7: VIABLE ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION SYSTEMS

And I don't mean systems in a derogatory sense. The most obvious alternative is that of parents teaching their children at home. This is not necessarily home tuition - natural education is a more apt description, although the Tory Telegraph described home tuition as 'sophisticated cruelty'.

Every year (or term) your teachers write about four lines about your progress - a 'going year-old spastic' and I have been told 'bugger off'. These are our great teachers voicing their opinions. They realise that I represent a threat to their little lives, so they try and make me look like a fool in front of everybody. That's why they're shit scared, because one day we are going to overcome. Of course, they'd never cop it, but I know it in my heart.

7: VIABLE ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION SYSTEMS

and a prepared change is more effective than a spontaneous one. Thus a prepared and organised revolution will have more chance of succeeding than a single component aiming blindly without any cooperation would. A revolution needs co-operation to get anywhere. Therefore systems - and again, I don't mean that in a derogatory sense - should be ready to take effect almost immediately, i.e. natural education, anarchsy-syndicalism, co-operatives, etc. These will not impair or hinder anyone - they are intended for everybody. Help others to help yourself. In natural education, teacher's discrimination and maladjustment, school uniforms, school dinners, punishment, examinations and reports simply do not come into it.

The image of 'school' is completely changed. 'School' simply does not exist anymore, and therefore there is no limitation, conditioning, discrimination, etc. involved or practised. We do not merely prevent or delay our disease, but cure it. Qualifications simply do not exist. What matters is what kind of person you are - what you think, what you do, your likes/dislikes, etc.

In natural education it is you that matters, not how many exams you have passed. You are a human being and in natural education love and understanding are the most important things. They are two things which the present education system neglects and has neither time nor sentiment for...they come later in the form of legalised 'love' (not unlike processed soup) - marriage, mortgage, car, job, holidays, etc. Work comes first. Natural education puts love and understanding first, and through those, co-operation and success.

8: CONCLUSIONS

It is obvious that a change is needed;
**THE ANARCHIST FEMINIST WEEKEND**

**How many came?**

About 150 on the first day - Saturday, and about 100 on Sunday.

Did they go away feeling it was all worthwhile?

We can only speak for ourselves being two individuals, who were also involved in organizing the conference. Although there were problems caused by our lack of weight and power in organizing a conference, at the last meeting where we discussed the areas of problems - as there must be when we recognize this we will continue to fall into the traps that, regardless of our intentions, merely replace one kind of hierarchy with another.

**Most popular workshop?**

There were a few workshops which had quite numerous attendance, some being: Women and Institutions & Prisons; Self-help & Internationalism which consisted of women from Ireland, Spain etc. talking about recent state attacks on them.

How do you feel about the press coverage?

In the meetings to organize the weekend, we did not discuss mass media coverage at all, so we were not prepared for the establishment newspapers being there. And so we were indeed disgusted by the Guardian's patronizing waffle written by a token-woman from their paper.

What do you feel about the male reaction at the Conway Hall meeting?

We were pleased at the attendance (60) as we had had thought that from what some people around the anarchist scene (both men and women) had said, that no-one would come. We were not really surprised about some of the anarchist-boys and anarchist-boot boys and their reactions - they were almost predictable. I thought it would have been better if some of the people who said nothing had come forward and offered something. I agreed with Gala from Freedom about the splitting of the meeting - I don't think that solved anything. (2nd person): I thought it was good to see such a mish-mash of people there and it did help to break down impressions that all women who see themselves as feminists don't want to have anything to do with men. It would be good to organize more open discussions around sexism, contraception, relationships, plus ones on prisons, syndicalism etc.

Any long-term benefits to anarchofeminism?

Hopefully the Anarchofeminist newsletter will be coming out more regularly, to keep people in touch, and a London group has been formed. If people are interested in contacting this group there are meetings at The Women's Arts Alliance, 10 Cambridge Terrace every Friday at 6.30 pm or write to Box 33 at Rising Free Bookshop, 162 Upper Street, London N1.

How was the creche run?

It was run on a 24-hour basis mainly by men from a group called 'Men Against Sexism'. This left the women free to attend the weekend discussion. Some relieved mothers said that it was the first 24-hour creche they had seen at a conference. There are plans to keep the child-care activities going.

