

BLACK FLAG

Now anarchy has shown its face

PARLIAMENT 'SOLE
BARRIER AGAINST
ANARCHY'

Those who say that the Law should not now be allowed to take its course must ask themselves seriously whether in that case any law can ultimately be expected to prevail. For the anarchists' objectives are not limited to the destruction of a few container firms.

The absence of government may alarm the authoritarian, but the politicians have yet to make out a case for the retention of repressive institutions, other than as a means to exploit the people.

No one pretends that the Industrial Relations Act is perfect. Longer experience will show whether and how it ought to be amended. But at present it is all we have as an alternative to deliberately contrived anarchy.

Of course, then, the anarchists hate it. They will go on trying to destroy it. But remember this. Neither they, nor their more innocent supporters have anything to put in its place except anarchy.

Without government the world could manage to end exploitation and war, and society develop in freedom.

The floodgates holding back anarchy are cracking. The liberal would ease the pressure by diverting some of the water; the conservative would shore up the dykes; the totalitarian would construct a stronger dam.

Subscription: 12 issues 75p.
(USA & Canada \$2.00) Post free.

Communications (Post Only) to:-

BLACK FLAG,
10 GILBERT PLACE, LONDON, W.C.1.

Issued by voluntary labour

THE SILENCE IS DEAFENING

Just before the trial of the Stoke Newington Eight, the Guardian called it "the most important political trial of the decade". It seems to be an understatement (says the Defence Committee)...

"So-called independent scientific experts have shown themselves to be professional frauds. Police witnesses have shown themselves to be incompetent liars. Special Branch pigs who have taken a crucial role in the case have refused to answer questions 'in the interests of public security'. It is becoming clear that a number of very high pigs are involved in a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. On the other side the defence ... have made a mockery of Justice James' assertion that 'this is not a political trial' and have effectively brought out that it is a confrontation between the State and the revolutionary movement in this country. So what has the Guardian to say? What have any of the newspapers had to say? FUCK ALL! The silence is deafening.

"Could it be big Press pigs are getting paranoid as to what is coming out of this trial?"

STUART CHRISTIE DEFENCE FUND

A.G. £2; W.S. £1; K.L. .40; R.E. £1;
A.B. £1; J.G. £5; R.E. £2; D.C. £2;
R.E. £3; A.M. £5; collection Toulouse
£38.69; collections London per M.P.
£3, £2.50, £2, £3.; Anon .50.

An old friend and comrade Michael Callinan is now detained in Brixton Prison on a charge arising from a speech in Hyde Park. (It must be years since the police arrested Hyde Park speakers on sedition charges, and one had thought that Speakers Corner had become a recognised 'safety valve' and a tourist attraction, advertised as such in the travel brochures...) The incredibly archaic charge includes an allegation of attempting to depose the Queen. Nothing too rusty to use these days... it is even said that copies of 'Black Flag' have been studied by the DPP to see if they 'deprave and corrupt politically'. Mike, a syndicalist, was speaking on an Irish platform.

BRUSSELS. Branch of the Black Cross just been formed, and proving very active.

AN INTERESTING COMPARISON Mr. John Biggs-Davison, Tory MP for Chigwell and a Roman Catholic, opposing the Government's 'appeasement' policy in Northern Ireland, likened it to the appeasement of Hitler. His closest political associates supported the latter but he now thinks it was bad. He compared Ulster and the Spanish Civil War which was a 'rehearsal for the European war'. He, incidentally, was for Franco. And Hitler? Don't stretch the comparison.

SIX (NEW) PENCE PER ISSUE.

Subscription: 12 issues 75p.
(USA & Canada \$2.00) Post free.

Communications (Post Only) to:-

BLACK FLAG,
10 GILBERT PLACE, LONDON, W.C.1.

Issued by voluntary labour

THE SILENCE IS DEAFENING

Just before the trial of the Stoke Newington Eight, the Guardian called it "the most important political trial of the decade". It seems to be an understatement (says the Defence Committee)... "So-called independent scientific experts have shown themselves to be professional frauds. Police witnesses have shown themselves to be incompetent liars. Special Branch pigs who have taken a crucial role in the case have refused to answer questions 'in the interests of public security'. It is becoming clear that a number of very high pigs are involved in a conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. On the other side the defence ... have made a mockery of Justice

James' assertion that 'this is not a political trial' and have effectively brought out that it is a confrontation between the State and the revolutionary movement in this country. So what has the Guardian to say? What have any of the newspapers had to say? FUCK ALL! The silence is deafening.

"Could it be big Press pigs are getting paranoid as to what is coming out of this trial?"

STUART CHRISTIE DEFENCE FUND

A.G. £2; W.S. £1; K.L. .40; R.E. £1;
A.B. £1; J.G. £5; R.E. £2; D.C. £2;
R.E. £3; A.M. £5; collection Toulouse
£38.69; collections London per M.P.
£3, £2.50, £2, £3.; Anon .50.

An old friend and comrade Michael Callinan is now detained in Brixton Prison on a charge arising from a speech in Hyde Park. (It must be years since the police arrested Hyde Park speakers on sedition charges, and one had thought that Speakers Corner had become a recognised 'safety valve' and a tourist attraction, advertised as such in the travel brochures...). The incredibly archaic charge includes an allegation of attempting to depose the Queen. Nothing too rusty to use these days... it is even said that copies of 'Black Flag' have been studied by the DPP to see if they 'deprave and corrupt politically'. Mike, a syndicalist, was speaking on an Irish platform.

BRUSSELS. Branch of the Black Cross just been formed, and proving very active.

AN INTERESTING COMPARISON Mr. John Biggs-Davison, Tory MP for Chigwell and a Roman Catholic, opposing the Government's 'appeasement' policy in Northern Ireland, likened it to the appeasement of Hitler. His closest political associates supported the latter but he now thinks it was bad. He compared Ulster to the Spanish Civil War which was a 'rehearsal for the European war'. He, incidentally, was for Franco. And Hitler? Don't stretch the comparison.

The trial of the 'Stoke Newington Eight' sometimes called the 'Angry Brigade Trial' opened - after the defendants had been in custody since August - a week early. It has been going on for over a month at the time of writing. It will continue through the summer (with a break of three weeks holiday for all but the defendants) and if it finishes this year we shall be lucky.

Why is it taking so long?
It is not an abstract case involving company law, nor are there complicated questions to argue. The prosecution are taking so long to argue their case because it has weight (avoirdupois) but not substance. It is not for us to comment while the case is sub judice though everyone else is doing so. But we will take a look at the Press.

Fleet Street. The case opened to a rush of headlines. The 'quality' papers reported the allegations made by the prosecution in full. The Telegraph reported these, and subsequent allegations, repeating the phrase that the accused wanted to 'disrupt society' several times. But as the prosecution witnesses appeared and either gave evidence favourable to the accused, or were dismissed as fools or liars, no word appeared. The Guardian and to a lesser extent the Times did report some of these exchanges. The fact that a copy of the Standard (a vital piece of police evidence) had been destroyed because the police did not have room to store it came over in several papers, including the Standard.

The prosecution's Mr. Mathews remarks about anarchists who wanted to disrupt society were later described by a witness as 'Tory prejudice'.

This was not reported. The average newspaper might be forgiven for thinking it was a strange verdict if at the finish the accused were acquitted. At the moment many think the case is over. While Special Branch make such a bad showing in the box, nothing is reported.

Mr. Palmer Hall refused to answer questions on Special Branch activity and was asked by John Barker if the reason he refused was because he was undertaking illegal Special Branch activities. 'I can't comment on that,' he replied.

The best reports come in 'Time Out'. It is criticised by many of our friends as commercial. So it is. Precisely because it wants to sell, it does not flout its readers' opinions audaciously. Its coverage is reasonable, and it is only a pity it is confined to London.

Lawyers. There has been a lot in the Press about the absence of QCs. 'Free Society' published a prejudicial report, in which among other things it suggested that QCs had not refused to take the case because they disliked the politics of the accused. Nobody has alleged that. Many QCs refused to act because they were frightened of the political police, which is another matter. (One professional man candidly admitted he would not give vital forensic evidence because, he said in private, he was afraid of what would happen). It is a pity there should be any criticism of those who are representing the accused. They may explode the myth that QCs are essential.

