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Angry Young Scots?

Stuart Christie

Dominating the news has been the spate of bombings, arson and personal attacks upon Ministers, Ministries, police and senior civil servants. The motif has obviously been political and is connected with the Industrial Disputes Bill but also, it seems, the whole of Government policy including criticisms of the Spanish fascist regime made by way of force. We may dismiss as fanciful the Machiavellian comfort of the Left ("it's probably the National Front trying to stir it up and make out how wicked we are"). The whole matter seems too widespread for that. The National Front is only a front for the right wing Tories and they do not (like Charles Lamb's Chinaman) burn down their houses to roast pigs to get roast pork. There are simpler ways than that. And how important is the "Angry Brigade" (if it exists)?

Let us take the valuation current in everyday society - hard cash and effort. Many Jewish people feel strongly that the mass murderer Dr Josef Mengele is still alive and well. (continued overleaf)
The Israelis would like to get him as they got Eichmann. A reward is offered of £20,000. To capture this multi-thousand murderer, you must proceed at risk of life, health and liberty over swamp and forest and then try to kidnap him in the teeth of the Paraguayan police.

Half the price as is offered for this unspeakable monster is offered by the Daily Mirror, and few risks are involved. All you have to do is to say that on such-and-such a night you saw Mr. X. put a bomb in Mr. Carr's house at Barnet, and provided your victim fits neatly into New Scotland Yard's category of Dangerous Thoughts Extremist, you can sit back comfortably the rest of your life. Let us hope you do not select from "clues" obligingly planted by criminal reporter John Stevens of the Evening Standard!

COMPARISONS OF VALUE.

Perhaps it sticks in the gullet to commit perjury? Well, for £5,000 you need do no more than perform your common law obligations. This sum will be made by the People to anyone passing on a clue leading to the conviction of any one of half-a-dozen particularly vicious sex crimes probably committed, as is usual in these cases, by supporters of the Tory Party. (In the event of conviction, political affiliation will be concealed. It might prejudice the jury to know the accused were self-confessed Conservatives).

THE ANGRY BRIGADE

This tells us that the outrages of the "Angry Brigade" are regarded seriously, and members of parliament are getting worried. The press does not ask the real issue: how is it that people can feel so strongly about issues that affect them, like the Industrial Relations Bill, that they can risk life and liberty? But the M.P.s ask each other anxiously — if they can do that over the Industrial Relations Bill, what would "they" do over a plan to send them to concentration camps? They shout confidently about the possibility of a Right Wing backlash. But privately they are terrified little men. Sir Peter Rawlinson, for instance, the Attorney General, made the press conceal the attack on his home. Had the perpetrator been found before the "Angries" revealed the fact themselves, would he have prosecuted not declaring his interest in the case? This is what Heath's boys are reduced to. ("Sorry, I didn't want to frighten my children.")

(Continued on page 5.)
THE CARR BOMBINGS: ANGRY YOUNG SCOTS (From page 4).

The government announced it was going to take a tough line. It would have "no nonsense". It was going to tackle unofficial strikers. The Yachtsman spoke glibly of Civil War. Like public school bullies, they come back crying at the first bloody nose... "Tisn't fair! We're prefects!" The minister for employment made a great thing of attacks on power workers during their strike. Some were beaten up or their car tyres or house windows were slashed; their wives were refused service in shops (some shopkeepers have since seen a great light, following a boycott) or their children sent home crying from school... Serves them right, suggested the Minister. Now they know where public opinion lies. So do you now, said someone anonymous.

The Eunuch cries for Rivers of Blood. Pakistani homes are blown up in London. The Right Wing makes it clear how they intend to divide the workers, to prepare for civil war, by racial conflict. Is it so very surprising someone has "introduced violence into British politics", as the Tory M.P.s say - for as it never affected them before, they do not know it existed before. Did they ever have to get the kids to bed while Mosley was holding a demo outside the East End tenement windows? As nobody ever marched to Mosley's country home, they assume that violence never existed - well, of course, not so far as "WE" are concerned....

DOLS THE "ANGRY AND YET for all this I am sceptical as BRIGADE" EXIST? yet to whether the Angry Brigade, so-called, exists. The police have told so many lies and made so many evasions it is impossible in this case to rely on any single piece of evidence.

The Establishment can tolerate an Underground that is as devious as the Bakerloo Line. What it dreads is that working-class youth with concern about industrial relations, international affairs, working class solidarity and so on, should adopt the type of urban guerrilla tactics seen in this sort of thing. It can face the duchess's daughter taking up with the hippies and going off to Katmandhu chanting Non Violent Revolution - or even violent if it comes to that - it looks with dismay at the casting off of bourgeois values by those who can stand up and fight for their interests one minute and go back to delivering (or not delivering) the post the next. (Continued...
They can bear to think of strikes, especially when it happens to hit a competitor. The ruling class can even bear to think of the police battling with demonstrators. As a famous Tory Duke once told his tenants in far-off Ireland: "You little think to know my temper if you think I will mitigate my just demands in rent by your shooting my bailiff". But the "Angry Brigade" have made it all just a little more personal.

Yet, I repeat, IS there such a thing? Or are we really facing a new trend, a development of young working class thought? The police of the day confronted with the Luddites, thought it was necessary to find a "leader" and they sought for Capt. Ludd. Once again, reports suggest they seek a "leader".... and (as someone is said to have found a farm labourer called Ned Ludd, who got the blame for the Luddites) one crooked journalist "discovered" a certain angry young Scot... but perhaps are all angry young Scots....? Those who worked out neatly that if a certain young Scot did so-and-so, and this is in line with that, then all we have to do is offer a reward for proving it, have slipped up. The fact is that he was not a leader but he might have been a prototype? What was unheard of in 1964 may be very much the fashion in 1972 if we move remorselessly forward to "1984".

