-called "nuclear waste mountain".

The Ultra-Leftists described the EEC Commissions proposal to sell nuclear waste cut-price to the Russians as "outrageous, considering that millions of British people, especially old-age pensioners can scarcely afford any of the stuff, and often have to exist on inferior substitutes like ash.

With FOR's "militant" faction stepping up pressure, it seems likely that the group will become more radical generally, with demos and public campaigns (including civil disobedience, if needs be) being the order of the day. It is expected that FOR will start promoting the idea of 'DIY nuclear waste' - selling special 'kits' with which any intelligent layperson can "create nuclear waste in his/her own home". Trouble, however, can naturally be expected from CARNAGE, the Campaign for Real Nuclear and Atomic Garbage, which believes that most nuclear waste is mass-produced, diluted rubbish, and is threatening to "boycott" the major monopolistic power-plants "until they start givin' us nuclear waste like it used to be", as a spokesperson put it.

# THE NEXT ISSUE

Can you wait for such exciting features as:-

The SAS - an inside peep



The National Front: an alternative strategy

Helmet Laws Suck.

plus  
Dinosaurs: are they really extinct? special Xtra! probe.  
Do UFOs threaten civil liberties?

Just a few of the features that may or may not be appearing in the next issue.



It's rather difficult to write an Agitprop column for the first issue of a new paper, so the information below has been stolen from Freedom, Peace News, The Leveller, the London Weekly amongst others.

**FREEDOM** Anarchist fortnightly 20p - 84b Whitechapel High Street. The anarchist elderstatesperson intelligent, internal debate and information. Small sized newspaper.

**ANARCHY** Anarchist Magazine 20p 37A Grosvenor Avenue, London N5 - 01 359 4794

**BLACK FLAG** Anarchist newspaper 20p - published by Black Flag, Over the Water, Sanday, Orkney, KW17 2BL Less than monthly, since they decided to come out fortnightly.

**SOLIDARITY FOR SOCIAL REVOLUTION** Libertarian socialist theoretical journal 20p Publications Secretary, 123, Lathom Rd. London E6 Produced in tum by different collectives.

**BREAD AND ROSES** News Journal of the Anarchist Communist Association. 15p Irregular. Box 2, 136 Kingsland High Street, London E8 2NS - large format

**ANARCHIST LONDON WEEKLY** occasional! newspaper - Metropolitan Warehouse, Wapping Wall, Wapping London. tel 01 488 0602 (thursday night).

**LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST** paper of the 'Libertarian Communist' group. 15p - 27, Clerkenwell Close. London EC1 Irregular. Superbly printed.

**PEACE NEWS** Anarcho-pacifist 20p Fortnightly. 8, Elm Avenue, Nottingham - 0602 53587 Well produced.

**REBEL** Irish Anarchist Paper. 10p - 5, Hennetta Street, Dublin.

**OPEN ROAD** Canadian Anarchist/Anarcha-feminist news journal Every three months. Box b135, Station G, Vancouver, BC, Canada. Well produced with good international news. The second best anarchist paper in English!

**SEARCHLIGHT** hardly anarchist, but the best analysis of Fascism. Monthly magazine. AF & R Publications, 21, Great Western Buildings, 6 Livery Street, Birmingham 3 - 35p

**REVOLUTIONARY UNION NEWS** and **WORLD LABOUR NEWS** two news sheets produced by the Industrial Workers of the World in Leeds and Oldham respectively. Free.

**IWW P.O. Box 48** Oldham.

**EVENTS**

6th November - London WC2 - CAAT London Group Meeting, Friends Meeting House, St Martins Lane 8pm

8th & 22nd November - East London Gay Liberation Front Meetings. Back Bar, Duke of Fife pub, in Kathenne Rd, Forest Gate, E7

10-11th November - Planning Meeting to discuss actions at Heysham Nukes The Warehouse, 78a Penny Street. Details: University Half Life Group c/o Students Union, Lancaster Uni.

