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editorial

Another year, another Black Flag. After a well attended meeting at the Anarchist Bookfair last year, Black Flag has finally recruited some new blood into the collective. More is needed, but at least we haven’t folded, which was looking pretty likely at the time. We hope now that we can move towards more frequent output than the annual stumble for the books.

This statement concerns the “State of our Movement”. Where have we been, where are we now and how can we move forward. Tensions between the need to organise and have our political activity in our local communities and see our workplaces and the need to organise and show our face nationally and globally are touched upon. Indeed the G8 protest in Gleneagles caused furious debate on our editorial list and the next issue will look at the politics of this and the other high profile international summit protests.

As part of the examination of the state of our movement, Nick Heath’s article on page 12 touches on the need to rethink the anarchist media in this country. He questions whether the British Anarchist Movement needs these glossies. We’d like to know what you think. How can we make sure that we aren’t putting effort into duplication and irrelevance.

Two events have eclipsed the G8 protests just as we go to press. The awarding of the Olympic Games to London and the London bombings and ensuing terror alerts. The Olympic bid was a blow but hardly surprising. Olympic Committee President and Nazi Sympathiser - Avery Brundage once said famously, “The cardinal rule of the Olympics is no politics,” which is like saying the cardinal rule of boxing is no punching. The French government has been a thorn in the side of the US’s imperial objectives and France are paying the price while the US’s favourite poodle gets the gold.

But this is not only a question of French humiliation on an international stage. This is about the kind of National Security apparatus that the Olympics require in the post-9/11 world, and which country would have been more likely accommodate what amounts to temporary martial law. In the wake of the bombings in London on 7th July, the state’s adoption of detention without trial and the ‘new’ shoot to kill policy horrifyingly played out on a London tube train on 29th July, London is certainly game. Repression of local dissent and the poor has been a feature of every Olympics. Pope Hitter’s o冷链 of Berlin in 1936 to the 1986 slaughter of hundreds of students in Mexico City, to the thousands of African-American homeless men illegally jailed in Athens.

We have our work cut out for us.

Black Flag, BM Hurricane
London WC1N 3XG
BlackFlag@lycoxs.com
www.blackflag.blinknews.net/blackflag

For a social system based on mutual aid and voluntary cooperation against state control and all forms of government and economic repression. To establish a share in the general prosperity of all – the breaking down of racial, religious, national and sex barriers – and to fight for the life of one world.

For a world of freedom, equality and solidarity.

7 days at the world's most secure golf course
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Another year, another Black Flag. After a well attended meeting at the Anarchist Bookfair last year, Black Flag has finally recruited some new blood into the collective. More is needed, but at least we haven't folded, which was looking pretty likely at the time. We hope now that we can move towards more frequent offprints than the annual stumble for the booklets.

This issue concentrates on the "State of Our Movement." Where have we been, where are we now and how can we move forward. Tensions between the need to organise and base our political activity in our local communities and our workplace and the need to organise and show our face nationally and globally are touched upon. Indeed the GB protest in Glasgow caused furious debate on our editorial list and the next issue will look at the politics of this and the other high profile international summit protests.

As part of the examination of the state of our movement, Nick Heath's article on page 12 touches on the need to rethink the anarchist media in this country. He questions whether the British Anarchist Movement needs more glossy. We'd like to know what you think. How can we make sure that we aren't putting effort into duplication and irrelevance.

Two events have eclipsed the GB protests just as we go to press. The awarding of the Olympic Games to London and the London bombings and ensuing terror attacks. The Olympic bid was a blow but hardly surprising. Olympic Committee President and Nazi Sympathizer Avery Brundage once said famously, "The cardinal role of the Olympics is no politics," which is like saying the cardinal role of boxing is no punching. The French government has been a thorn in the side of the US' imperial objectives and France are paying the price while the US' favorite pencil gets the gold.

But this is not only a question of French humiliation on an international stage. This is about the kind of National Security apparatus that the Olympics empire in the post 9/11 world, and which country would have been more likely accommodate what amounts to temporary martial law. In the wake of the bombings in London on 7th July, the state's adoption of detention without trial and the 'new' shoot to kill policy horrifyingly played out on a London tube train on 3rd July. London is certainly game. Repression of local dissent and the poor has been a feature of every Olympics. From Hitler's sending of Berlin in 1936 to the 2018 slaughter of hundreds of students in Mexico City, in the thousands of African-American homeless men illegally killed in Athens.