THE CASE CONTINUES.

A LEGAL PARABLE

Let us say the firm trading as - well - Matthew Rodgers & Co. brings an action against Irish Traders in the High Court. The defendants are able to prove that the plaintiffs have lied, cheated, swindled, and have only brought the action, on perjured evidence, to bring their commercial opponents to financial disaster.

Could Matthew Rodgers & Co. have the effrontery merely to withdraw the action? They would face (at the least) heavy costs; they would be impelled to restore to Irish Traders what they have suffered by damages.

They could certainly not just shrug it off with a promise that their accountants would look into the matter, and go into the next court, where they had Movement Ltd on the same hook.

Even the county court, that stands for much, would not put up with that. Movement Ltd would be able to show that Matthew Rodgers & Co. did not come into court with clean hands. They would say no court could take the word of those who had admitted to such fraudulent practices as the plaintiff, on his own admission had done in the next court.

It would be expected that Movement Ltd would be enabled to go free from the court and resume trading while the Fraud Squad would deal with Matthew Rodgers & Co.

ALL THESE NAMES ARE FICTITIOUS. THAT IS HOW COMMERCIAL LAW OPERATES FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM (at least when applied fairly).

The conduct of affairs in the criminal courts should be on an even more equitable basis, for what is at stake is Life and Liberty.

Let us consider an actual criminal case. Special Branch (its boss man is, surprise, surprise Matthew Rodgers) brought an action against some Irish gentlemen. They were charged with an arms conspiracy, and flung in jail. It was clear they were politically in opposition to the British Political Police (Special Branch). The same branch objected to bail. While they were in jail and prevented from access to means of their defence, their enemies were spinning a conspiracy against them. They wangled the case past committal stage, still objecting to bail.

What happened then? Four men and a woman, of Saor Eire, claimed they had been framed, and the case suddenly collapsed. They had been in jail since October... in June, at the Old Bailey, it became clear that the Special Branch had 'planted' the weapons. ONE BY ONE THE PROSECUTION WITNESSES DECLINED TO ANSWER "FOR REASONS OF STATE SECURITY"... (HA, HA, BLOODY BIG HA, HA). It began to stink. Mr. Justice Bean called the defence counsel in for a chat in his chambers and told them the prosecution was not going forward.

Then a Mr. Parker told the Press he was "in fear of his life"... he had helped frame the case, the case had collapsed and now "the IRA would get him". He only hoped Special Branch would look after him now he was of no further use.

Back to the drawing board (not to mention the hanging and quartering board) Special Branch picked up its portfolios and patted its bulging breast pockets, and smiled ruefully at one another. Then they all tramped next door into Court No.1 to deal with an "anarchist conspiracy".

ON TRIAL

Stuart Christie, Anna Mendelson, John Barker, Hilary Creek, Chris Bott, Angela Weir, Kate McLean, Jim Greenfield.

CHARGE: Conspiracy to bomb and a load of other things.

MR JUSTICE JAMES: Is there any objection to the address? (Hilary applying yet again for bail).

INSP. HABERSHON: Yes, my lord. I have noted it is in N.1. and in the course of our investigations, we have discovered that there are many people of a similar ideology who live in Islington.

JOHN BARKER: If it can't be established, why say it at all? Why do you feel this compulsion to say things that can't be established?

MR LIDSTONE (forensic expert) This is part of my job, to put things in the proper perspective for this court.

MR MACDONALD (barrister): What is an apparent correlation, Mr. Lidstone?

MR LIDSTONE: A set of facts which appear to be linked together is a correlation. An apparent correlation is one that appears to me. Someone else might decide differently, but it appears to me -

MR MACDONALD: I see. It is an entirely subjective Lidstonian view?

MR LIDSTONE: Yes, well, I haven't heard it described as a Lidstonian view, sir, but I would agree it is my view.

MR LIDSTONE: I will make one statement that I would like to put on record. I come from a forensic explosives establishment which has over 100 years of active investigation. It is well known all over the world and we take great pride both in the accuracy of our observations and in our integrity. To suggest that I have the slightest interest in refusing to give any information whatever I regard as insulting.

MR. MACDONALD: I am not suggesting that you were refusing to give information, Mr. Lidstone, I'm suggesting that you are lying.

MR YALLOP (forensic expert): I would indeed say it was a miracle no-one was killed or seriously injured in any of the explosions.

ANNA: Mr Yallop, would you tell the court what is the statistical probability for there to exist an associated set of 27 miracles?

MR YALLOP: Er, no, hum, her, I don't think I could.

MR. MATHEW (prosecuting barrister) Could you tell me exactly what was implied (in a leaflet picked up by a policeman) by the phrase, 'Monday militancy'?

MR MELTZER (witness): I thought that was a phrase recently made very clear by the dockers and the miners and the railwaymen. It suggests that it is not much use putting on your old clothes and going along for a demonstration at the weekend.

MR WINSTAIN: It means industrial militancy, does it not?

MR MELTZER: Yes, as opposed to this irrelevant political agitation advocated by the Vietnam Solidarity Committee, that is what this leaflet is all about.

MR JUSTICE JAMES: What does it mean when it criticises 'myopic non-violence'? What is myopic non-violence?

MR MELTZER: The idealised cult of non-violence that suggests this, alone, can achieve results.

ANARCHO QUIZ

1. To which party did James Connolly (now claimed by nearly every Irish left-wing fraction) really belong, and which did he try to start in Belfast?
2. Which two French kings "never oppressed their people, exacted no taxes, had none imprisoned unjustly, and have neither war nor massacre on their consciences"?
3. Which Hollywood star abused Goebbels so violently (after he was in power) that he was "shocked at the obscenity of the language used", and which producer said sycophantically this was "untypical" of Hollywood reaction to the Nazis?
4. Is there a street in Moscow named after the anarchist Peter Kropotkin?
5. What has the Eastman Dental Hospital in London's Gray's Inn Road to do with anarchism?

(Answers: pp 16/17).

THE OLD LADIES OF DEWSBURY

Recently the medical officers of Yorkshire released two old ladies of Dewsbury from an asylum in which they had spent their entire adult lives. They had been 'certified' some forty years ago. Why? Only because they were morally delinquent. That was the permissive society, if you like; permissive to the point where they could do any dam thing to you they pleased.. All the girls' had done was they

Prisons are the Universities of crime.

Peter Kropotkin.

NO NEW HOLLOWAY PRISON - BLACK
ALL WORK ON THE WOMAN'S JAIL.

had both had "illegitimate" babies, the law taking it on itself to say which lives are legal and which are not. They were deemed to be "feeble-minded" though this probably meant not very bright. When the babies were born, the girls' parents were shocked. They washed their hands of such 'monsters'. The authorities deemed the girls to be 'morally defective', 'morally delinquent' and liable to be 'morally contagious' - all such terms being then in use. More, they might yet again 'burden the parish' with the upkeep of further healthy human lives. The girls were certified.

What became of the children? Probably these illegal births grew up in orphanages to be put in the Army to fight and die for the State (if male) or 'into service' for the rich (if female).

The girls grew into womanhood in the asylum. Finally they became institutionalised, and by the time the medical authorities grew to be a little bright themselves, there was nowhere to send the girls now dependent upon institutionalism. Had there been a Hostel for State Victims they could have gone there. Finally, in their old age, municipal wisdom has found a place for them, not too grand, forty years after.....

This was not in the heart of Irish bogland or in some Italian Catholic village... it was in solid "Red" Yorkshire where the miners' lodges paraded every May Day with slogans of Solidarity. Socialist councillors, proud of their achievement, stalwarts of the old ILP with Jowett and Snowden, saw the girls grow up under their care.

The kids today seem strange to old-timers in the movement, even comic in their concern for 'Gay Lib' etc. But by Christ they would not stand by and see that sort of thing any more.

A snippet falling on our desk informs us that one Robin Percival, at present co-editor of Peace News, will in the autumn be starting with others "a non-violent training and community action centre in Derry". If, one would have thought, there was one thing the beleaguered people of Derry could have done without, apart from another centre training for violent action, it was one training in non-violent action...