Was there anarchists from any international groups present at the conference?

There were many people from different countries. One woman was from...

---

Dear Black Flag,

In the October issue of Black Flag you carried an article entitled 'Feminism?' by R. Miles which, in my opinion, managed to thoroughly distort feminism, misrepresenting both the ends and the means advocated by most feminists.

The bulk of the article was devoted to presenting and then attacking a series of statements, supposedly representative feminist thinking, which no feminist would defend ('Golda Meir reached... the pinnacle of the feminist aspirations...' Feminists are 'in favour of any censorship which would aid their own cause'.) Feminism is accused of everything from liberalism and narrow-mindedness to being individualistic and failing to liberate working-class women.

Never once are the real precepts of feminism addressed. Feminism does, of course, attack the oppressions brought on by patriarchy, and does focus on the oppression of women; but this occurs not in an atmosphere of 'ranking' oppression ('more oppressed than thou'), but in an effort to point out the different kinds of oppression people are subjected to because of sex and sexual preference. Miles has attacked this aspect of feminism as being, somehow, 'liberal', using precisely the tone that women have been subjected to by the Left for as long as they've been involved; it implies that women's oppression isn't the 'real' revolution. Fighting oppression in whatever context it affects us is the 'real' revolution; and far beyond this, feminism teaches that no revolution can be real or complete until we - all of us, men and women alike - can deal with the attitudes, like sexism, that all of us have internalized. This process must be a part of all that we do in changing our world.

But feminism is much more than a focus on sexism. It has also a very powerful positive voice, a side that points out how we can learn to deal with each other as full human beings, which Miles - and indeed many British critics of feminism, seems unaware of. This part of feminism says (in that phrase we use so often and never pay enough attention to) that the personal is political - and the political is personal: until our politics are manifested in our personal lives, we won't succeed in carrying through the changes we seek.

Feminism means a fundamental change in attitude, toward both what we're doing and how we're doing it; how we do something is as important as what we do. Within this new framework, community-building (which Miles found so easy to scoff at in the guise of consciousness-raising groups) has just as important a place as accomplishing 'business', until we recognise this we will continue to fail to fall into the traps that, regardless of our intentions, merely replace one kind of hierarchy with another. Finally, feminism also asks for a change in approach when we deal with each other, away from the confrontations of linear thinking ('I'm right, so you're wrong'), to an attitude of synthesis, striving to understand alternative points of view and seeking common ground.

It follows that as long as these aspects of feminism are ignored or misrepresented, so also will anarchafeminism be. I am an anarchafeminist because I see the strong similarities between feminism's principles and ideals, and those of anarchism. But anarchists have too long stopped short of 'bringing the revolution home' - applying anarchism in their personal lives; and this is what feminism has brought most successfully to anarchism. Far from being a 'contradiction' in terms, as Miles asserts, anarchafeminism is the merging of two strands of revolutionary thought, which together point toward changes in ourselves and in our world. How could it be denied that both of these are necessary? And that we begin now in making these changes, and in learning to live our ideals: anarchist and feminist. Of course there are problems - as there must be when we strive for freedom within an authoritarian society. To claim that within such...
a society neither anarchism nor feminism can be lived, however, is to deny us our power. We must begin from where we are, individually and collectively, and grow from here. As Paul Goodman once said, 'A free society cannot be the substitution of a new order for the old order; it is the extension of spheres of free action until they make up most of social life'.

Have anarchists 'too long stopped short of bringing the revolution home'? Equally, do not many feminists fail to see there is any discussion on it, not to mention that 'male' and 'female' are really nothing but words; that there is no reason why this attitude should be continued. And even if it is, the discussion on feminism in the World Today is 'anti-libertarian', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands. The discussion on feminism in the Women's movement is 'anti-feminist', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands.

The discussion on feminism in the flag is of interest because it is so rare there is any discussion on it, not to mention that 'male' and 'female' are really nothing but words; that there is no reason why this attitude should be continued. And even if it is, the discussion on feminism in the World Today is 'anti-libertarian', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands. The discussion on feminism in the Women's movement is 'anti-feminist', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands.