We have our work cut out for us.
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London Bombings
Below is a statement put out by Libcom.org in response to the London Bombings on Thursday 7th July.

As social anarchists and libertarian communists, we at libcom.org deplore the horrific attacks on innocent people this morning in London. We express our deepest sympathy to anyone affected by the blasts. We condemn the use of violence against ordinary people and the perpetrators of the bombings whether they be luddities or any other variety of anarchist.

Terrorist actions are completely at odds with any struggle for freedom, future society and never help oppressed people in any part of the globe. Instead violence against civilians is a tool of states and proto-states everywhere it is used to suppress anyone the state chooses to oppose.

The British Government, by sending British soldiers to kill and die in Iraq and Afghanistan has made all of us a target for terrorists in their pursuit of increased profit and power at the expense of ordinary working people. We stand for a world in which human solidarity and cooperation replace the quest for profit as society's driving force, and stand in solidarity with all people fighting exploitation and oppression in all its form, from opponents to the occupation of Iraq to those in Iraq who are opposing both the occupying forces and the ultra-reactionary Islamists that the Occupation helps strengthen.

Our thoughts today are with the victims of this atrocity, and their loved ones.

Erected by
Clare MacNaughton, Caroline Stockley
Society Group, Anarchist Federation
International of Anarchist Federations
435 E1A Securitas, West Midlands
Anarchist, Barky Vale, Ipswich
Anarchist, Sheffield Anarchists
Farmers Manifesto, Farmers Solidarity Federation
South London Solidarity Federation
Red Party, Organise!
had ignored the demands of the striking workers and headed towards the fence. The state, therefore, had cut off food and water to the workers through a blanket blockade. As a result, there were massive protests across the country.

The police ignored the demands of the protesters and arrested and beaten uncompromisingly. The response of the state was brutal and ruthless, with the use of tear gas and water cannons to disperse the crowd. The police killed and injured many protesters, including children and women. The situation was dire, with many protesters facing arrest and imprisonment.

Despite the government's efforts to suppress the protesters, the movement gained momentum and spread across the country. The police maintained a tight grip on the protests, but the protesters were determined and continued to demonstrate.
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Despite the government's efforts to suppress the protesters, the movement gained momentum and spread across the country. The police maintained a tight grip on the protests, but the protesters were determined and continued to demonstrate.

Yes, well, there it was. After almost two years of planning and approximately £200,000 spent by the anti-authoritarian movement, the protest at the G8 summit came to an end in the space of a few hours. However, the G8 summit also led to the cancellation of the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.

One thing that everyone agrees is that the summits are symbolic. No matter how well they go, they remain symbolic and this is for one simple reason the summits themselves are symbolic. The summits are just pomp and ceremony for the world leaders to show off their democratic and constitutional credentials. Even if you did manage to shut down the meetings, the decision making will get made anyway. They just need a few more days.

All theproblems with the G8 summit are that there will be protests at the G8 summit in 2005, which was attended by 1,500 people in March on Glasgow and hundreds took part in blockades. But it was all worth it.
had ignored the demands of the strikers and headed towards the fence. The state, caught unawares, had to rely on its own police force to quell the rioting and maintain order. Local residents were in a state of shock and disbelief.

This week’s events in London, away from the rest of the UK, that little group of protesters happened to be at the right place at the right time and had the opportunity to grasp the sheer scale of opposition to both the policies and the extension of the G8. In the summary, despite the enormous resources at its disposal, the state did have it all its own way at Gleneagles.

The next day, the police rounded up the occupiers and addresses, without a clear legal right to such action. It was a time of uncertainty and confusion. The legal rights and procedures were not always clear, resulting in confusion and unexpected outcomes. The police also detained people in custody, which was a serious violation of their basic human rights. The police used force and violence to prevent the occupation of the site. The police also arrested or detained people who were not directly involved in the protest. The police’s actions were unlawful and violated the rights of those who were peacefully exercising their right to protest.