Anyone in public life can make the news which otherwise they might lack by phoning the police and saying they received a kidnap threat by post. Even the clown Nabarro claimed someone wanted to kidnap his daughter (reaction of police was said to be "What for?"). We can hardly judge the motives and actions of the present direct actionists by what anyone can write or phone on their behalf. It is only reasonable to judge on what is apparently happening. The Establishment seems prepared to be tough, and at the same time it is shitting itself. If this is what is happening as a result of the 'aggro' going in the right direction for a change, we will not be so hypocritical as to condemn it.

We should not make the mistake of emulating the violence of the "Angry Brigade", if such a thing exists, or the many intelligent young people impelled into action. But one must respect their integrity. They are translating our "fantasies" into reality.
THE MAUDLING PRIZE

Hot competition this month for the coveted Maudling Prize of IDIC *OF THE MONTH. Always a firm favourite, the Daily Sketch leader writer made a good bid by consistent anti-industrial-action articles, while supporting all such action to keep the paper going against the wishes of the management: writing himself out of the only job such a moron could get. He was ruled out only by a strict application of the rules (idiots, not cretins).

Angus Maude always a hot favourite (though his belief that terrorists are people who try to terrorise ministers out of their jobs - and the pseudo-intellectual conclusion that surely one knows someone else will take their place - was echoed elsewhere). Good try though in saying that the Rudi Dutschke affair infringed no British rights or civil liberty. Dutschke is a German, you see... If you banned Marx, or Hitler, from the library shelves, that is no concern of ours ... it would be different if you banned, say, Angus Maude.

Daily Mirror journalists made a good bid, venturing down Angel Alley (the name has a fascination for the Mirror) and interviewing, among others considered the dangerous men of Britain, a "bearded anarchist in a flowing cape" identified as "Sebastian Scragg, a university lecturer". He was duly enshrined with Bert Ramelson, Tariq Ali, Gerry Healey and all that grim crew, as the universities searched what was left of their confidential files... But under those Moss Bros false whiskers was our old and trusty friend Cedric Fauntleroy. Poor Mirror - it tries.

Award of one Green Shield stamp (no gum) goes this month to Sir Fred Hayday, member of TUC General Council and former chairman of the TUC who told the Sunday Express that "every kind of anarchist and group of professional rowdies will be making plans to get in on" the old carthorse's demonstration. If so, why have it? How many kinds of anarchist and professional rowdies does he think there are? Leave alone the anarchists (as he well intends to do) what for Christ's sake are "professional rowdies"? "We are as opposed to these groups as is the rest of the public," (Continued on page 12).
ANY GOOD CHINESE MARXIST will tell you that Anarchism no longer exists in the Empire of Mao Tse Tung. For good measure he will tell you the date it ceased to exist: January 27th 1947. (The time, I believe, was 11.30 a.m.) In case this reminds you of the English bishop who worked out the date of the Creation, let me explain. A congress had been called by the Chinese anarchists, but less than 43 persons were able to attend. These included 14 hitherto unknown people. In that year, travel was impossible. Those who came were surrounded by police, some of whom voted for the dissolution of the movement, proposed by one of the "newcomers". The congress declared the "irrevocable" dissolution of the anarchist movement.

For this reason you will learn that there are no longer any anarchists. Indeed, it was possible to hold in a certain court, to the consternation of many party members, that the offence of "anarchism" no longer existed, and had been an impossible fact (like witchcraft), at any rate since 1947, as the party textbooks were there to affirm.

Those who may like to believe that Chinese anarchism survived the "congress" will be interested in a reference made en passant in a school history book, referring to the survival of the Jews in the rising Christian world after the decline of the Roman Empire. "They remained together, often huddled in the same streets or in occupations where they would recognise each other, however sordid. Eclipsed by the new religion which had adapted itself to the age, they remained firmly convinced of their discredited tenets, and their scoffing and derision of the new era enraged the public. But they could not hide their hatred of the new world, nor did it bother to disdain its contempt. In all
this they resembled nothing so much as those anarchist
groups in our modern republic, faced with the glorious
triumph of their hated rival."

How far this has any historical truth so far as the
Jews of Europe are concerned is irrelevant, though the
picture of Maoism as the persecuting Church is apt enough.
If the Jews were scoffers, were they not right to be so?
Was their hatred entirely unreasonable? No matter. What
interests us is how this picture contrasts with that of the
later reader which tells us that there are NO anarchist
groups in our modern republic, and the conclusions drawn by
the Press and all good Marxists that what does, therefore,
exist are bandits and C.I.A. agents operating as anarchists
in disguise.

If I were an American spy I would find a better disguise
than something which did not exist... The only American I
met for the last thirty years I do not think was a C.I.A.
agent. He was a Chicago G.I. who had deserted from the
Korean war. (If "Joe the Tailor" reads this, let the editor
know what happened to him... he is still remembered by his
anarchist friends whose children are still addicts of
the cacophonous music he taught them. He was one of many
we helped on his way home, out of solidarity not out of any
regard for Imperialism, and he was the last person to be
called an Imperialist).

The strength of anarchism in
this country never lay in its
massive organisation, but in
the appeal it made to so many
who were able to influence the
surroundings in which they
lived and worked. Our intell-
lectual understanding of
anarchism did come from the
groups, but in the many guilds which made up the working-
men's movement we found our real strength. Still today
many regard themselves as anarchists solely by virtue of
their activity within the factories fighting for a greater
degree of control by the workers themselves, and not by
the so-called elected representatives who are merely
faithful servants of the State.