It was precisely such a centre that was set up when the Protestant King endowed Maynooth as a Catholic seminary, to be run by French refugees from the French Revolution, that set the Irish RC Church on its "non-violent" lickspittle course of obedience and subservience to the Crown, while paying lip-service to the Republic after it had won. The Irish people, and above all, one would think those of Derry's Bogside and the Catholic 'ghetto' of Belfast, know all about non-resistance as well as they do about violent actions for the sake of violence and nothing more. What they would appreciate would be to know how to defend themselves, from 'friend' and foe alike. It is pacifism and social-democracy, either directly or in the popular

Establishment-sold packages, that has left them naked in the storm to their enemies.

Readers of 'The Times' may have noticed a sudden concern for the man made redundant - especially the executive type who has had his days of gin and Jaguars and now faces the icy winds of reality.... it has come out with some searching criticism of the Heath Government, which does not lose sight of the fact that under the Thomson regime many 'Times' executives and journalists may go that way too...

The concern for the unemployed has brought some unforced Tory reaction. Compare this letter with the sort of guff heard at election times:

"The £20 a week worker... is with us in his millions and if we give him more and more we endanger the material fabric of the country. It is a tragedy of every century... a crime of civilisation, that the sweat and toil of so many worthy men have but small value when measured in coin of the realm. The state may add a tithe to their sustenance by engaging in the sport of Robin Hood, but carried too far that game will surely destroy both nations, rich and poor."

That's how it is (in capitalist logic) though it suits the apologist for capitalism sometimes to phrase it differently. The 'value when measured in coin of the realm' is, of course, an arbitrary one determined by the power possessed by the faction concerned. Such power is exercised on the state by withdrawal of labour either by strike action or by causing a scarcity; or within the state by covert pressure. Or it is practised on the community by fraud, persuasion or other forms of pressure. The coin of the realm value is artificially imposed. It has nothing to do with the natural wealth of a community. It concerns the way that wealth is to be unfairly distributed.

MAGAZINES

INSIDE STORY... tells some of the story the national press cuts out. No.3. has some fascinating information about Special Franch and police scandals.

MOLE EXPRESS in Manchester is a lively grass-roots paper that sounds, and is, real libertarian. 5.

The Society for Individual Freedom gave a luncheon at the House of Commons. It invited as guest of honour Mr. Brian Faulkner. His words in favour of such individual freedoms as internment without trial were highly appreciated.

THE MAUDLING PRIZE FOR IDIOT OF THE MONTH.

An unknown journalist, signing himself H.C.E., is winner of the coveted and hotly contested award. Writing in the 'Jewish Chronicle', he is overcome with a natural hysteria at the Lydda attack by Japanese gunmen to give vent to a degree of imbecility unmatched in any other paper.

He speaks of THE NEW TERRORIST INTERNATIONAL...which has such obvious similarities to the old Judeo-Masonic Conspiracy that one wonders if "HCE" is a Nazi infiltrator into the Jewish Chronicle. Just as Dr Rosenberg linked together 'capitalists, communists, trade unionists, freemasons' in a vast Jewish conspiracy, H.C.E. links together "international anarchism ..which..affects every country and undermines all forms of social order" with "the institutionalised dissidence of the Communist Parties (of France and Italy)" which can also 'dispense jobs and patronage'. Baader-Mainhoff, Weathermen, Nationalists (not the Irgun, though), Arab terrorists, all are one and the same movement supported by Russia and China in amicable agreement. *These highly authoritarian, masochistic, deviant, drug-taking, hippy, disciplined gunmen, the 'anarchists' are used by the

Russo-Chinese fraternity in every country but their own. 'Ironically' only the Arab States have realised it 'and have driven out or severely restricted the Palestinians, so that their last foothold is in the Lebanon'. Hold on: authoritarian, masochistic, drug-taking, terrorist and Palestinian? Stalinist, Maoist, Marxist. 'They profess a primitive form of Maoist Marxism' (how primitive could that be, one wonders?) "but their impulses are basically anarchistic and destructive", says HCE in the grand manner of the Protocols. (This is in fact almost a paraphrase: "many of these movements are not Jewish, but behave as if they were").

His conclusions: "The special branches of the civilised world's police forces will now have to operate on a global basis, constantly informing each other of the movements of terrorists and their Russian and Chinese quartermasters".

The money from Moscow and Peking plus ten cents will get us a cup of coffee... But are they not (if not 'civilised') at least 'global'? Are they not in on it too? And if the Arab States are to join in, why not them? Either say 'Western Alliance' (which may well include anti-Israel forces, Mr HCE) or admit you want a world police force including the Russians and Chinese you pretend to be berating. NOTE: the 'special branches of the world' means the Political Police. That is exactly what the Gestapo wanted. In Europe, they achieved it.

The leaders of the 'international anarchist conspiracy' are 'often women' he warns, though he does not quote a single anarchist woman (all are Nationalists or Marxists) and it is precisely the line of argument Dr Rosenberg would have used had he been faced with a phenomenon like Golda Meir. PRIZE TO H.C.E.: Fading copy of Rosenberg's 'Real Rulers of Russia' in which all the leaders of Russia are

~~alleged to be~~ ~~from~~ ~~with~~ the grudging exception of Lenin ("What is he? They say he is no nigger"), The 'real ruler' of all was, of course, an Anarchist - and a woman (the very combination that makes HCE see red, and various other colours), Emma Goldman ("She is for sure the vilest woman going - the gravest digger of Russia": Alfred's English was a bit more primitive than our 'Marxism').

DEMOCRACY

"Democracy...is a word the real gist of which still sleeps.. It is a great word, whose history, I suppose, remains unwritten, because that history has yet to be enacted." WALT WHITMAN.

"Democracy has been promulgated and its principles endlessly proclaimed; but in no country in the world has it ever, for more than a brief space of a few months, been put into practice. For democracy requires three conditions for its fulfilment, and until all three conditions are satisfied, it cannot be said to exist. It is only necessary to state these conditions to show that democracy never has existed in modern times:

"The first condition of democracy is that all production shall be for use, and not for profit. The second condition is that each should give according to his ability, and each receive according to his needs. The third condition is that the workers in each industry should collectively own and control that industry."

Herbert Read.

SUPPORT THE STOKE NEWINGTON
EIGHT DEFENCE GROUP

240 Camden High Street,
London, N.W.1.

IT'S HAPPENING HERE!

10.

THE WORK OF THE ~~ANARCHIST~~ BLACK CROSS

A worker in Spain was in prison for his activities in building up the CNT once more. His wife was forced to go to work and look after their children, with no other income but her own small earnings... He was forbidden to work in prison (the only way a Spanish prisoner can keep alive)... We sent out an urgent message to several comrades here and abroad... With no costly 'administration', we have no idea who responded and who did not. But she received in all the fantastic sum of £126 (half her year's income) from different comrades....

Had we been a 'charity' we would have announced with pride the case history, collected the cash, spent it on overheads and salaries, and sent some on. It all went direct. That is not charity but solidarity and the way we like it. But we're only sorry we couldn't write and thank all who sent. So this is it. Whoever you were.

In London, Chicago, Cologne, Milan, Brussels, Berlin the Anarchist Black Cross is organising Solidarity for Political Prisoners.

Other committees for political prisoners have been formed in many towns, in co-operation with the general work of solidarity. In Lancashire, comrades of the ASA have formed a Libertarian Prisoners' Committee to 'adapt' prisoners in response to our call. The reason Governments imprison militants is to impede, harass and discourage the class struggle. Therefore, the support of prisoners becomes a first line of struggle.

SCOTTISH MAOISTS — A total of
SENTENCED 81 years

faces William McPherson, Matt Lygate, John Doran, Colin Lawson — 26 years, 25 years, 24 and 6 years respectively. Why such high sentences? They were only accused of burglary. Two of them had no previous convictions. Lygate admitted he had received stolen money for political purposes, but not that he had taken part in the actual burglaries.