GB Legal Support Group’s initial statement on the policing of the G8 protests in Scotland, July 2005

During the G8 protests in Scotland, there were several cases of police brutality and human rights violations. The police used excessive force and violence against protesters, including the use of tear gas, batons, and dogs to disperse the crowd. The police also detained and arrested protesters, including those who were peacefully protesting. The police’s actions were unlawful and violated the rights of those who were peacefully exercising their right to protest. The police also used force and violence to prevent the occupation of the site. The police’s actions were unlawful and violated the rights of those who were peacefully exercising their right to protest.
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The following is a brief summary and analysis of those years, and the aftermath.

With the 2004 publication of a book—"No Retreat"—by two former members of Manchester Anti-Fascist Action, and the launch of a new physical force anti-fascist organisation—Ansold—new seems as good a time as any to go over some old ground as to what Anti-Fascist Action (AFA) was, what it did, and why it eventually fell apart, from an anarchist perspective. This isn’t a ‘kiss and tell’, so nudes will be avoided and specifics kept out where possible. It is also the perspective of an ex-AFA member active in Liverpool and the Northern Network, so it will mostly take a Northern angle.

AFA’s origins
AFA was originally set up in 1985 as a broad front anti-fascist organisation. The main fascist organisation at this time was the British National Party (BNP). Various contenders for the title of the ‘real’ National Front also existed, following the demise of the original MF after Thatcher took power in 1979. Taking Liverpool as an example, the few attempts by the BNP or NF to hold public marches or meetings in the city centre during the 1980s had been smashed into the ground by a large turn out from locals—notably from the Liverpool liberal community. The last attempt by fascists (NP) to march through Liverpool city centre was in 1986—also an early AFA judicial mobilisation. That failed too, but didn’t stop the BNP selling papers openly in the town centre on a regular basis, unchallenged. Nor did it stop them starting a campaign of harassment against Left wing targets—in particular against the bookshop 'News From Northern', run by a feminist collective. After a few almost-successful attempts to burn the bookshop down, the windows were smashed on an Saturday day time attacks—probably after a paper sale—and fascists generally scattering into the bushes to intimidate staff and customers as and when they pleased, it was obvious something had to be done. Other fascist attacks at the time included smashing the windows of the Warrington Trades Council (now the office from which Liverpool BNP local activity was this was typical in any area in Britain where they were left unchallenged.

AFA was launched in Liverpool in 1986. At that time, Miliband was still the strongest working class group on the Left (though in the process of being kicked out of the Labour Party). They were also the Socialists Workers Party were interested in being organisational part of AFA. The SWP, in fact, sometimes sold papers in Liverpool city centre at the same time as the BNP—though, to be fair, if a fascist attack on any of the groups—both the SWP and Militant would have a turn out. From an early stage the main organisers of Liverpool AFA were associated with the local anarchist scene. This became more explicit with the re-launch of Liverpool Anarchist Group in 1987.

Liverpool AFA was mostly anarchist—rather than never an anarchist organisation. However, the agreement of anarchists with AFA’s twin aims of ‘ideological and physical opposition to fascism’, and the anarchist emphasis on direct action rather than isolation, meant that, within AFA, much of the cutting edge on the streets was provided by anarchist activists.

Collapse and relaunch of AFA as a national force
Nationally, meanwhile, the original AFA had collapsed due to its incompatible political differences. Local and Regional groups (like the Northern Network) however continued, and national calls-outs still occurred using existing contacts. AFA was re-launched in Liverpool in 1989, and in 1990 a national meeting was held in London to set out a new national structure. The re-launch of AFA was as a militant front, aimed at creating a network of different political tendencies—co-ordinated through the working class, to reclaim working class spaces from the fascists as their own. The class perspective was agreed because, first, fascists don’t just play the race card—they address grievances from the whole working class (unemployment, bad housing etc.) and their success is often based on disarming others with so-called ‘socialist’ councils. This propaganda needed a class-based answer. Second, it wasn’t enough to ‘defend democracy’—if AFA didn’t say that the system was messed up, that would leave fascism as the ‘radical’ alternative. Third, the working class is the object of fascist attack once in power—only the working class can oppose it. AFA, it was agreed, would not integrate to ‘bottle’ that was part of the problem such as corrupt councillors. Links, it was agreed, would continue to be made with black and others community groups, but AFA propaganda should be mainly aimed at the communities where fascists themselves aimed to recruit.