We also had many supporters of great mental ability
(Continued overleaf)
including some of the nation's great scholars. Many could not survive in present times and have either perished from want or made compromises. Only a very few have maintained their independence living upon the workers who are sympathetic to them and supply them with their wants.

In fact, when Herbert Read visited China, I myself made a point of visiting him. It was strange that he was on some official Government mission. (Actually, British or Arts Council or something like that — Ed.) He helped make a demarche to the authorities stating that certain comrades, professors and scholars, were being treated so badly that it caused a great scandal in England. I am sure this representation by a famous foreign scholar made an impression on the authorities, and this considerably alleviated their condition. Although I understand there were many criticisms of Read in England (for accepting a knighthood &c. Ed.) he behaved to us in a most comradely way. After using an interpreter we selected, his perhaps favourable attitude to Chinese communism changed rapidly.

In the larger cities our groups are still active, and you will find that the anarchists represent that trend among the workers which wants to take over control of the factories and workshops. The younger generation which has not our tradition of secrecy and conspiracy, imposed upon us by years of despotism, thinks that it can openly defy the dictatorship, and of course in its own logic it is right, for against open defiance the State is powerless. It can suppress the individual but not the idea. Amongst the Koreans, where anarchism was always strong, we have many groups and as these are a displaced people, they carry the idea everywhere. Many peasants will tell you, in criticism of the anarchists, that they lost "because they should have assumed the dictatorship, and they were the only ones we trusted, because they did not want power". I am told by my Spanish correspondent that this is sometimes heard in Spain, too. But had we assumed dictatorship I do not think to flatter ourselves we should have been better. And it is only in North China where the anarchists can be said to have "lost" in the military sense of having (Continued on page12)
CHRISTMAS DAY
IN SEGOVIA
(from information smuggled out of the prison).

It is Christmas Eve. The guards call out the prisoners to line up for Mass. The officers and warders are more bitter and sullen than ever, for there has been a major blow to their prestige. For months they had gleefully told the politicos how those bastards at Burgos would be strangled by the garrotte... now international publicity, (or was it some adroit tactics by way of kidnapping?) had frustrated them.

How could they enjoy Mass in the right spirit? The blood of Manzanares (the police chief who specialised in torture) was unavenged, "and he had done no more than the rest of us". They pushed the prisoners along.

Then one veteran of the jails, an anarchist, came forward with yet another of his insufferable demands. He wanted a communal dinner on Christmas Day!

It should be understood that the politicos are not only separated from other prisoners, who have greater privileges, but in that jail they are - for security reasons - divided into three groups according to the degree of surveillance deemed necessary. Some have become enfeebled by years of incarceration and constant struggle, some are still young and active... On Christmas Day, demanded our comrade, let us eat together.

Unheard of insolence! It was the famous scene from Oliver Twist! Our friend quoted the rules ranging from the prison handbook issued in the 'eighties to the declarations of the chaplain... Meanwhile the prisoners rushed forward, demanding to meet old friends again. They could not hope to be with their relatives for Christmas... but over the grille were their comrades... they pushed and fought, socialists, anarchists, trade unionists, ETA...... they forced down the barriers and sent the guards flying. The officers came rushing to their rescue. But they had some inhibition at opening fire just before Christmas Day (they may even have thought there was a religious objection and they could have been charged with sacrilege). So

(Continued overleaf)
they pushed and jostled the embracing prisoners, and finally managed to tear their apart and get them back to their cells.

No matter. They had achieved FRATERNISATION. Between friends, it is true. Yet it recalled that famous fraternisation between 'enemies' of 1914 - English and German soldiers. Hit by rifles and canes, they were dragged from each other's arms, singing and shouting slogans.... this was midnight Mass in Segovia.

Sixteen of the prisoners (CNT and ETA) were singled out for punishment by solitary confinement.

The museum director at the MDGMAUDLIN@PRIZE says Sir Fred. But he has come up via unions where the anarchists are not unknown - the shop assistants happened to have been built up by one John Turner, who was also at one time editor of "Freedom" (around 1931). It is the professional rowdies that won Sir Fred the prize, though, over stiff competition - it's a way to make a living, but how?

ANARCHISM IN CHINA  
(Continued from P.10 )

been outgunned and out-soldiered, against every Army, Red, National and Japanese. In one of Pa Chin's novels, the hero says bitterly, "Lucky Makhno! He only had two armies to fight! The CNT must win in Spain for it only faces one!"

End.

SMALL ADS
Free service...send in yours (present lot are ours).


PORTOBELLO ROAD, West London. Watch for our stall on Saturdays. Help appreciated.

PERENNIAL REQUEST for accommodation in London. Any help?
IMMEDIATE STEPS

The hardest thing to achieve about any libertarian revolution is the libertarian revolutionary movement itself. It is easy to pretend it exists; more difficult to get it.

Faced with an irresistible demand the State can now respond only with a degree of force that does, in fact, sweep countless thousands into the revolutionary movement who otherwise would remain apathetic. But it does not have to wait until the demand becomes irresistible. It can use force or it can use persuasion... or both.

The would-be libertarian is faced with many roads to choose - even rejecting the authoritarian path, he may become a reformist, a quietist, a militant liberal and still delude himself he is a revolutionary. He is confused even without the hammer blows of the State or the seductive demands of whore capitalism.