The discussion on feminism in the flag is of interest because it is so rare there is any discussion on it, not to mention that 'male' and 'female' are really nothing but words; that there is no reason why this attitude should be continued. And even if it is, the discussion on feminism in the World Today is 'anti-libertarian', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands. The discussion on feminism in the Women's movement is 'anti-feminist', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands.

The discussion on feminism in the flag is of interest because it is so rare there is any discussion on it, not to mention that 'male' and 'female' are really nothing but words; that there is no reason why this attitude should be continued. And even if it is, the discussion on feminism in the World Today is 'anti-libertarian', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands. The discussion on feminism in the Women's movement is 'anti-feminist', ranging from hitting women and growing a beard to demanding that women's power be used to protect their children and husbands.
STATE KIDNAPPING

"Tug of love" cases - where the father and the mother squabble for possession of the child - happen often. Clearly when 'kidnapping' happens as a result, it cannot be compared with kidnapping for money. But there are cases far worse than kidnapping for money: where prestige, power and ingrained prejudice are concerned.

Take for instance a famous case that happened in Rome towards the end of the last century. A devout Italian housemaid was deeply attached to the baby son of a Jewish household where she worked. Not wishing him to be forever damned, she took him out one day and baptised him. Not wishing him to be forever damned, she took him out one day and baptised him.

The Roman Catholic Church condemned her decision. The boy was the ideal Blas Pinar, leader of Fuerza Nueva (New Force) - the Spanish ultra-rightist party - was 'worried' by the reports. About 'bastard' children being born because of the lack of divorce facilities. But he pointed out he was equally worried that women's rights campaigners in Spain sought the 'easy solution' of divorce and re-marriage. What was his solution? At his farm in Tenerife, he made a solemn pronouncement to the press (which shoked many members of his party) that he favoured 'concubinage'. Marriage must remain indissoluable and sacred, but men could be permitted to take concubines whose children would be 'legitimate'. The concubines would have a temporary status which the master could terminate at any time, and perhaps financial arrangements should be made by prior civil contract.

A journalist asked Senor Pinar if wealthy men could take male concubines. He told her indignantly, 'I am not joking'.

FASCIST BELIEFS OR RELATIVELY LOW ECONOMIC STATUS.'

Letters of support should be sent to: Bayou La Rose, 2115 Esplanade Avenue, New Orleans, Louisiana, 70119

*The Roman Church took a somewhat different attitude years later, when Bertha Hertog, a Dutch Catholic, was hidden by her Malayan grandparents, brought up a Moslem.

Kamalla Miller had two girls and a boy. She was married to Arthur Miller and living in Champaign, Illinois. Being unemployed, in 1974, one of the kids sick, and needing to wash dozens of clothes and wait on tables to live, they left their three kids with Kamalla's mother and went to California. Arthur got work in the bakery (pipetting) and they sent for the kids, only a few weeks after leaving them.

They were served with papers for a custody hearing. Kamalla's mother claimed that the couple were 'unfit' because of their anarchist views to have custody of the children. Kamalla was an anarchist-pacifist, Arthur described as an 'IWU organiser'.

The court was told how rich and respectable were the grandparents, how poor and abusive the parents. The Judge ruled that the grandparents were obviously better fitted to be the guardians. 'Rocks', Hertog was the ideal parent because of all his money! (The American religion in a nutshell; they do not evidently study the home lives of British Monarchs). Desperate at being unable to obtain her children - and with the boy dying in the grandmother's care - Kamalla went to desperate measures. After the other two children had been locked in the house for two years, they ran away. Kamalla took them in. She got to know the kids again, and got to know her, she de-brain-washed them of the reactionary -ary ideas with which they'd been pumped. Now she has been charged with kidnapping.

FASCIST CATHOLICS

Who says Fascists don't have hearts? Blue felts the genuine soul of Fumal, leader of Fuerza Nueva (New Force) - the Spanish ultra-rightist party - was 'worried' by the reports. About 'bastard' children being born because of the lack of divorce facilities. But he pointed out he was equally worried that women's rights campaigners in Spain sought the 'easy solution' of divorce and re-marriage. What was his solution? At his farm in Tenerife, he made a solemn pronouncement to the press (which shoked many members of his party) that he favoured 'concubinage'. Marriage must remain indissoluable and sacred, but men could be permitted to take concubines whose children would be 'legitimate'. The concubines would have a temporary status which the master could terminate at any time, and perhaps financial arrangements should be made by prior civil contract.