All were members of the Workers Party of Scotland and the John Maclean Society. They were condemned for their political beliefs. No point in saying we do not identify with their Maoism. Those who crushed them would crush us too (indeed the kept press maintained John Maclean — surely well enough known in Glasgow's history! — was an 'anarchist' and this was an 'anarchist trial').

The case goes to appeal BUT WHATEVER THE OUTCOME IT MUST NOT REST THERE. It is quite clear what the Establishment is saying. ALL BURGLARS MUST BE GOOD TORIES. OTHERWISE, TORY JUDGES WILL MAKE THEIR SENTENCES HEAVIER. We must force the judicial establishment to spell this out. It is an argument used time and again against the Freemasons that they will, if appointed to the Bench, give lighter sentences to 'their own'. But this applies to the Tory Establishment of judges too. They are hypocrites enough not to want it spelled out. Let it be made quite clear so that judges are shown to be 'favouring their own'. That way we can help these victims of the class war.

BRIANT'S OCCUPATION

Once more the workers show themselves far in advance of the political 'vanguards' who bemoan their apathy. The well laid out and modern colour printing plant in the Old Kent Road, Briant's, was doing well for its bosses. But sites are better money-spinners than factories. So the factory, like many others, was to be closed, the assets stripped, and while the workers went on the dole, the bosses would reap a profit. 'We cannot afford lame ducks' is the cry.

THE WORKERS SEIZED CONTROL and continued to run it. So far the press has not whipped up too much agitation against such an outrageous procedure, for the simple reason that it cannot be certain that if it whips up a pogrom against the Briant occupation, the printworkers will allow the presses to keep rolling out lies. It touches them too closely.

The Tory line that the workers are just 'layabouts' is confounded...these people COULD take their redundancy money and go on the dole, but they won't. They want to go on working the way they know how and to produce their high quality product. They don't want to sit round and wait for a change of government.... they haven't any faith in the Labour Party anyway.

The Socialist vanguardists have no time for workers' occupation when it comes to the crunch. 'You cannot have socialism in one factory'.... When in the class struggle the State gets hit, they argue feebly, 'These people are trying to destroy capitalism building by building'.

But that is what the class struggle is all about.

Workers Occupation.

Hitting Oppression.

Direct Action.

Finding solutions for oneself. That is the road to freedom.

Latest communication from a body describing itself as the Vietnam Vigil to End the War says specifically to us that "the success of the Journalists Noon Hour Thursday vigil depends on participation of journalists, photographers, editors etc. working on publications such as yours". Such as ours? (The editor is in clink, and as for the photographers...) Yes, yours.. "we cannot rely on journalists from the popular press" though they have on the committee of the Campaign hogging the glory Anthony Howard (Statesman), Mary Kenny (Standard), Claud Cockburn, James Cameron, Neil Ascherson and all...

We are asked to join the "Labour Campaign for Peace" to which MPs, clergymen, and other villains have contributed. If we thought a "vigil" would end the war we would go and stand about diffidently with these dignified journalists all, sparing the time from Oddenino's. But where the power of the working-class is no longer effective because the military machine has taken over, the boozy cynics of Fleet Street will do no more nor less than the canting clerics or the wily politicians.

Another letter blithely informs us that "our troubles will be solved - and I see from your paper you have big troubles" if we go and meet some Jesus nit. This imbecile has apparently read the journal as distinct from the fellow-travellers on the Vietnam campaign who took it off a list somewhere. "How can you be so cocksure God does not exist? The world is a creation, therefore it had a Creator... this Creator we call God..... 12.

put your pride aside and come and hear about Jesus."

If the world is a creation, it had a creator (or creators). But where is the proof it was a creation? Even if it was, the creator, who was not up to much, might just as well have been Thos. J. Twitt jun. of the Dept. of Outerspace Creation, and not one of his better efforts. The trouble with these "saviour gods" is they won't stay put. By all means accept the hypothesis of a mythical Jehovah if you like (or a Thos. J. Twitt jun.) But why must the religious bring them to earth? Why not put our pride aside and go and hear about Antinous? (A much more interesting character around the time of the alleged Jesus who also claimed divinity).

And what presumption on the part of our reader (whom we will not advertise) by suggesting he knows the answer... If God really existed, he should see about improving his methods of communication.

ANOTHER COMMUNICATION from a Mr. Don Grattidge (38) who wants to form a UNITED WORLD YOUTH PARTY, "the under-35's". 'UNITY is essential for YOUR SURVIVAL and PROGRESS. Do you get the message?" he writes. Not very clearly. Common grounds for unity of 'this generation' above all (he thinks only 35-and-under now live) are "SURVIVAL: PROGRESS: FREEDOM". Now do you see? (It doesn't get much more specific). "It is accepted that never before have Millions of one generation broken through the barriers of Time and Accepted Reality." It hasn't. Not in our neck of the wood. United, what a force, he says - for all companies and individuals must contribute to 'Your Party' (his, so far) or 'you withdraw your Consumer Power'. Good old Tory Party dictum. 'Naturally' (and how) 'all Military and Police Personnel of Your Generation will be encouraged to Unite within Your Party.' Ours! My life!

German police burst in on the flat of a British business man, Mr. Iain MacLeod, at 6.30 a.m. Seeing plain clothes thugs at the door, he naturally slammed it. They opened fire and killed him. Excuse: They were looking for the Baader-Meinhoff 'gang'.

We had already warned in BLACK FLAG of the activities of the German political police gang. Using the pretext of political protest, and under paranoiac pressure from the bourgeoisie, they are shooting without mercy. Already two of our comrades, guilty of nothing but aiding political prisoners (von Rauch and Weisbecker) have been shot down.

Mr. MacLeod being outside any political activity, he may have been denounced by a business competitor (not an unfamiliar occurrence in German history) or he may, of course, have been an unwelcome witness. The alternative is to say the German police are behaving like mad dogs.

We learn that Baron von Braun at the Foreign Ministry has 'expressed regrets'. That is what diplomats are for. In unity with the murderers, however, are their accomplices in the gang who have hide-outs in many cities including London. The London haunt of the Interpol gang is in New Scotland Yard. To what extent were our political police implicated in the murder? It would be nice to have even an oily assurance that they, too, regret the action of their close colleagues.

The other day Joseph Fielding Smith died in Utah at the age of 95. He was leader of the Mormon Church, a direct descendant of the Prophet himself, illiterate enthusiast Joe Smith who, back in the eighteen-twenties, had a religious novel read to him and jumped to the conclusion, hearing fiction for the first time, every word was true.

The trash novel now would be worth a fortune. The multi-millionaire empire state built on the bum's dream has long since destroyed every copy lest it undermine the fanciful religion built around its premise that the Bible story was continued among the Indians of America. The absurdities of Mormonism were, of course, neither more nor less than those of other religions and Joe the saloom bum neither more nor less a prophet than Mohammed the camel herd who married the rich widow.

Driven out of the United States by an intolerance his followers emulated, Joe Smith being killed in the exodus, the Mormon leader led his people to a 'Promised Land'. But it was the practical Brigham Young who did it, adapting God's Word to every exigency of empire building and capitalist enterprise until he left behind a bulwark of right-wing capitalist oppression in the State of Utah, now part and parcel of the U.S.A.

At the time Joe Smith dreamed up his theocracy, there were other, nobler, more generous, more beneficial dreams. Elsewhere in the States were the Utopian Socialists, there was Proudhon in France, Robert Owen in England. Utah is a power incorporated into the States, the Mormon Church has powers in excess of the established Churches from which its original followers revolted. But the visions of the Utopian Socialists are as far off as ever. Not for want of practicability. Had they too had 'visions' that enabled them to march in step with capitalism and the State, they too would have established a Power, every bit as bad as the old.

Book Review

LESSONS OF THE SPANISH REVOLUTION

Vernon Richards

(Freedom Press £1.50, paperb. 75p).

This is a book written exclusively, it would seem, for Anarchists knowing the intimate details of the Spanish Revolution, and is apparently based on an 'Ivory Tower' assumption that there is a large number of anarchists who 'fail to understand', though one of the conclusions is that there were fewer anarchists in Spain than 'generally' thought. The polemic is a sustained one, highly personal, and more of individuals than institutions.