Anarchist Movement? Is there an anarchist movement? It is true there is the impression of one, so much so that some anarchist papers will address their articles to "the anarchists" (the anarchists must learn to organise... the anarchists should be interested in..... it is time the anarchists most anarchists.... few anarchists....). Some who come from authoritarian parties go on to criticise their 'leadership' in the anarchist movement for a long time until they find it non-existent.

What there is of an anarchist movement in this country has been subjected to the same strains and stresses as any political movement. It has retreated into its own limited circles - friendships made in propagandist activity replacing the pattern of neighbour-family life, perhaps - and its own byways of jargon and inertia.

ACTION We are concerned here not with those who have retreated but those who remain ready for action. At present one demand unites all those who claim to be both libertarian and revolutionary - whether they accept the label 'anarchist' or not - whether they have their own word for their own philosophy or not. That is the policy of WORKERS' COUNCILS. Look throughout the so-called Left and this one
issue is the yardstick of their revolutionary libertarianism. All the good causes and package deal liberalism, let alone the nationalist rubbish, can be dismissed like chaff. On this issue they are either FOR or AGAINST, though they might like to hedge if 'against'.

The reformist does not want any power out of the hands of the State. He wants to 'do good' not have good done by others! The liberal is concerned with the degree of freedom that exists within the State and the encroachment by the executive power upon that freedom. This can be a major issue on which we must all some time do battle, but it is not everything. Liberalism is concerned with freedom regardless of the class of the individual. Thus political liberalism will defend the right of rich and poor to dine at the Ritz Hotel... and in terms of the 'modern protest' movement, the true heir of liberalism whose name it rejects because of the failure of the parliamentarian liberals, it defends that right 'regardless of race, creed or colour'. The distinction of class is (hypocritically) said to be non-existent.

"Liberalism is a good breakfast but a poor supper".... From the militant liberal there will be every demand for protest - no demand for workers' councils.

THE LEFT Many on the Left REACTION will be as authoritarian as those on the right. They may be revolutionary, indeed, and scorn liberalism (except where it pays off on support, or where it allies itself to the revived corpse of nationalism) but they want a Party to form a State. Workers' control, yes - "through us"...councils, yes, subordinate to the Party, the "cadres" (intellectual leadership)... workers' control under State power.

The quietist (a strange new trend in pseudo-libertarianism, which consists of negatively opposing the STATE as an abstraction but in practice denying all action other than 'personal liberation', i.e. opting out of the rat race) has no use for 'workers' councils since there is no desire for change of the economic basis of society. Some quietists will go so far as to assume that so long as they can imagine the State is not there, it does not exist.

OUR TASK Having said all this, there does exist a large minority opinion ranging from Anarchists to some who consider themselves Marxists though not of the 'orthodox' variety, who are with us for (continued on page 15.)
WORKERS' COUNCILS. WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

We propose — and already we have some unofficial support for these proposals among workers of varying shades of libertarian revolutionary opinion:

a CAMPAIGN FOR WORKERS' COUNCILS.

Regardless of sectarian identity (which members are entitled to keep, though preferably apart from the Campaign itself — as such) we call for a united campaign for the establishment of a movement on syndicalist or council-communist lines.

The first groupings to be in groups of five people in identical trades. These would be 'primaries' which as they grew (five is selected arbitrarily as the lowest number) would issue their own bulletins for their own trade.

When they are able to get five people in the same factory or workshop, they should form "secondaries" to take the propaganda one stage further to the place of work. The "secondary" would not, of course, be a workers' council in the true sense. It would be part of a campaign FOR the council, on which all the workers would be represented. The secondary could nevertheless act as a focal point for unofficial action.

Is it rare to have as many as five in one place of work? How do you know? And why not plan to go to work somewhere where you can carry your revolutionary activity one stage further than talking about it? Nowadays there is no need to be frightened of the boss — he is frightened of you!

There is nothing new in this plan. It is the basic feature of ALL the revolutionary libertarian movements. In its bare essentials it could be the 'origins' of the CNT in Spain, the free soviets of Russia prior to Lenin, the council-communist movement of Germany, the I.W.W. .... the same bones are there. As it puts on flesh it may differ.

SO DON'T LEAVE IT THERE. GET THE CAMPAIGN GOING. LET'S HAVE SOME GET-TOGETHERS OVER IT.

A campaign like this can get going like a prairie fire once it's started.

Cartoon on Page 16 — by Arthur Moyse — reproduced from the busman's paper TARGET.
"FOR GOD'S SAKE, CALL OUT THE MILITARY, THE WORKERS ARE ATTACKING US!"
CARR BOMBINGS

IF A REVOLUTIONARY OUTRAGE occurred under the late - and un lamented - Abdul Hamid II, Abdul the Damned, there followed a routine massacre of the Armenians. This re-asserted the power of the State and cast fear in the minds of its opponents, which is all that could be reasonably expected. The Sultan was, it is said, fascinated when he was introduced to the works of Conan Doyle. Sherlock Holmes, it seems, actually tried to find out — for some inscrutable Frankish reason — the actual identities.

Will somebody please wake up Ferguson Smith the Damned and tell him to take his Bashi-Bazouks off the not inconsiderable minority who dissent from Establishment politics? Once the Carr affair was made known, all spokesman (except for one who was on out of his sleep and said he thought it was a Tory plot) declared it had nothing to do with the Government, the Opposition, the Bill, the Trade Unions, the opponents of the Bill, the workpeople, the British people... it must have been foreigners, French Canadians, Turamaros, Palestine Arabs, Cypriots, Rudi Dutschke and finally Stuart Christie who proved to be the only native of these islands not covered by parliamentary privilege.