A journalist asked Senor Pinar if wealthy men could take male concubines. He told her indignantly, 'I am not joking'.

FASCIST MOLESTERS

Mr Houshangi, Press Attaché at the London Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Islam, was very indignant with the Guardian which called the Ayatollah Khomeini a 'bastard' (in the unäesthethic phrase of a base paper), saying that it was 'a wicked immortality and a detestful violation of a person's character'. Mr Houshangi taking it in the words of the illegitimate child. (How absurd of Statism, to assume a person can be 'legitimate' or 'illegitimate', as if they could do something unlawful by being born! How typical, though, of criminal religion!)

Mr Houshangi lectured the Guardian on its profanity and on having 'stimulat ed open provocation from the whole Muslim world on your and your employees'. Could a wicked anarchist get away with this open reitement to terrorism (or would use it)? He urged the paper 'to at least formally apologise and hope that the consequences you have brought upon yourselves will be minimal'.

Does Mr Houshangi make the slightest pretence of not being a terrorist? Only when he is attacking Revolutions in Iran. Are they not attacking the personification of the State - the Imam Khomeini.
"There's a star man waiting in the sky! He knows we'd like to see him/ but he knows it'll blow our minds."

In bygone days people used to imagine fairies at the bottom of the garden; in these days of high technology, UFOs are the space age hallucination.

UFOs are the new religion, more intensely worshipped than either football or Christianity; more fervently believed in than ever football or Christ. One could possibly expect someone as obviously deranged as President Carter confessing having heard the voice of God, but not so many apparently normal people succumbing to such sci-fi drive.

The reason is simple. Most people are not normal; they suffer from what Reich called the emotional plague—a pathological belief in the necessity of obedience to authority.

During periods of social hysteria or unrest the number of UFO sightings increases. The first great upsurge of UFO sightings occurred in America at the outbreak of McCarthyism and the Cold War. The month the Korean war broke out produced an all-time high for sightings. UFO fever peaked again in 1968, a time of world-wide unrest with race riots, Russian tanks in Prague and factory occupations in France.

Hysteria is the form that anxiety takes in sexuality. One result of the sexual content of earlier mass hallucinations, heretical devils, witches riding broomsticks—was obvious. A well-known saint imagined angels brandishing a fiery sword. As he plunged it into her burning body she experienced a nono-mystical ecstasy. This punic-religious piffle had little appeal for the generation reared on Buck Rogers and Flash Gordon. Like the ghost who cannot die, these erotic fantasies burst through from the dark recesses of the subconscious, born again as other Left activists spend a great deal of their time and energy all the time the goal of the nazis. Much of their marching up and down and cheering and waving flags was simply sex gone sour.

The repressed sexuality we see in these symbols is incredibly useful for sustaining and building the empires of tyrants. The nazis were especially skillful in manipulating unfounded sexuality. Their weasels was originally a fertility symbol from tantra yoga. It was a symbolic depiction of two people in sexual intercourse. All the talk of breeding a master race had an underlying appeal to repressed sexuality. People bursting with energy all the time was the goal of the nazis. Much of their marching up and down and cheering and waving flags was simply sex gone sour.

Malcolm Simpkins too has had the same restrictions, though he by prison law is an 'old offender' against discipline.

Solitary confinement is used in British prisons as a form of psychological and physical torture. It consists of 23 hours a day in a cell, alone, with no contact with other prisoners and often there is no contact even with the screws; one hour exercise usually in a cage, exclusion from all prison activities (no classes, TV, etc.), restricted visits; restricted books, papers, letters. The reality of solitary confinement is that a person has no social contact or communication whatsoever, the purpose being to isolate and consequently to break the prisoners' identity and to confuse him/her in order to weaken resistance.