Organisingly, it was agreed that AFA would be a decentralised federation based on a regional structure—budding from the existing regions of London AFA and the Northern Network. The only national structure was to be a national co-ordinating committee of a delegates per region, to meet as and when needed, with no formal office or structure to impose policy—some minor national decisions did have to be made over these years, but these were non-contentious.

London AFA at that time was mostly run by the Muzac Red Action—on alliance with all of the anarchist anti-fascist groups in London, and the Solidarity Workers Power. There were also non-aligned independent trade unionists and other socialists involved.

The Northern Network
The Northern Network (originally the Northern Anti-Fascist Network) was a more effective front, a movement of both BNP groups—both BNP groups—by any means necessary was typical of AFA in this period.

And others. Tyne and Wear were actually a Council-funded body set up before AFA. Of the rest, Manchester were run mainly by Red Action (the strongest group outside of London as far as I can tell; a few groups—like York—would probably be best described as “non-aligned” independents. The rest were mainly organised by anarchists—sometimes in the DAM, sometimes out. Lots of anarchist activists at the time weren’t in any national organisation—or were involved mainly in other areas. This reflected the way the anarchist movement had grown since the early 1980s—some became anarchists through the left or Trade Unions, others through anti-militarism, others through animal rights. In the North things tended not to be so sectarian as in London. Apart from the regional groups of the DAM and Class War, there was also the general Northern Anarchist Network. There were often overlaps between different anarchist and activist scenes—people would join a call-out, but didn’t necessarily prioritise anti-fascist. Even the DAM didn’t officially prioritise anti-fascist—many or most of the DAM were trade union activists or shop stewards—though some groups

"AFA at its height was definitely far more than the activist core, and far more than just street fighters. AFA activism involved public speaking, magazine and pamphlet production, organising fund-raisers (gigs, carnivals), etc. A lot of people put time and effort into AFA-related activities who agreed with the aims, but weren’t particularly involved organisationally— or go to meetings. It should also be noted that at this time there was a working— and productive—relationship between the anti-fascist magazine ‘Searchlight’ and AFA, purely because AFA was the only game in town. This included, in Liverpool, a Searchlight member from Manchester speaking at a Liverpool AFA re-launch meeting in 1992.

Countering fascist mobilisations
At a Regional and National level, AFA activism was mainly based around countering known— or intelligence-indicated—fascist mobilisations. Rememberance Sunday in 1986 was the first national focus point in 1986—the Northern Front having made a point of marching to the Potteries on the day before attacking Left wing targets—nearly

the Anti-Peace Picnic outside the South African Embassy. These militant AFA Direct Action events— despite the fascists were stopped. In the North, meanwhile, the Northern Network mobilised against the BNP.

Rememberance Sunday meetings at Clifford’s Tower, York. The BNP chose Clifford’s Tower as it was agreed many of York’s Jewish community were burned to death in the middle ages. None of these early AFA mobilisations in York were relatively open, and quite large. In 1986, if you were involved in the BNP.
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Collapse and relaunch of AFA as a national force

Nationally, meanwhile, the original AFA had collapsed due to a number of Action League political differences. Local and regional groups [like the Northern Network] however continued, and national call-outs still occurred using existing contacts. AFA was re-launched in London in 1989, and in 1990 a national meeting was held in London to set out a new national structure. The re-launch of AFA as a militant 'national' anti-fascist alliance of different political tendencies - contrasted to the working class, to reclaim working class control of anti-fascist politics as their own. The class perspective was seen as a political change - that would move away from fascism as the 'radical' alternative. Third, their working class style was the object of fascist attack once in power - only the working class can oppose it. AFA was agreed, was not interested in 'collaboration' that was not part of the problem: such as corrupt councils. Links were agreed, would continue to be made with black and minority ethnic activist groups, but AFA propaganda should be mainly aimed at the communities where fascists theoretically aimed to recruit.

Organisationally, it was agreed that AFA should be decentralised federation based on a regional structure - from the existing regions of London AFA and the Northern Network. The only national structure was to be a national coordinating committee of a delegates per region, to work in cooperation with the existing local AFA groups, and be set up at the meetings. Links were also made with Jewish and other anti-racist groups, and meetings were held to address working communities. In later years this co-operative orientation was also set up AFA groups at this time - a process repeated several times as students came and went.