The Special Branch then raided everyone at sight on the left, in default of any Armenians to massacre. Increased from 90 to 150 when Harold felt the winds of unpopularity, the political squad now proved to have 300 in London alone. After a week or two, during which the press faithfully reported that the Yard was raiding "known political agitators", "left wing extremists" and so on, it was announced they would turn to more orthodox methods, as introduced into this country about 150 years ago... they would actually try to find who did the job.

May I ask, as a law-abiding citizen of mature years, how I can find out what degree of political thought is permitted by the Yard? Under what law do they presume to say "you are suspected because of your views?"

Are agitators illegal? Well, what is Enoch with his "rivers of blood" speech? Is political activity, for which Dutschke is banned, open to British citizens?
How far "left" does one have to go before one becomes an "extremist"? Have the major political parties the right to decide — and if so, is the upkeep of Special Branch charged to their political funds? (No, the taxpayer). Under what law are the anarchists subject to having fierce dogs taken into their house, for no other reason than their beliefs, when Ulster Unionist M.Ps and the Monday Club are above suspicion?

Look out, you complacent members of parliament, who give these powers into the hands of the police. Sir John Falstaff Waldron may be a coward (and hide the fact of his own house being hit when he would tell the world if it were somebody else's) but this does not mean he has not political ambitions. If Scotland Yard is to decide without reference to law who are "politically undesirable" the Police can take over just as easily as, in other countries, the Army has done.

WHEN THE POLICE FORCE WAS FORMED, IT WAS JUST THIS CONTINGENCY THAT WAS FEARED BY ALL RADICALS, AND IT WAS THE VERY REASON PEEL'S BILL WAS RESISTED. The Bill was only got through by not making the national police, or the City police — only the London police — subject to the Home Secretary. That safety is vanishing fast.

NOTE TO THE B.B.C. When political time is allocated only the major political parties are considered. It took 300 police three weeks to get through a tiny section of the Anarchists, Maoists, IS, some Trots and a few "Underground" for good luck ("we haven't a warrant but if you like we'll come in on drugs instead"). How long would it take five police to go through the Labour and Tory parties in London, searching all their activists, homes and offices? Two days?

WHO IS THE SILENT MAJORITY?

EZRA BRETT MELL

All government corresponds in a certain degree to what the Greeks denominated a tyranny. The difference is that in despotic countries mind is depressed by a uniform usurpation; while in republics it preserves a greater part of its activity and the usurpation more easily conforms itself to the fluctuations of opinion.

William Godwin.
OURS E L S E S

We are endeavouring to organise a little better than heretofore and readers interested are invited to get hold of our "Black Flag Statement" (now actually ready) on anarchist organisation.

We are also preparing a series of leaflets on matters affecting our immediate organisation; the first being on the rights of colportage (i.e. selling in the streets of dissenting literature).

We are endeavouring to transform the Bulletin of the Anarchist Black Cross into a journal of international revolutionary anarchism. The Black Cross will continue its specific function and the Black Flag Group will shortly hold its first general conference.

This journal is still in the transitional stage but we hope to improve.

MISPRINTS IN LAST ISSUE. A peculiar boob was that the article on "POLITICAL OFFENDERS IN ENGLAND" received the strange title of "Rise & Fall of the Press" while the article on THE PRESS had no heading at all. Other than that we seem to have behaved ourselves.

IN THIS ISSUE we conclude the survey of anarchism in China and continue the examination of the anarcho-syndicalist movement (which will go on for some time). The series on Trotskyism concludes next month. Then we shall deal with the mysterious Parvus-Helphand.

COPIES: We lost most of our readers with the postal strike but the indefatigable Gerry Bree stepped in and sold so many on the streets we are nearly out of Vol.2. No.1. But we have kept some copies back for old readers.

Hope to send No.1. with No.2 when strike is over and to get in some subs which will keep is afloat. (Previous sales of Bulletin: 250. We must push this to 1,000. Then we can think about fortnightly issues).

Collectors: We can't keep back numbers very long. We have a few of No.1; but Vol.1 as such is unobtainable. In next issue we shall list what we do have of Vol.1 and of Cuddon's for you strange people.

SUBSCRIPTION:
15/- per annum for twelve issues.

Giro account:
Anarchist Black Cross
51 172 0009
HEAVY BREATHING

Most of it this month done down our neck over the Carr affair. Ross Flett visited by the heavy squad just after - purely a coincidence I assure you, Hon.Member - he had been one of the shop stewards to sign the works petition against police interference with the gas conversion fitters owing to having Stuart Christie work there.

Great eagerness among the Pigs... the famous gelignite smelling dog, as shown in all leading newspapers, was quick to take up the scent... alas, Ross's bitch was on heat and all the dog was interested in was the same as the rest of us.

Raises a difficult problem for many of us canine lovers who, as is undoubtedly our right, keep a few aniseed buns around the house for our doggy friends, as we like them sloppy and loving. You are warned to keep such buns away from police dogs that may come in your house. Dogs love them. They slush all over for them. But it ruins them for police work.

Please therefore see to it that none of these are in sniffing range when you have unwelcome visitors - unless it is, of course, a bunch of crooks with forged warrants.

Surprising the solidarity that came out at this time. It had been announced that a certain person had actually taken certain action against the Industrial Relations Bill and the police were looking for him. His colleague on the Black Cross was overwhelmed with phone calls offering to put up you-know-who. Reaction of ordinary non-political workers? Elderly comp. - not known to him - comes and sits beside him in the canteen.

"I haven't been active since the General Strike... reckon I'm respectable. My boy just got married - in church, too." (Leans over confidentially). "The room's free if your mate R.A happens to be on the trot..." This reaction was typical. But how about the Vanguard, the Cadres of the Left, all the politico shit? "My God, I thought I'd got halitosis.... how they scattered, the fash rads, the new party mob, even the gallant libs... Nothing to do with us and take him away for a start!" said a friend.