There are numerous examples of prisoners being put into solitary confinement or 'on the block' due to their political beliefs. Almost all of the 80 Irish Republican prisoners in England as well as other left activists spend a great deal of their sentences in solitary because the State wants to separate them from the other prisoners, as it does in the United States, to avoid an even stronger politicization of prisoners in general.

Fascist prisoners - but they will have them at a price. Though Phil and Malcolm are not anarchist prisoners. Not at the Home Office, anyway. Because in the long term jails the Fascist influence on prisoners is marked as such, and cannot, for that reason, be allowed the rights any other prisoners have—because the Fascist group have lost control.

What has become of Galsworthy's reform? Since the National Front took power within certain prisons and one uses the words deliberately (for how can a prisoner refuse without being in breach of discipline, the authority of the National Front warders?) solitary confinement for certain political prisoners—though the category of political prisoner does not exist according to judges—can go up to two or even three years, and for first offenders at that. We refer at the moment to two anarchist prisoners, Phil Ruf and Malcolm Simpkins.

When the Garett riot occurred last year Phil Ruf was shipped out of the prison to Durham prison. Coachloads of the men were shipped out for two days after the riots and scattered in prison around the country. The Garett riot occurred when prisoners protested over the drugging of another prisoner and the Governor sent in the riot squad.

Since the Garett riot Phil was held in solitary confinement on 'Rule 43'. He was marked as strange goings-on out of the riot. The rule allows for the segregation of prisoners without any offence. It is used in cases where prisoners are separated from the others 'for their own good' and also allows for segregation by the Governor to ensure 'good order and discipline'.

Although this order has to be renewed regularly by a magistrate it is often abused, and in Phil's case, was allowed for a prisoner to be held for a year or even years in solitary without even being found guilty of any offence. The reason is simple. Most people are not normal; they suffer from what Reich called the emotional plague—a pathological belief in the necessity of obedience to authority.

The repressed sexuality we see in these symbols is incredibly useful for sustaining and building the empires of tyrants. The nazis were especially skillful in manipulating unfounded sexuality. Their weasels was originally a fertility symbol from tantra yoga. It was a symbolic depiction of two people in sexual intercourse. All the talk of breeding a master race had an underlying appeal to repressed sexuality. People bursting with energy all the time was the goal of the nazis. Much of their marching up and down and cheering and waving flags was simply sex gone sour.

Malcolm Simpkins too has had the same restrictions, though he by prison law is an 'old offender' against discipline.

Solitary confinement is used in British prisons as a form of psychological and physical torture. It consists of 23 hours a day in a cell, alone, with no contact with other prisoners and often there is no contact even with the screws; one hour exercise usually in a cage, exclusion from all prison activities (no classes, TV, etc.), restricted visits; restricted books, papers, letters. The reality of solitary confinement is that a person has no social contact or communication whatsoever, the purpose being to isolate and consequently to break the prisoners' identity and to confuse him/her in order to weaken resistance.

There are numerous examples of prisoners being put into solitary confinement or 'on the block' due to their political beliefs. Almost all of the 80 Irish Republican prisoners in England as well as other left activists spend a great deal of their sentences in solitary because the State wants to separate them from the other prisoners, as it does in the United States, to avoid an even stronger politicization of prisoners in general.

Fascist prisoners - but they will have them at a price. Though Phil and Malcolm are not anarchist prisoners. Not at the Home Office, anyway. Because in the long term jails the Fascist influence on prisoners is marked as such, and cannot, for that reason, be allowed the rights any other prisoners have—because the Fascist group have lost control.

What has become of Galsworthy's reform? Since the National Front took power within certain prisons and one uses the words deliberately (for how can a prisoner refuse without being in breach of discipline, the authority of the National Front warders?) solitary confinement for certain political prisoners—though the category of political prisoner does not exist according to judges—can go up to two or even three years, and for first offenders at that. We refer at the moment to two anarchist prisoners, Phil Ruf and Malcolm Simpkins.

When the Garett riot occurred last year Phil Ruf was shipped out of the prison to Durham prison. Coachloads of the men were shipped out for two days after the riots and scattered in prison around the country. The Garett riot occurred when prisoners protested over the drugging of another prisoner and the Governor sent in the riot squad.