BNP driven underground

Within a year or so, the Liverpool BNP went from boasting about how the 'reds' were always beaten when they tried to force the BNP off the streets (according to fascist newspaper Leveson's town) to the effective collapse of political group. Years later, the BNP admitted in the Liverpool Echo that they were driven underground by left wing extremists in the mid-1980s [Oct 1993]. The result was that the BNP would have a turn out. From an early stage the main organisers of Liverpool AFA were associated with the local anarchist scene. This became more explicit with the re-launch of Liverpool Anarchist Group in 1987. Liverpool AFA was mostly anarchist - but it was never an anarchist front or a recruiting tool. They were working class AFA activists and meetings were held to address working communities. In later years this co-operative orientation was also set up AFA groups at this time - a process repeated several times as students came and went.
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Within a year or so, the Liverpool BNP went from boasting about how the 'reds' were always beaten when they tried to force the BNP off the streets (according to fascist newspaper Leveson's town) to the effective collapse of political group. Years later, the BNP admitted in the Liverpool Echo that they were driven underground by left wing extremists in the mid-1980s [Oct 1993]. The result was that the BNP would have a turn out. From an early stage the main organisers of Liverpool AFA were associated with the local anarchist scene. This became more explicit with the re-launch of Liverpool Anarchist Group in 1987. Liverpool AFA was mostly anarchist - but it was never an anarchist front or a recruiting tool. They were working class AFA activists and meetings were held to address working communities. In later years this co-operative orientation was also set up AFA groups at this time - a process repeated several times as students came and went.

"At its height was certainly far more than the activist core, and far more than just street fighters. AFA activism involved public speaking, magazine and pamphlet production, organising fund-raisers (gigs, carnivals), etc. A lot of people put time and effort into AFA-related activities which are important in their own right, but were not particularly involved in the core activities. This reflected the fact that the nationalist movement had grown since the early 1980s - when there were a few much more visible AFA groups, but now AFA was the only national organisation. The nationalist movement had grown since the early 1980s - when there were a few much more visible AFA groups, but now AFA was the only national organisation.

Counteracting fascist mobilisations

At a National and Regional level, AFA activists were mainly based around counter-mobilising known or intelligence-led anti-fascist organisations. In the North West, the national effort led to the AFA building a network in Manchester and the Northern Network. There were often overlaps between different AFA and anti-fascist groups, people would join a call-out, but didn't necessarily participate in anti-fascist AFA. The DAM didn't officially participate in the Anti-fascist groups - many or most of the DAM were trade union activists or shop stewards - through some groups
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Regions were organised (established Regions providing backup to new areas, such as the Midlands, when requested) and Tactics evolved and were constantly under review. A typical 'event' in the North would involve a call-out after intelligence indicated fascist activity — eg a BNP election leafletting would be taking place (mobilisations weren't just about marches). AFA would meet, send out notes, and according to intelligence gathered on the day, Sometimes AFA mobilising entities were not set to counter fascist propaganda, but also to provide a legal excuse for being there. As time went on, in the Northern Network (London AFA operated very differently), each local group elected a delegate during mobilisations. Delegates from each group met together on the day and coordinated events. Usually, but not always, the unofficial 'chief stewards' was the one in whose backyard the main mobilisation had occurred. Near Manchester this was likely to be someone from Manchester AFA/Red Action, due to its proximity to Manchester. This wasn't always the case — for instance, an anarchist from nowhere near Manchester was the chief steward at a mobilisation at Cohoes. Lennon's 'Cooperation' anyway, was more based on informal working relationships and trust rather than on any official positions, and once the fascists were located, what happened next had more to do with personal initiative and 'bully' than a 'commander'.

National AFA mobilisations

The main national public AFA events over these three years are incredibly well known (or used to be), but are worth outlining.

In London, Blood and Honour — the main music front — was beaten off in the street in 1989 when they tried to organise publicly. In 1990 an AFA Unity against Racist Murders demonstration at Notting Hill's 'Cooperation' anyway was more successful.

The '92 and '93 Umbrella Carnival in London in September 1992 provided a useful recruiting ground for the 'battle of Waterloo' a week later when Blood and Honour were strung off the streets again by over 2,000 anti-fascists.