Well, you find out where everyone stands some time or other. As a certain detective sergeant told one comrade: "This is getting the anarchists a bad name".
The Rise & Fall of Trotskyism.
(Last issue: The rise).

PERMANENT REJECTION

The Russian Revolution was carried out by workers' soviets (councils), and the idea of council communism spread rapidly, particularly in those countries which had no mass libertarian workers' movement previously. Lenin did his best to incorporate council-communism into the Communist Parties and then subordinate it. Inside Russia, it became illegal. But it remained a force in Germany, in particular. Because it was crushed by the Right, its traditions were — though non-Bolshevik, not demonstrably anti-Bolshevik. When Trotsky, therefore, was pushed out of power by the more able Stalin, and found himself deserted by his followers, he tried to put himself at the head of revolutionaries who were not, at least, Stalinists.

This was the meaning of the 'Fourth International' slogan, which before Trotsky appropriated it, had been that of the anti-parliamentarian communists. But Trotsky did not capture the movement. Instead, he helped deliver the deathblow to it. It had the added stigma of being called 'Trotskyist' which it was not. Trotsky himself, having taken its slogan, went on to denounce it, in the name of Marxism.

Meanwhile his struggle with Stalin went on. The wily Georgian bank robber knew how to bludgeon his way to power and keep it. He was goaded by the barbs of the sophisticated Trotsky like a bull at the corrida, and it may be that only these taunts kept him from going farther on his reactionary course. It is by no means impossible that he may have played with the idea of crowning himself, similar to General Bonaparte.

Trotsky, and his followers — for though he lost out on the German workers, he soon picked up an intellectual following (due to Max Eastman, founder of the cult) — attacked the policy of the Kremlin in China. There, the C.P. supported the Nationalists and sacrificed the Communists, hoping to build up an ally against Great Britain. The policy went sadly wrong. Attacking the whole mentality of this line, Trotsky appropriated the famous phrase of Helpand "Permanent Revolution". But in the rest of the world, the Trotskyists
followed a line of Permanent Rejection. The "Fourth International" was not after all to be a party in its own right but a cuckoo in everyone's nest. By becoming a sort of permanent protest group within the C.P. in some countries, or the Labour movement in others, it justified those movements in leftish terms. It reconciled the militant, outraged at C.P. tyranny or social-democratic treason, to "remaining within".

In England it became a well known cycle that a worker might go from industrial militancy to the I.L.P., then into the Labour Party as the ILP declined, then by further militancy into the Communist Party and out of the Labour Party, and by sheer disgust out of the C.P. into the Trots... and thus back to the Labour Party from which he left in disgust, either to plain "industrial militancy" or - if he were that way inclined, and there were a few - into the Tories.

Basing itself on an entirely wrong estimate of the Labour Party, Trotskyism here helped to justify it; while it preserved, so far as Russia was concerned, an artificial distinction between the State and the Civil Service. The Soviet State - it said, and many were deceived - was good of itself; what was wrong was "the bureaucracy". Only remove the bureaucracy (which the worker outside Russia could not do) and all would be well... but all was not well, and all whom Trotsky influenced urged support of something of which they were the most bitter calumniators.

When a Trotskyist party became militant, and strong enough to be independent, it was excommunicated from the canon. The POUM in Spain was the first to go. Subsequently Trotsky denounced it for entering the Spanish Government though in fact several parties subsequently followed suit. The Ceylon Trotskyists actually helped form part of the bourgeois Government, and in Algeria their role was to say the least ambiguous. Such a permanent rejection meant that Trotsky's name was kept alive as a Pretender to the throne of the Kremlin. But it was ruinous for the workers, and the left in particular. But this permanent rejection in the 30's and 40's made Trotskyism a contender for the New Left when it arose after the total discrediting of Stalinism. And moreover, not only had Trotskyism an appeal for the new style fash rats - it had ground roots in one particular country, where it got its chance - and failed.

Of that, next month.... A. Meltzer.
RUSSIAN TEACHER: We have a new pupil today - little Boris from our great republic of the Ukraine. Now Boris - show your culture - who wrote "The Brothers Karamazov"?

BORIS: I don't know - some Russian.

TEACHER: You fool, you clot, you peasant ... 'some Russian'! I give you another chance - who wrote "The Queen of Hearts"?

BORIS: It wasn't a peasant, anyway - he'd be too busy digging.

TEACHER: (sarcastically) You are right, he would be too busy digging - you peasant, you barbarian, you Makhnowista. Who...I give you another chance...wrote "Anna Karenina"?

BORIS: I don't know - it wasn't me.

TEACHER: You are right, you swine! And here you are with cultured Russian Communist youngsters, members of the Comsomsol, their fathers in the Party - one even in the GPU .... WHO WROTE "STATE AND REVOLUTION"?

BORIS: I did! I admit it! I also wrote "Dr Zhivago".

From: "HARD CORE NEWS" (Texas Anarchists)
A PLEA FOR CAPTAIN JOHN BROWN
(who endeavoured to instigate a negro slave revolt by individual action without mass support)
"Serve him right". "A dangerous man". "He is undoubtedly insane". So they proceed to live their sane, and wise, and altogether admirable lives, reading their Plutarch a little, but chiefly pausing at the feet of Putnam who was let down into a wolf's den; and in this wise they nourish themselves for brave and patriotic deeds some time or other....