13th November - British Withdrawal from Norther Ireland Campaign London Group Meeting - 6 Endsleigh Street. 7pm

17-18th November - London CND annual Conference. Details CND 29 Great James St. WC1 tel- 01 242 0362

12th December - London Men's Centre meeting on Transsexuals. 8pm. Details from Danny Cohen c/o Bread & Roses 316 Upper Street, London N1.

**GROUPS**

**ABERDEEN** Libertarian Group. Contact c/o 163 King St.

**ABERYSTWYTH** David Fletcher, 59 Cambrian Street.

**BELFAST** anarchist collective c/o Just Books, 7 Winetavern Street Belfast 1

**BIRMINGHAM** meet sundays 8.30pm at the Box and Grapes, Freeman St. or ring Joanna 440 5132 (also an anarcha-feminist group)


**BRISTOL CITY** 4 British Road, BS 3 3BW

**BRISTOL** Students: Libertarian Soc. Students Union, Queens Road B88

**CANTERBURY** Alternative research group, Contact Wally Barnes, Eliot Collage, University of Kent.

**CARDIFF** write c/o One-O-Eight Bookshop, 108 Salisbury Rd.

**CHELTENHAM** anarchists see street



sellers, 11.00-1.30 Saturday mornings Boots Corner, High St.

**COVENTRY** John England, Students Union, University of Warwick, DERBY Collaborators welcome. Contact Andrew Huckerby, 49 Westleigh Ave., Derby DE3 3BY tel. 368678.

**EAST ANGLIAN** Libertarians. Martyn Everatt, 11 Gibson Gardens, Saffron Walden, Essex.

**EDINBURGH** anarchists meet 8pm on Monday at First of May Bookshop,

**EAST ANGLIAN** Libertarians. Martyn Everett, 11 Gibson Gardens, Saffron Walden, Essex.

**EDINBURGH** anarchists meet 8pm on Monday at First of May Bookshop, 45 Niddrie St., Edinburgh.

**EXETER** Anarchists Soc. Univ. of Exeter, Devonshire House, Stocker Road, Exeter.

**GLASGOW** Anarchist Group. Initially, weekly meetings. For further information contact John Cooper, 34 Raithburn Avenue, Castlemilk, G45

**GREENWICH & BEXLEY** syndicalist group, John Ryan, 47 Binsey Walk London SE2 9TU

**HASTINGS** Anarchist group, Solstice 127 Bohemia Rd, St. Leonards-on-sea Sussex tel. 0424 429537

**HIGH BENTHAM** Ask at the Dragonfly on Saturdays

**HUDDERSFIELD** meetings every 2 weeks For details tel. 0484 38156 (Polytechnic Students Union)

**HULL** Libertarian collective 16 Park Grove, Hull

**LEAMINGTON & WARWICK** c/o 42 Bath Street Leamington Spa.

**LEEDS** 189 Hyde Park Road, LS 6

**LEICESTER** anarchist group Lyn Hurst 41 Briarfield Drive tel. 0533 21250 (days) 0533 414060 (night) Bookshop Blackthorn 76 Highcross St 0533 21896