For his facts, Richards claims to rely on 'official documents' (but in practice on books and newspapers). He accepts them uncritically, and if he finds the source unreliable, has recourse to the familiar "Even he admits..."

How reliable is Richards a guide? He begins by plunging into the question of whether the CNT participated in, or its members voted in, the elections of February 1936. There is completely no proof it participated, but of course no one will ever know what its members actually did. At the time, all members of the Right Wing were convinced "the anarchists voted..." (hence there was no Left-Wing swing, merely an alteration in tactics); all Leftists were convinced they had not, and if they had done so, the Right would have electorally disappeared. (Compare an equivalent question: did Bernadette Devlin gain her seat from the Unionist because of a Civil Rights swing... or because the Catholics stopped splitting the vote?) For Richards, all is clear.

He can quote three 'sources' to say they did (two of them with charged reasons), and the next 'historian' can quote four... But commonsense may say that in view of what happened in July 1936, there may really have been a Left Wing swing, and surely no minority could have resisted the Army revolt in that way.

He indulges in some extreme spleen against the one-time Secretary of the CNT, Horacio Prieto. (Perhaps it is one bitter nature resenting another? Prieto was TB, a bitter, but certainly at one time sincere worker): he is charged with causing the entry of the "CNT" Ministers into the Government. The real culprit was the vain, stupid Garcia Oliver, who had succeeded in becoming a "well known person".

The Civil War caught many libertarians stuck in anti-Fascist, as against social-revolutionary, postures (Richards no less: his claim to have been a farsighted critic in 'Spain & the World' is untrue; by the time he came round to criticise, after the May events, the die was cast in Spain). In Spain, the militants went to the front - Ascaso, Durruti, many hundreds and perhaps thousands: they played no further part in the intrigues in which Richards revels. Those like Federica Montseny, Garcia Oliver and so on kept away from the fighting: they are rightly criticised by Richards for angling into positions of power in the Republic.

The organisation, used for years not to criticise its delegates in public, allowed them to cavort in the Republic and the Generalitat, with no means of preventing them from doing so short of shooting them since they were not in fact delegates. They came to control the press, and Richards has great fun reproducing some of their absurd chauvinistic quotations. Having seized the press, they countered the

criticisms of themselves with dignified protests that they were old libertarians who did not deserve these diatribes; they had striven self-effacingly and even now, only wished to be of service... Such "lessons" for Anarchists are sadly clear to many in this country, Vernon Richards excepted.. "It would be interesting to know what changes took place in the editorial staffs of (Freedom Press), and the political significance of these changes. And, last but not least, by whose orders these changes were made. Such information is not readily available..." (For the words in brackets, read the CNT dailies). For much the same statement made in an internal bulletin a young comrade was recently vilified and a solicitor hinted at legal action. To Richards, this will be a "personal attack". But are not his "lessons" precisely that one should make such personal attacks? Or only in Spain?

The author has a knack of ascribing the most impossible opinions to those with whom he disagrees, or to ideas he wishes to refute. Thus (assuming 'for space reasons' the reader is acquainted with anarcho-syndicalism) he refutes it by saying that "to be consistent" the anarcho-syndicalist "must, we believe,

OUR NEW PUBLICATIONS

HOW THE STUDENT RISING IS
RE-ABSORBED Garcia Calvo 20p
WHAT IS THE CNT? Peirats 10p
MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM
Kropotkin 20p

still selling
THE ORIGINS OF THE ANARCHIST
MOVEMENT IN CHINA 10p 15.

hold the view that the worker, by definition, must be revolutionary." By definition, the only assumption can be that he works; but Richards has it at the back of his mind someone, somewhere (this time he does not produce a book reference) has said the workers are basically good and pure (Rousseau?). It is, he says wisely, "a mistaken view".

He is, however, at the beginning of the book, obliged to contrast what the working-class, when in revolt, did achieve, to contrast it with the manner in which Oliver, Montseny &c. collaborated with the Republic to crush it. But it is far from clear that he is really on the workers' side when, later in the book, he feels that, after all, the "organised productive workers" are only "a section of society". For them to take over would be an authoritarian act. He looks instead to "the people". That is precisely what Companys, Montseny and all were on about. A war of the People against foreign oppression, as opposed to a socially divisive Revolution.

How, except at the level of organised production, can one change the economic basis of society? Richards has an answer: seize the "financial reserves" and the gold. It should have been done when the Government had virtually collapsed, he says (i.e. when the financial reserves were valueless.) The gold still had a value, to buy arms abroad. But one cannot have one's cake and eat it. He endorses a criticism that the Republic shipped gold to Russia. It was to buy arms. He has some mystical, pre-Keynesian faith in the Holy Gold itself, seized from the banks in the People's Cause. Was there another seller bar Russia? The arms dealers of the world would not sell, for political

reasons, to the Republic. And the very way in which the Republic sold itself to the workers was to say that it had a legal right to buy arms; that it must be preserved for that purpose. Is it true that arms dealers would have cut their own throats by selling to the Revolution? They were not that desperate for customers in 1936. There is simply not a vestige of sense in Richards's belief that Gold could have saved all. (He is elsewhere on record as advocating "fair taxation" and accusing those who dissented from this on anarchist grounds that they must surely believe in worsening conditions being favourable for revolt, "a very inhuman attitude"!)

It would have been a superb piece of theatricalism to have dumped the gold in the Mediterranean. As it is, the gold that is now deposited in Mexico as the last remaining property of the "legal Spanish Government" is precisely the bait that has lured Horacio Prieto and others into political collaborationism that has outlasted the Civil War.

The book fails to give the main facts of the defeat (given graphically in Garcia's book). The workers had been manoeuvred by the failure to obtain arms in 1936 into a position of trench warfare, from which they could defend but never win. They knew that neither gold nor

good leadership would make any difference, and that the Revolution was lost when the war crystallised into its lasting form. But they could not surrender for the enemy was too vicious. As Napoleon said, "Only from traitors I learned the truth." The collaborationist traitors were right in saying that the only hope was that the world war might come in time so that the situation could be resolved. The alternative was surrender. That came first. But for ten years after the surrender the Resistance grew up, the real CNT of the militants who played no part in collaboration. Of the story of Sabater, Facerias and others Richards does not hint, except a passing disapproving reference to those who believe in 'action'. Instead, he rakes over the dissensions of the exiles, in which the collaborationists naturally played a larger part than they did in Spain itself.

The high quality of the production, so customary with Freedom Press printing, is a sign of how far the British Anarchist movement could have gone. It has been dissipated into yet another badly-edited volume by Richards, the stupid and tendentious Eltzacher's Anarchism, a weekly paper echoing the ideas of last generation's Peace News. Richards in his criticisms of Oliver and Montseny gives a diagnosis. But he fails to see the application. LIB.

ANSWERS TO QUIZ ON PAGE

1. Himself a member of the Socialist Labour Party, he tried unavailingly to create the Independent Labour Party in Belfast to overcome religious differences. (It is, unfortunately, a myth that he was a syndicalist).
2. Louis XVII & Napoleon II. The remark is sarcastic - they never

ruled and their reigns were posthumous legal fictions.

3. Marlene Dietrich. Invited as a 'Nordic beauty', daughter of a Prussian soldier, to return to Germany, she asked to speak by phone to Goebbels personally. Louis B. Mayer, of MGM, sycophantic pro-Nazi (although Jewish) apologised.

The death of the Duke of Windsor has revived all the old controversies about the Abdication and brought the inevitable mumblings about hypocrisy. It pervades so much of English Establishmentarianism that it will come as no surprise to anyone to find that the mumblers are no less hypocritical. The story of the Duke of Windsor as told by all sections of the Press is not just Hamlet without the Prince, it is a Hamlet in which the Prince was really on good terms with his step-father and objected to being sent to England when he liked being in Elsinore...

Some columnists hide their knowledge of the facts of the case by coy references to the "pretty face" of the young Prince, or the excessive interest he took in clothes to the indignation of his austere father, or pictures of him in the drag-like plus-fleurs costume he affected, or even daring references to the 'gay Prince he was once'.