We dream of foreign countries of other times and races of men, placing them at a distance in history or space; but let some significant event like the present occur in our midst, and we discover, often, this distance and this strangeness between us and our nearest neighbours. They are our Austria's, and Chinas, and South Sea Islands....

David Thoreau (1859)

(Or should he rather have said with "anarchist"-quietist M.C. 'Freedom' 1971: "it is merely a demonstration that somebody, somewhere, has stronger feelings on the subject or a larger portion of hate in his make-up than other people")

HELP WANTED

We have an overwhelming need for TRANSLATORS from and into all languages.... especially Spanish, French and Italian.

Much valuable material waiting to be put into English - which could be done as language practice by any advanced languages student.

VOLUNTEERS PLEASE!

Typing help wanted in London; anyone wanting to help distribute please note we now have a team; and HOW ABOUT SOME OF YOU BASHFUL ARTISTS? (Sit down Arthur, you're not bashful).

THE ORIGINS OF THE MOVEMENT FOR WORKERS COUNCILS IN GERMANY

THE ORIGINS OF THE ANARCHIST MOVEMENT IN CHINA

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BONNOT GANG

1649 - DIGGERS & LEVELLERS

SURREALISM & REVOLUTION

(now trying to convert into decimals)

NEXT PUBLICATION: UNAMUNO'S LAST LECTURE ready end February.

To follow: Modern Science & Anarchism, Peter Kropotkin.

"SIMIAN"

(son & heir to Coptic Press)
THE GREAT DECIMAL REVOLUTION is on us ... and while it makes no changes in the nature of capitalist society, it may perhaps shake the popular belief in the Divine Right of Money.... "where will the money come from?" ... it comes from the Mint and the print and if it is "short" this is not a divine calamity, it is an act planned by the State.

"If you print too much you will have inflation... look at Germany in the 20s" they chant parrot-like, as if the great calamity in Germany was having to carry around suitcases of the stuff. In fact, this inconvenience was soon overcome by overprinting the word MILLION on the mark notes. What caused the inconvenience by way of unemployment and so on was occupation and forced reparations, not the mere quantity of money needed to make up a mark.

We give up EVERYTHING to the State. In return, it calculates our "value", or more often, our power, or our relationship to those who do the calculating, and hands us back this worthless paper. If the State defaults on its bargain, or is defeated, the paper may be used to good purpose in the toilet.

Money is the currency of the State. Devalue it, and its currency is devalued. Nobody could be forced to give up the money system for once a State has lost confidence, its money system has gone automatically. Nobody was ever forced to refuse dealing in the million-mark currency of the Weimar Republic once the Nazis came in. Only a lunatic, or a collector, or a fanatically sanguine republican, would touch it any more.

Money is only the token of our slavery. It is our check-out slave pass from capitalism. Let us hope that mucking about with the symbol may shake some of the popular confidence in its magic.

The Common Market. Meanwhile, all forms of making the money system fairer or more flexible exist. But they all depend on the worship of the symbol itself. There is a Money Ethic by which all reformers work. If there is unemployment, they suggest utterly useless toil—since "good money" can hardly be given for nothing — and taxation systems go on until they make so loss they must be
revised. Free Trade and the free market is one of these constant myths, and it is this which receives fresh impetus by the discussion on the Common Market.

One cannot deny certain benefits from entering the Common Market. As opponents of nationalism, we want to see boundaries disappear. And this is in the modern trend, for the people of today hate boundaries which are the fences of the "nation" — in reality the State. Any traces of nationalism are in defence of regional differences which have little to do with the State.

Most discussion of the Common Market is on the question of prices — but the solid economic fact of capitalism remains that even if London and Charleroi are both in the Common Market, it will be dearer to live in London than in Charleroi — or Bath, for that matter — because there is a bigger demand.

On the positive aspects of the Common Market one is up against a problem like Women's Suffrage. Of course it was a progressive demand. One could not oppose it... but one knew it would not bring about anything positive if one was around at the time — and where it is still an issue (Spain, for instance) it is seen even more clearly as good but irrelevant to the actual situation — for Men's Suffrage counts for little.

DUTSCHKE But for its marginal benefits — well, one supposes that even for offshore operator funny-money Home Secretary Maudling it would be hard to expel anyone merely for doing what they are doing themselves... engaging in political activity.

SQUATTING

The People pledged itself "to crusade fearlessly" (laughter) on behalf of anyone whom readers reported were being neglected by the authorities. Was the local authority failing to carry out its duty? Tell us.... ah, yes, Mr and Mrs Fisher, crawling around on all fours because they are refused a larger flat and their wheelchairs wouldn't go through the door. That would make a nice article.... but it was due to the scruffy squatters finding out the case that it became a scandal, and only their direct action in a token seizure of what would have been alternative accommodation brought the cases to public notice.

One day when squatting becomes something in the historic past, how many will claim the glory? But where are they now? j. l.
Miguel García García has been visiting Universities with the film "To Die in Madrid". A non-partisan Spanish committee in defence of political prisoners organised the tour. This was not so dramatic as his tour of Germany and Italy, but the postal strike prevented us notifying comrades. How we miss the postman like everyone else!

As a prisoner for twenty years, Miguel spoke with conviction of the Spanish repression, both in regard to prisons and outside. He visited Cardiff twice, Bristol Poly, Swansea, Southampton, Bristol Spanish Society and Birmingham University; also spoke on Welsh TV.

Pity many of our supporters missed this and many anarchist students may have thought that the film - going around under the auspices of Soc Soc - might be another Maoist night out. Agreeable surprise to some few who came to meet a CNT veteran of the actual battlefield and jails. It was, however, a good thing that Miguel spoke to so many of the 'unconverted' - though, despite temptations, he stuck to the question of Political Repression and avoided putting the anarchist case. We shall reserve that for our own film tour (now planned)..........