AFA's relationship with Searchlight started in the mid-90s. Searchlight was a small anti-fascist organisation that used to produce a newsletter called 'something for something relationship' — Searchlight would give details of right-wing meetings and events to anti-fascists. In 1993 Searchlight ran a smear campaign against anarchists — in particular against specific DAP and Class War members — alleging they were right-wing fascists. This wasn't a coincidence; now there were strategies to make Searchlight look as bad as possible. The argument was 'if we're right, why not us, who's winning the political vacuum created on the left by Labour abandoning the working class on the one hand, and AFA's success in beating the fascists on the right. The BNP were moving from the 'battle of the streets' (which they lost) to a EuroNationalist/community activists' strategy. AFA was not only to counter this, but also to challenge Searchlight directly.

In Glasgow, around 1992 — relationships between anarchists and Glasgow Red Action deteriorated to the extent that anarchists felt compelled to organise a separate meeting. At least two anarchists leaving the meeting were physically attacked by Red Action members. One of the organisers of the meeting — a committed anti-fascist of long standing — was later falsely accused as a police informer in Red Action's paper 'Red Action'.

Red Action and the IWCA

The main contribution to the unified front, however, was 'Building the anti-racist working class strategy' — the Independent Working Class Association — around 1995. The IWCA was formed as a response to the growing presence of anti-racist groups on the streets, as well as a desire to build solidarity across different parts of the working class.

The United Front crumbling

The 'united front' — where activists worked together and no-one took the lead — started to break down by the 1990s. This was partly due to the failure of the IWCA to effectively coordinate different groups, as well as the increasing reliance on volunteers and the lack of a clear strategy for organizing.

AFA thought about Red Action's strategy. When Red Action started pushing for a more formalised structure, a lot of anarchists were written, circulated, sent out, and a meeting held in the North in late 1995 where London Red Action put forward their case. The argument was 'if we're right, why not us, who's winning the political vacuum created on the left by Labour abandoning the working class on the one hand, and AFA's success in beating the fascists on the right. The BNP were moving from the 'battle of the streets' (which they lost) to a EuroNationalist/community activists' strategy. AFA was not only to counter this, but also to challenge Searchlight directly.

Electoral politics take over

As was said at the time, many AFA activists already had wide political experience and Red Action's strategy was seen as a means of engaging with the political system. The formation of the IWCA was part of this process, aiming to build a united front against racism and fascism.

Looking back

I stopped being active in AFA around the end of 1996. I believe that the missing link between the police attack on the Millwall fans in 1991, with Millhill Politicising following in 1993, standing candidates against Labour, and then the IWA and the Socialist Movement in the UK in 1995. As Red Action pushed forward with political activity, Arthur Scargill's Socialist Labour Party was launched. As was stated then, this was a united front organisation like the IWCA, a clear political alternative to the political establishment.
full coach and minibus — over 80 people — to the event, though on that occasion we were stopped on the outskirts of York and executed all the way back to Liverpool by the police (the same happened to a coach from Newcastle). Buses of police tactically in the Merton Street of 1984-Liter.
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up in 1997. From this way was used it is clear that this Committee and the Aberdonian, AFA is still involved for some time, and now, by the end of 2002, AFA is now a national organisation largely through confrontation. The first action against AFA was recorded in 1990, and in 1992, the Aberdonian, AFA, was expelled by the new, official, officially for ignoring this policy. Expulsions didn't stop the decline. There were some local re-organisation - eg in Liverpool, but by 2001, AFA is now a national organisation largely through confrontation. The Red Action's analysis, back in 1995, was that, using AFAadapted to the new BNP strategy, AFA would 'suffocate' and wither. AFA was forced to confine AFA. Without confrontation AFA - as it then was - would have no means of existence. It is in this confrontation created for the purpose - anti-poll tax unions, strike support groups etc - do us harm later on when the struggle is gone, despite effects by some activists to keep things going and to garner the struggles. So, this Red Action analysis was more can see a self-defeating prophecy.

Tactics Stagnate: How often is the AFA strategy in the 1990s. AFA is now a national organisation largely through confrontation. From the refusal of many AFA activists to be drawn into a strategy they disagreed with, the redirection of energy of an important section of AFA into a new national organisation, seemed, of itself, to have won some time for keeping AFA going. But there were definitely other factors. If AFA had never existed, the AFA decline would have been much slower. This happened with the 'Stop the City' campaign in the early 1980s and the '80s style denen' in the 2000s. There's a case to be made that AFA's existence of some of the strong points - and the national AFA - was too important in 1989 and 1990. After the 'Stop the City' campaign, the AFA was left at the door step, and the street was far more important than the AFA.