HRH had a classical Freudian repression, with the fierce father - strict, bovine George V - whose wife had to conceal her interest in art and music in his lifetime, as her 'duty' was to her husband who thought only of horses.

(Answers to Quiz, continued)

4. No, despite popular opinion to the contrary. There is a Kropotkin Street but it was named after the General of that name (a distant relative), in Tsarist times.

5. It was founded by a bone-faction from the camera millicen-also, who at one time contemplated giving the name to the anarchist movement.

an unexpected taste for advanced plays on lesbianism, and a liking for such performances as the 'red hot momma' Sophie Tucker giving her 'where-with-a-heart-of-gold' act. Nevertheless she preserved a rigid maternal repression over Edward, both of them slaves to their code. It may be that Mrs. Simpson - precisely because of all the talk of her 'unsuitability' as Queen - was the first woman with whom he could establish a satisfactory relationship, since she was so clearly not Queen Mary. The other women, such as Mrs. Dudley Ward, all safely married, with whom he went through an appearance of platonic flirting to keep up pretences, were arbitrarily dumped.

With the humbug surrounding Royalty none of it could be explained. Even now they shrink at it. So HRH as King clashed with the ruling class, and could not go through with the humbug. In came the intensely inhibited but innocuous George VI... back came the homely virtues to Buck House, and gone with the Windsors went the sex sets. Some crept back under cover as the years went by. But the Boy Prince, petrified like Lot's wife as he looked back wistfully on the Gay Twenties, was condemned to a futile life... no more, no less futile than the one he abandoned.

FRANCO'S PRISONER

Twenty years in a Spanish jail

Miguel Garcia

hardback Now available from us

at £2.25 plus .15p postage. Signed copies.

FICTIONS OF ANARCHY

Christie & Meltzer. Available

from us at £1.05 plus .10p postage.

hardback (The paperback, published by Sphere Books at 35p, will be on sale everywhere from July 30).

old story about 'colportage'. When the Po Lice at Hyde Park or anywhere else declare that you cannot sell dissenting literature legally there, they are lying. No test case is needed. They have been held over the years and the law is clear. No licence is needed (if you disbelieve it, ask at Westminster City Hall for a licence to sell papers... they will tell you no such licence is issued or required, and a hawker's licence is not necessary for papers).

The sale of the evening papers at every street corner is only possible because of the law specifically relating to dissenting papers and magazines known as colportage. As they had already obtained the rights to be sold freely and without hindrance, and it was agreed they did not merely by the fact of being sold constitute "obstruction", vendors of the daily and evening papers were able to take advantage of that fact and so have never required a hawker's licence.

Po Lice harassment of papers at the point of sale in the street, raids upon bookshops merely for dissenting literature and confiscation of same, is illegal and unconstitutional. The fact that magistrates may condone theft does not make it less so. That the courts turn a blind eye to police crime in this respect makes it impossible to say "they can't do that to you." But the rights of colportage lie deep in the constitution and it is doubtful if at the present time the government would tamper with it. Instead the Home Office ignores the law. But defendants have (for what it is worth) the law on their side. 18.

SOCIAL &
PERSONAL
Morale continued high among our friends in the case of the 'Stoke Newington Eight'... Stuart is fine, and getting every support from his friends, but WAKE UP and give more support to the others... Jim and John are in one nick, and Hilary and Anna in another so visiting is at a low ebb, and Chris too needs solidarity. They've all been in nearly a year, with little exercise, no income; needs fags and mags and someone to bring them in, not to speak of dinners and clothes....

There'll be lotsa trendies getting in on the band wagon in the event of an acquittal... but it's now they could be done with...

Someone had the bright idea of presenting a cake to Anna on her birthday, in court. Mr. Justice James was taken aback. He is trying to be polite to conceal any bias it might be suspected he has. He agreed. But Holloway nick did not. She never got the cake her friends outside paid for. But loads of publicity. And the counsel helping her (she is conducting her own defence) suggested it might be tested for bombs. The cake remained uneaten - but the point was made...

IN TOWN NOW... Over the last four weekends we have met comrades from France, Spain, Belgium, Italy, Canada, U.S.A., Jamaica, Australia, South Africa and even some from London... We are doing our best to transform the Centro Iberico meetings into an international centre which will have its own premises. We have met a few comrades from the "rest of England". But the Londoners? The phoney's have for years kept the rest away. Now the phoney's have scuttled for cover how does one signal the 'all clear' to the rest?

The leader-writer of the Daily Telegraph, confident that he spoke for "all decent British people" (surely tautology? Does the boulder suggest there are other types of British people?) apologised to "poor Barcelona" for the behaviour of the Celtic football fans who ran riot in that city.

Poor Barcelona lost control of its affairs 33 years before, to an invading Army, and when the Glaswegians complained of 'unbridled savagery' in the police force, it was not by way of novelty to the Catalan city.

The police have long been absolute rulers accustomed to exercise torture. They work wonders in preventing a 'permissive society' such as the Telegraph deplores, but found it difficult to control an exuberant football crowd. The Telegraph had no need to apologise. It was not a reflection on the Barcelona police efficiency: the Gestapo was also efficient, but had it survived into the present day, it would have found itself unable to deal with such matters as issuing parking tickets without a display of excessive zeal.

What did the Glasgow fans expect, having got drunk and disorderly, asks the Telegraph. Possibly that the police obeyed some restraints and did not act as wild beasts, that is to say, like authoritarian police used to getting their own way immediately. They all must know better now.

Can it really be that the leader writer of a national daily does not know Spain is a police state?

When the thirteen miners' pickets came up for trial in June, in Dunfermline, Police Sgt Beveridge gave evidence of "tension". 'Until Friday February 11, relations had been good,' he said.

'Early on the Monday morning about 200 policemen were on duty controlling 2,000 or 2,500 pickets on the service road to Longannet. The atmosphere, Sgt Beveridge said, was quite different from other days'. - press.

At the rate of one policeman to every ten or fifteen civilians, was it surprising? A disciplined force is one that seems stronger than one numerically superior anyway. 'There appeared to be a lot of hate generated between the pickets towards the police.' This was what he thought condemnatory of the miners. They were fighting for their livelihood. The police were there to prevent them doing so. A certain amount of hate was naturally 'generated'. What did they expect?

THE I.R.A. COURT REVERSED

The surprise for the Industrial Relations Act Court in getting its decision reversed twice in a week is not, of course, a victory for the workers. It is a setback for the Tory Government in its union-bashing policies - which would not have been put into operation by skilled Big Business operators like Supermac or Butler, but only by this bunch which has neither worked nor exploited for a living but just been kept all its life.

The courts came to the rescue of Big Business when the Act proved unworkable and put the Government in a spot. The Act bashed the unions for the actions of the shop stewards, when the Labour Party knows and Big Business knows that it is precisely

the trade union leadership that time and again stands out for settlement with Big Business, as against the militancy - or, as they say, 'irresponsibility', of the shop stewards.

The Government spokesman have expressed time and again their surprise that trade union leaders are not co-operating with the Industrial Relations Act (when everybody knows that a Labour Government will introduce something similar with which they will work). But had they experience even on their side of the table, they would know that it is difficult for the TU leaders to sell out so blatantly as registration under the Act would be. (Even so, some have done it: the amateurs can be right!)

But trade union leaders know well that they cannot stem all industrial activity. Even under dictatorships it cannot always be done. Ultimately, it is what makes trade union activity tick. They prefer to see it organised by the elected shop steward, hoping to buy off individuals as they become dangerous, by positions in the TU bureaucracy, rather than do it themselves. If the Act is to make them responsible for the shop stewards, it will (they fear) plunge them into militancy or complete sterility.

They are living easy on the TU movement. But only a free trade union makes it tick. If the shop stewards were to be hounded out of existence, what (they fear in a cold sweat) would happen to the TU office - holders no longer able to pass the buck or to come into disputes, around the end, as arbitrators? Every issue would be a major one.

The trouble the Government is

finding is due to the fact that if you smack someone on the backside with a cricket bat, you may succeed not in warning him to behave, but in waking him up. ("Thanks for that insult, I had too much ease..." ran the poem... it finished with the recipient of the insult rising, "and stood victorious over larger foes").