Stuart mentioned in the course of his interview with the Evening News (EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH CHRISTIE the specially printed bills proclaimed... look at the value of this journal, where you can get 'em all the time) that he was not really a political activist any longer, and this was only a "charitable organisation". Theye DID put it in inverted commas but how do you convey a mickey-taking look? Those who took the remark at its face value tended to say you had to hand it to him for bloody impudence.....

NOTE: We are preparing a new list of prisoners in Spanish jails. Please ignore our circular sent out to a few comrades only. We find one obstacle after another placed in our way by the jail authorities, especially since the Burgos Trial which has made them particularly nasty. Those who want to send money and aid to prisoners, please wait and get a new address. Prisoners MUST get aid from outside, relatives or friends, or they would perish from want. The authorities are trying to discourage us from sending anything.
Discussion on ANARCHO—SYNDICALISM.

ii. THE CNT in SPAIN as compared with other unions.

LITTLE IS KNOWN in this country of the internal structure of the CNT. It is judged either by its degree of militancy in labour struggles or its record in the civil war; even in other languages, information on its aims and principles is scanty.

If it comes as a surprise that it had no bureaucracy — it had one paid secretary for the whole of Spain, and its delegates were subject to recall — it may be a surprise that it engaged in collective bargaining. That is what the delegates were for. Moreover, at no time did it regard the 'closed shop' as an aim. It took the contrary view, and many of its industrial attitudes may surprise and even shock British trade unionists who have had to struggle in entirely different circumstances.

The CNT was born out of the printworkers' and bookbinders' unions which were the most highly skilled in Spain. They took a pride in craft and good workmanship and this attitude they communicated to the whole of the C.N.T. They were imbued with an anarchistic attitude that the boss was a robber "but if you are a thief, we are not," they would tell him openly. They would not do shoddy work. For years there were no new prisons because the masons were in the CNT which declined such work. They would not rob the till - 'banks'; they would make demands for higher wages but no employer could deny they were entitled to them. In other countries, this might be associated with reformism but it was not so with them.

They did not say 'a fair day's work for a fair day's pay'. They said 'Come, you robber, it is time you paid us more. And take away your watchdog of a foreman — we will not steal your goods. You are the thief, not us.'

They combined the demand for economic betterment with one of a high moral standard. It is for this reason that the CNT survived repression. It is not necessary to comment on whether their attitude was or was not 'anarchistic' — it had a lot of Spanishness in it — but as it happened, it worked.

Take a comparison with the I.W.W. of America, equally revolutionary, born around
the same time and reflecting the same attitudes, but with as profound an American background as the CNT's was Spanish.

What would happen if the boss asked the employer to swear he was not a member of the 'wobblies'. De Leon said (and his advice was followed by all wobblies) - "Swear! Swear by all means! The whip of hunger took the oath, let the whip keep it!" The CNT said that nobody should ever deny his membership card. Prisoners in Franco's jails have treasured theirs over years.

Why didn't the employer refuse, in an open market, to employ CNT labour? Because, in the open market, every one knew they were the best workers. Political Catholic unions acted as strike-breakers - but nobody would buy a house they built - or they would bargain for a lower price. The U.G.T. as a socialist union had - over many years, including those of the Primo de Rivera dictatorship, government support actual or implicit, but only in the Asturias (where the miners pursued an independent way) did it find itself able to say that the union label meant a guarantee of workmanship.

When, therefore, the CNT was forced to follow the contrary path - that of sabotage - it meant something more than it did when other unions did it. (It should be borne in mind that, contrary to English capitalist usage, sabotage does not mean blind malicious breakage - it may mean damage or it may mean deliberate improvement to make something uneconomic).

It was the last resort for the CNT workers to destroy THEIR factories which THEY planned to take over one day and which THEY regarded as THEIR OWN. But they were prepared to do it and it was a threat to the employer. Even more was the fact of making the job more expensive by putting even better work into it. The employer also knew that blacklisting a strikers delegate meant throwing out all his labour force. There were no two ways about it. He could only hope to bribe the police to take the man in for some other, imaginary 'offence' or for political reasons. So far as an economic blacklist was concerned, it was hopeless.

It is not to say this is something that is necessarily applicable in other countries. It worked in Spain, but else where might take different forms. (These forms will be examined in the next issue).
The Houses of Parliament, Buckingham Palace, No.10 Downing Street and the Chancellery of the Exchequer were blown up last night. A police spokesman said that while the buildings were totally wrecked, this was not a professional job. "It was quite amateurish," he said.

It was anticipated there would be ten years of investigation after which nobody would be caught, but he ridiculed attempts to make much of the affair. "Whoever did this had only an elementary knowledge of chemistry and is certainly known to the police," he said. "On the other hand, if these attempts continue, it could well be dangerous. Handled by ignorant people like this, they could hurt themselves."

He revealed the roof of Scotland Yard had already been blown off, but it had not been revealed to the Press. "It was not newsworthy," he said. "Besides they might have done it again."

Later the News of the World offered £2,500,000 reward for anyone who could identify the suspect as being Robert Maxwell whose photograph was being handed around by the police.

Lord Louis Mountbatten denied responsibility. "My organisation, the Royal Navy, does not believe in violence" he said.

Several Broadstairs yachtsmen, known to have raced and beaten "Morningcloud", were taken into custody and beaten up. "These were only routine enquiries," giggled the yachtsman premier, scarcely able to conceal his truncheon.

Several ghosts disappeared from their usual haunts.