**HACKNEY** anarchists Dave tel. 249 7042

**KINGSTON** Anarchist 13 Denmark Rd Kingston-upon-Thames tel 549 2564

**LONDON** Workers group Box W c/o Rising Free.

**WEST LONDON** Anarchists 7 Pennard Road W12

**MALVERN & WORCESTER** area Jock Spence, Birchwood Hall, Storridge, Malvern Worcs

**MANCHESTER** c/o Grass Roots, 109 Oxford Rd. M1. Soon to be changed.

**MID-SUSSEX & SOUTH COAST** anarchists c/o Resources Centre, North Rd. Brighton E. Sussex

**NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE** Black Jake c/o 115 Westgate Road, NE

**NOTTINGHAM** c/o Mushroom 10 Heathcote St tel 582506 or 15 Scotholme Av., Hyson Green

**OLDHAM** Nigel Broadbent, 31 Cooke St. Failsworth Manchester.

**OXFORD** Anarchist group c/o Danny Simpson, Exeter College. Anarchist Workers group ditto.

**Anarcha-Feminists** c/o Teresa Thom hill 34 Divinity Rd.

**PORTSMOUTH** Caroline Cahm, 25 Albany Rd, Southsea Hants.

**READING** Anarchists c/o Shevek, Clubs Office, Student Union, Whiteknights, Reading, Berks.

**SHEFFIELD** Anarchists c/o Havelock Square, S10

**SHEFFIELD** Libertarian Society. PO Box 168. Sheffield S11 8SE

**SWANSEA** Don Williams, 24 Derlwyn, Duvant, Swansea.

**SWINDON** area. Contact Mike, Groundswell Farm, Upper Stratton, Swindon, Wilts

**WESTON-SUPER-MARE** Martyn Redman, Flat 5, 23 Milton Road

**KENT** Ramsgate: Peter Ford, 22 Royal Royal Rd. Sevenoaks: Jim Endesby 70 Bradboim

**N. E. Anarchist Federation.** 16 Park Grove, Hull

**SCOTTISH LIBERTARIAN** Federation Nina Woodcock, 74 Arklay St Dundee tel 814541

**DIRECT ACTION MOVEMENT** National grouping of class struggle anarchists. contact : DAM, 28, Lucknow Drive, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Nottinghamshire Groups in various towns.

**ANARCHIST COMMUNIST ASSOCIATION.** National grouping of class struggle anarchists. contact: Box 2, 136 Kingsland Haigh Street London E8 2NS. Groups in various towns and contact with DAM elsewhere.

**SOLIDARITY** a libertarian communist group. contact 123 Lathom Rd. London E6

**USEFUL TELEPHONE NUMBERS**

Gay Switch Board 01 837 7324 - 24 hour phone service for homosexuals. information, entertainment guide, medical and legal referrals, flat sharing, or just a chat.


Rape Crisis Centre 01 340 6145 - 24 hour service. Information and advice. Birmingham Rape Crisis Centre now running 24 hour counselling service for women who have been raped or sexually attacked. 021 233 2122 (24 hrs) or 021 233 2655 ( 10-6pm week days)

Squatters Advisory Service 01 359 8814

RELEASE 01 289 1123 - Information and advice about Drugs, the law, housing and women's rights. Emergency 24 hour service 01 603 8654.

To help us to complete this page send information to Box 151, Rising Free, 82 Upper Street, Islington, London N1. The next issue will be out in time for the January sales, so it would be helpful to have all details in by mid-December.

**Xtra-hard Xword**



**ACROSS**

1. Erection is a confine on Scots Air Force (8)
5. He governed Egypt with capital on credit (6)
9. Labour youth leader becomes in end navy A.B. ( 4.5)
11. County to sever South African link ( 5)
12. At Rialto. WI star comes good with tailored repartee ( 9.3)
15. Basil one amongst her boys (4)
16. Villainous Edward a deserter devious creature (7.3)
18. Sweet to private enterprise (but he's a square to us!) ( 6.4)
19. An old Slav in the conservatory (4)
21. Isn't Sid's clay what rebuilds the I.W.W. for example? (12)
24. Two of us with boy in Greek epic (5)
25. French name in Alistair, perhaps, on face or it. (9)
26. Exodus of Irish revolutionaries to follow some Hegel (6)
27. Commercial writing which follows (8)

'Xtra!' in its manifold generosity has decided to give a fiver and a years subscription to anyone who correctly completes this crossword (snigger). Just send the completed crossword to our box number.

**DOWN**

1. A sore point for strikers (4)
2. Bad load is part of success for Red Brigades (4)
3. Marvellous boy for Sidney and Beatrice (6)
4. Red hot conservative with links which give some pull (8,5)
6. Is repeated in red regime (8)
7. Part of Millwall or Kerry provides employment (10)
8. Again and again concerning the little French I have (10)
10. Short night missile is filled up, gives slight edge (6,7)
13. Christ! See Sham hit is something new (3.7)
14. Delivering, before dispatched (10)
17. Call back about babysitter? (8)
20. The cinema becomes, in retrospect, of the national culture (6)
22. French town in imperial bishopric (4)
23. Fancy steaks give me bladder trouble (4)

by Reklaw