The TU leadership, some of it, is making very radical noises now. The insult of the Robert Carr Act has stirred it up. Even more, of course, the reaction to the Act by the working people of the country (not all of whom went as far as the Angry Brigade, but some of whom would have had they dared) has showed them they must forsake their ease for a struggle... lest they find everyone more militant than they has been swept away and they stand in the lonely place of extremest militants going.

MEETINGS: LONDON - Hispanic Centre (Centro Iberico) meets Sundays from 5.30 on at Holy Trinity Church (opp. Holborn Tube) parish hall, Kingsway.

Anarchist Black Cross is not holding meetings but call in any time up to 10 p.m. (literature &c available). We keep a 'contact table' there while other meetings going on.

SALFORD: ASA organised an anarchist talk-in recently. Miguel Garcia went one day and talked on Spain (with film), Albert Meltzer the next. ABC covered four meetings altogether.

PRINTWORKERS: Meetings 10 p.m. Sats in Fleet Street: write for details.

Now available in new edition:
THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BONNOT GANG (La Bande a Bonnot) 10p. From us.

PERSONAL: On holiday? - drop a postcard to 100483 J.S.Christie, H.M.Prison, Jebb Avenue, Brixton, London, S.W.2

~~PSEUDO-ANARCHISTS.~~

Unfortunately, we have to deal in these columns with the pseudo-anarchists who spring up whenever there is not too much repression. They can adopt the most radical names with impunity, and do nothing about it. Better, they can combine names ('anarcho-capitalist' is one started in the States - where else?) that sounds cleverly radical by combining mere words with actual reality. We may deal with these phoneys in a later issue. In recent issues we have had to castigate the so-called pacifists.

It is not, despite what some readers have assumed, we have a mad thing against pacifists. We have always accepted a person could be a pacifist and still disbelieve in government. Despite Jack Robinson's belief that we see 'pacifists under the bed' we have only objected strongly when they have become an organised body under his part-leadership to seize control, at which point he says off-handedly, "we are not necessarily pacifist" or "we are accused of the heinous crime of being pacifists", in a manner calculated to 'pacify'.

We would have the same objection to the 'individualists' if they did the same thing. As it is, they can be left to talk together, proclaiming the virtues of being alone ("I would sooner see a film in an empty cinema...") while calling for bigger and better meetings to discuss isolation. While, however, they are of no account, it should not be thought that they in any way relate to the anarchist movement. Basically, their ideas are Non-Violent Fascism (occasionally ordinary Fascism). That Fascism is now

wearing a bad name because of its Hitlerian associations is beside the point. The 'individualism' preached by this sect is not the anarchist individualism which says that ALL are individuals and can achieve liberation, but the fascist individualism which says that SOME, the elite, are superior to the 'masses'. It is, properly, elitism (since fascism later adopted some socialistic ideas as well).

Take the (at least honest) "Thoughts on Snobbery and Elitism" by Jeff Robinson (Individualist Forum No.2.) The "hallmark of the individualist is his attitude to crowds, mobs, the masses..." A mob is by nature sub-human, he declares (a fascist credo, and the case for the elitist party). With its faults, is it not precisely human? No, he says, "there are individuals among the masses who are personally likeable (but) the fact is I find the masses detestable."

Some of his best friends are 'masses' but on the whole get rid of them.... Yet what is he? An elite person. (This is exactly what the Nazis originally meant by an Uebermensch; the idea that the Master Race was racial came with the spreading of the idea among the masses, who could not be told they were detestable when they were wanted). The masses are 'born with trivial ugly minds'. But his is important and beautiful. (What a disappointment when one meets these beautiful minds!)

It is not the shortcomings of the educational system that are responsible for the triviality and crudeness of the minds of 'the masses'. The teachings at his school, which he devoutly imbibed, 'fell on deaf ears' to the rest: "I have never yet heard of a school that teaches car worship, obsession with gambling, keeping up with the Jones's...(most schools actually preach against these things)." Christians preach against worldliness but you are not expected

CENTRE POINT

to take such sermons seriously. This is an old cry of elitism. But worldly success is measured precisely by the make of your car and the size of your possessions as compared with the Jones's even though you are told it is all nothing but vanity.

How do you qualify to be a member of the mass and how to be one of the elite? Well, a member of the mass is that 'vast section of the population' (vast section? And what of the other large section left - individualistic?) "whom

advertisers bemuse, on whom revolutionaries pin their hopes.. to whose material demands the economy is mainly geared..." Precisely those who work for a living, to whom the economy must be geared, who offer a mass market for some advertisers (others prefer a small, highly selective class of purchaser) are those who can change the material base of society, hence revolutionaries (i.e. those who want to change the material base of society) must base their hopes on them....

And the elite? We are 'frequently physically surrounded by crowds while the masses are always present. But while we are in them we are rarely if ever of them.' This is what we all think - but only the rich achieve it; hence Tory snobbery and elitism, that arises out of prosperity. But this 'individualism' in the dispossessed becomes fascism in that it strives not to alter society nor to achieve liberation for all individuals, but to show how a new elite (by race - or, as the pseudo-Left, even pseudo-anarchist, would say - by brain) can replace the old.

A feature of Tory thinking today is that we should not be "greedy". Tory thinking was based on greed. But those that have, now have enough. You must not be greedy by wanting to earn money by the sweat of your brow any more. But it is perfectly legitimate to want to earn it by sitting on your arse and doing nothing. Wages must be frozen. You must not expect to save anything from them. Prices may rise. But wages may stay put. How, then, make your pile? By having money inherited, buying property and making a killing on the sale of your house.

People who have bought a house for £500, lived in it rent free for 30 years, and retired selling it for £10,000 (only because they had £500 in the first place) write indignant letters to the press against the 'greedy workers' who want more pay. "We are on fixed incomes," they bleat of the interest on their £10,000. "We cannot strike..."

The house racket has grown to the point where soon nobody will be able to afford to live in the cities. Already London is becoming a barren concrete jungle in which it pays to leave the barrack blocks empty rather than fill them with people. The quaint houses that tourists come to see in England are swept away to build hotels and car parks for the tourists. The rent of a flat is three times the average earnings. Lose your home and you are ruined. However much you earn you will remain a bum. If you don't squat you will be separated, broken away from your family.

The skills of the building workers are diverted to huge, useless office blocks of which

in the middle of London, useless, ugly, expensive, it stays empty because it is easier to make a killing by keeping it empty and letting its value increase... from £5 million to £20 million.

That is the way of capitalism, but the Minister of the Environment chooses to make a fuss because it is easier to upset a few people over empty office blocks, and make it look as if he is attacking the scandal, than attack the whole racket. Hundreds of flats stay empty for the same reason, but the Minister will do nothing about them. He talks of vague action against the property tycoon who built Centre Point (and acted quite legally) but the Home Office and Scotland Yard co-operated to prevent the squatters making sense of Centre Point.

The only people who tried to make sense of the housing racket in London were the squatters. They put empty buildings - left empty for profit or for planning motives and intended to be left to fall into disuse - into family occupation. They had to fight the Government, the Law, the Police and the Press. Bailiffs were used against them. They fought back and won. Now some councils, only a few so far, have seen they made sense. A few more years of life in a house left empty for the purpose of destruction may save families from being broken up, and also saves the Council endless expense in the bureaucracy of Family 'Care'. The law was against the people. The profiteers were against the people. The councils stood by. Squatting

made sense, however. The direct action of the people meant more than any amount of do goodism. The councils did not hate it because it was efficient. They hated it because it dispensed with Doing Things for the People. It meant the people Did Things for themselves.

(as at round one)

THE GOVERNMENT versus THE DOCKERS

When the Industrial Relations Court turned its attention to the dockers' shop stewards they found themselves in a spot of difficulty. The trade union leaders caved in immediately they were hit for, like the disciple who went away sorrowing, 'they had great possessions'. But the dockers could not care less about the law. In contempt? They showed it.