Since the Garett riot Phil was held in solitary confinement on 'Rule 43'. He was marked as strange goings-on out of the riot. The rule allows for the segregation of prisoners without any offence. It is used in cases where prisoners are separated from the others 'for their own good' and also allows for segregation by the Governor to ensure 'good order and discipline'.

Although this order has to be renewed regularly by a magistrate it is often abused, and in Phil's case, was allowed for a prisoner to be held for a year or even years in solitary without even being found guilty of any offence. The reason is simple. Most people are not normal; they suffer from what Reich called the emotional plague—a pathological belief in the necessity of obedience to authority.

The repressed sexuality we see in these symbols is incredibly useful for sustaining and building the empires of tyrants. The nazis were especially skillful in manipulating unfounded sexuality. Their weasels was originally a fertility symbol from tantra yoga. It was a symbolic depiction of two people in sexual intercourse. All the talk of breeding a master race had an underlying appeal to repressed sexuality. People bursting with energy all the time was the goal of the nazis. Much of their marching up and down and cheering and waving flags was simply sex gone sour.

Malcolm Simpkins too has had the same restrictions, though he by prison law is an 'old offender' against discipline.
is being backed by a political group but was hushed by others.

The whole matter ended in disaster, with the two unbacked by the Union, unionism at an end in the newspaper, the NHS triumphant, and moreover Peter finding himself blacked from any job in nursing anywhere. He gives some conclusions aren't all (perhaps.

But as he says, 'There are a lot of Marxist abbreviations knocking about...once Management or a Trade Union can click you into a category then you are much easier to deal with. From the start I moved on the basis that it was my job to represent the members' view. As much as I kept to myself...there exists much sympathy and enthusiasm for anarchist methods of doing things. Once you attach the label "Anarchist" to them people become frightened.'

Do they? It would be ungenerous to criticise Peter if you read the article you see what a terrific fight Peter put up. But not if you read Anarchism Lancastrium! He describes it as on the 'lunatic fringe' - it puts people off (if not exactly 'frightened' them). For instance, anarcho-syndicalism was labelled in A.L. as 'too hairy-chested'. Too much so that its adherents probably wank themselves while watching Come Dancing (quoting from memory).

What is anarcho-syndicalism? Putting the 'anarchist method of doing things' into a permanent industrial organisation for one thing. At the least, keeping in touch with other radicals in industry so you can't be cut off and isolated and so discredited and victimised. This happens very seldom to the 'Marxist abbreviations' precisely because they are labelled! It is known how to (and how not) to deal with them. It is known what support they can draw upon outside their workplace even if defeated in it.

Libertarians can be dealt with as isolated cranks very easily ("doesn't even vote, for instance, anarcho-syndicalism was labelled in A.L. as 'too hairy-chested'. Too much so that its adherents probably wank themselves while watching Come Dancing (quoting from memory).

What is anarcho-syndicalism? Putting the 'anarchist method of doing things' into a permanent industrial organisation for one thing. At the least, keeping in touch with other radicals in industry so you can't be cut off and isolated and so discredited and victimised. This happens very seldom to the 'Marxist abbreviations' precisely because they are labelled! It is known how to (and how not) to deal with them. It is known what support they can draw upon outside their workplace even if defeated in it.

Libertarians can be dealt with as isolated cranks very easily ('doesn't even vote,' for instance, anarcho-syndicalism was labelled in A.L. as 'too hairy-chested'. Too much so that its adherents probably wank themselves while watching Come Dancing (quoting from memory).

What is anarcho-syndicalism? Putting the 'anarchist method of doing things' into a permanent industrial organisation for one thing. At the least, keeping in touch with other radicals in industry so you can't be cut off and isolated and so discredited and victimised. This happens very seldom to the 'Marxist abbreviations' precisely because they are labelled! It is known how to (and how not) to deal with them. It is known what support they can draw upon outside their workplace even if defeated in it.

Libertarians can be dealt with as isolated cranks very easily ('doesn't even vote,' for instance, anarcho-syndicalism was labelled in A.L. as 'too hairy-chested'. Too much so that its adherents probably wank themselves while watching Come Dancing (quoting from memory).