The tipstaff of the High Court began to shit himself. Bowler hat and all, he had to walk down to the docks and serve a notice on the shop stewards to inform them they were under arrest. And so - to the Government's dismay - precipitate a strike of all London's docks. Someone had a stroke of genius (mark that guy in the next Honours List for a CBE) - the Solicitor General entered a plea for the men without their knowledge and the arrest was annulled. We were told the S.G. was acting in defence of their rights. Hundreds, indeed thousands, are arrested and slung in jail, by the Courts; they in custody awaiting trial; they await the pleasure of some stupid judge as they 'purge their contempt' but when it came to stopping every dock in London the S.G. was concerned with the human rights of the dockers.

The moral is surely obvious.

: the PAPERBAK C.
FLOODGATES OF ANARCHY is out :

We believe that social revolution can be achieved by the methods of the FIRST OF MAY MOVEMENT - the international movement for WORKERS' COUNCILS NOW, which demands as the first step towards altering the economy the occupation of the places of work by the people who work in them.

In this respect the workers who have occupied the factories such as now at Briant's have shown the way ahead in a much clearer manner than the so-called 'revolutionaries' have been able to do even theoretically.

The seizure of the places of work is not the revolution. But it is the way forward to the economic change that is indispensable for revolution.

FORM FIVES! It is not possible to build a revolutionary movement on the basis of an existing organisation. In order to remain within the laws it has to trim its programme and to concentrate on reforming the laws until it becomes indistinguishable from advanced liberalism. It becomes only a movement of permanent protest which is to say a liberal organisation, not a revolutionary one.

But in every revolutionary situation we need the people who know what it is all about. We do not need anarchist organisation, we need workers' organisation. Workers' organisation needs convinced anarchists who are capable of putting up a struggle and of showing that it is not necessary to subordinate the movement to a political party.

That is why we need groups of anarchists in every trade and industry, who may meet only socially in normal times, but who are capable of working with others for WORKERS'

councils. Whenever any dust-up occurs - and we see now how it is going to happen every time a forced redundancy is made if there are enough militants about - it is always necessary to look round and see who there is to help. A group of only five in an industry - better, five in a factory - is worth 500 powerless people in a political-type organisation that can do nothing but pass resolutions.

HOW DOES ONE COMMUNICATE ?

THE RT REV JOHN ROBINSON asked in The Times, despairingly, how one could communicate through the mass media. (One can't). He gave a lengthy lecture to a "square" group of Methodists on sex in the course of which he pointed out that law could not always control morals, and that one should wean oneself from the "paternalistic assumption" that it should do so. (In future generations such assumptions will appear ludicrous in the extreme).

The press seized on the idea of lowering the age of consent...SEX AT 14 - CALL BY CHURCH LEADER.... and the poor battered army of "Disgusteds" were treated to a story of how a former Bishop apparently advocated sex for 14 year olds.....

FOOTNOTE: On a different level, the press has had a sensational story from the New York Times about a new 'terrorist international' ... it is supposed to come from the CIA, in fact it is a rewrite of the story first appearing in the 'Jewish Chronicle' (see page 9)! The New York Times had just time to get their copy when their 'revelations' appeared.

COMMON OWNERSHIP

OR

WORKERS' CONTROL?

The political missionaries will, no doubt, cease their pilgrimages to the work-in ladies of Fakenham now that the Northamptonshire firm of Scott Bader has offered them financial assistance in starting a firm on the lines of common ownership.

Scott Bader is a common-ownership form producing polyester resins, and amongst its charitable gifts to the village in which it is situated is an unpleasant smell of chemicals which spreads for a quarter of a mile around the factory. The firm was built up as a thriving family business by a Swiss Quaker, Ernest Bader, between 1920 and 1951, during which time he amassed a large personal fortune out of the labours of his workers.

In 1951 his religious guilt caught up with him and he decided to gradually hand over the firm to a common-ownership organisation called the Scott Bader Commonwealth. Bader has now relinquished the controlling interest but still enjoys the authority of the guru, and he has ensured that his son Godric Bader will remain Chairman of the Board of Directors and Managing Director for life.

The firm now has about 400 employees and an annual turnover of over £4 million. Day-to-day management is in the hands of a conventional Board of Directors and policy decisions are "approved" by the Community Council of employees. (Significantly not all workers take advantage of the opportunity of becoming shareholders in this 'utopia') Inevitably some of the top managers with their eyes on expansion find Bader's idealism a drag.

The defects of the set-up ought to be apparent even to liberals! There is certainly no Utopian equality of wages - 25.

the ration of the highest to the lowest is 6 to 1 - and life is certainly more satisfying for the research scientists than the labourers loading drums of chemicals. Obviously a highly advanced technological industry like Scott Bader is involved in, must tend to elitism because there is little scope for the interchange of jobs and work sharing &c. However, the obvious solution of disposing of the chemical plant and starting a more suitable venture does not appear to have occurred to anyone. Or perhaps it did and was seen as a threat to the vested interests of the hierarchy?

The Scott Bader set-up underlines the futility of thinking that workers can change society by becoming 'little capitalist' co-partners in a common-ownership firm. Even if the free relationships between workers we would like to see existed at Scott Bader (and they do not), the experiment would still have little relevance to the struggle for a free society. The vast majority of capitalists are not going to give up their powers to make the decisions. Even if a group of workers manage to establish a common-ownership workshop then they are still enslaved by the market forces of capitalism: it is still necessary to produce what is profitable without regard to the real priorities of social needs.

THERE IS NO LEGAL ROAD TO A FREE SOCIETY AND WORKERS' CONTROL. They can only be achieved by a

revolutionary movement based on anarchist principles which will defy the violence of the State, seize the means of production and use it for the good of all, sharing the stimulating and boring work, the decisions and the products of our labours.

THE RESIGNATION OF MR. MAUDLING

As we go to press we learn of the resignation of Mr. Maudling from the Home Secretaryship. We need not waste any sympathy on the setback to Mr. Maudling's career (if he wants any, he can write to Mr. Dutschke), nor do we (who inaugurated the Maudling Prize for Idiot of the Month in his honour) need to be told he acted unwisely.

BUT ONE ASPECT OF THIS BUSINESS TOUCHES US CLOSELY. Mr. Maudling is not said to have acted with any criminal intent. He is put forward as the victim, but the fact that he is associated with the Poulson interests makes it imperative for him (associated as the Home Secretary is with the Metropolitan Police) to resign in order that he should give no signs of partiality. Public servants have been suspended for the same reason. It seems to do credit to all concerned BUT FOR THE FACT THAT MR. ROBERT CARR WHO COMES IN AS HOME SECRETARY IS IN PRECISELY THE SAME POSITION.

At the moment the 'Angry Brigade' is under investigation by the Metropolitan Police, and Mr. Carr is personally concerned in view of the explosions at his home. Several people are actually at the moment on trial, and one who has been convicted was given 15 years by a judge who concealed his personal interest in the case and acted clearly

26.

against the jury's intention. The judge concerned, Mr. Melford Stevenson, is now regarded with contempt and suspicion amongst a large section of political persuasion. Yet he continues to officiate at trials, just as Mr. Robert Carr is now entitled to use openly, instead of by side-remarks, the force paid by the public to pursue his private quarrels.

Is this, however, not fully in keeping with the character of Carr the Coward?

(ANNOUNCING A NEW AWARD: THE ROBERT CARR PRIZE FOR BRAVERY.... for the trickiest sod of the month).

LETTERS

The sale of your book (Floodgates of Anarchy, in Spanish edition) here made a great impression. It was very well reviewed in the Buenos Aires papers, where Stuart's case has made a big impression.. Even in England, it seems, one can be imprisoned for one's ideas rather than one's actions. The copies are being avidly read by our 'Tupa' friends; as you know there is a strong libertarian section of the Tupamaro movement and it would be stronger still if there were more books on anarchism today: in Spanish, in the main, we have only the not very relevant 'classics'.

- Eg. M. (Montevideo).

Have just read Miguel's book - I salute a courageous militant - right on! - Rcy E. (Bath).

Surely you will agree that the anarchist movement seems split to a disastrous extent... - F.J.J. (London).

(Not at all. What is anarchist is not split. If it splits from what is not anarchist, it is not disastrous. There would be more point to worrying about the extent to which the working class movement is split).