The IWWA today

What about the IWWA today? Times have moved on. There are two types of question that can be asked.

1. What is the IWWA an effective strategy for building a working class movement? If the IWWA is an effective strategy for building a working class movement, then the IWWAs, AFA and how the IWWA is an anti-fascist strategy?

The first question is really beyond the scope of this article. Briefly, however, the IWWA has shown that, in some areas at least, group is not one that can be seriously challenged. Even if the movement is not working, or if it is, it is not working on the level of the national media. The conclusion on immediate work is that the IWWA is an effective strategy for building a working class movement, that community activists could learn from. The web site has some good ideas. We need to be very careful here, however, that the IWWA's natural progression from AFA?

The AFA public contact list had over 50 groups spread across Britain in 1997. The strongest Red Action groups used to be London, Manchester, and Glasgow. The IWWA made a strong showing in the North, London (Islington) and Glasgow (Stirling). By 2001, the one group in London had most work so far - with 15 councillors. The IWWA web sites, late 2004, showed an increase in organisational activity. There are still some groups in the South - which reads: what happened to the original IWWA opening campaign in Manchester and Birmingham? Why didn't the IWWA have a noticeable presence in Manchester? As far as I can tell, the IWWA has a strong presence in London in AFA during these years, only the campaign 'Take it to the people'. - AFA and AFA public contact list had over 50 groups spread across Britain in 1997. The strongest Red Action groups used to be London, Manchester, and Glasgow. The IWWA made a strong showing in the North, London (Islington) and Glasgow (Stirling). By 2001, the one group in London had most work so far - with 15 councillors. The IWWA web sites, late 2004, showed an increase in organisational activity. There are still some groups in the South - which reads: what happened to the original IWWA opening campaign in Manchester and Birmingham? Why didn't the IWWA have a noticeable presence in Manchester? As far as I can tell, the IWWA has a strong presence in London in AFA during these years, only the campaign 'Take it to the people'. - AFA and AFA public contact list had over 50 groups spread across Britain in 1997. The strongest Red Action groups used to be London, Manchester, and Glasgow. The IWWA made a strong showing in the North, London (Islington) and Glasgow (Stirling). By 2001, the one group in London had most work so far - with 15 councillors. The IWWA web sites, late 2004, showed an increase in organisational activity. There are still some groups in the South - which reads: what happened to the original IWWA opening campaign in Manchester and Birmingham? Why didn't the IWWA have a noticeable presence in Manchester? As far as I can tell, the IWWA has a strong presence in London in AFA during these years, only the campaign 'Take it to the people'. - AFA and AFA public contact list had over 50 groups spread across Britain in 1997. The strongest Red Action groups used to be London, Manchester, and Glasgow. The IWWA made a strong showing in the North, London (Islington) and Glasgow (Stirling). By 2001, the one group in London had most work so far - with 15 councillors. The IWWA web sites, late 2004, showed an increase in organisational activity. There are still some groups in the South - which reads: what happened to the original IWWA opening campaign in Manchester and Birmingham? Why didn't the IWWA have a noticeable presence in Manchester? As far as I can tell, the IWWA has a strong presence in London in AFA during these years, only the campaign 'Take it to the people'. - AFA and AFA public contact list had over 50 groups spread across Britain in 1997. The strongest Red Action groups used to be London, Manchester, and Glasgow. The IWWA made a strong showing in the North, London (Islington) and Glasgow (Stirling). By 2001, the one group in London had most work so far - with 15 councillors. The IWWA web sites, late 2004, showed an increase in organisational activity. There are still some groups in the South - which reads: what happened to the original IWWA opening campaign in Manchester and Birmingham? Why didn't the IWWA have a noticeable presence in Manchester? As far as I can tell, the IWWA has a strong presence in London in AFA during these years, only the campaign 'Take it to the people'.
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up in 1997. From this way was used it is clear that this Committee had power – a far cry from the old national committee. In itself, this is an indication of how few anarchists were still involved organisationally by now, and how far the Northern Network had declined. In 1997 an AFA Action Network officially formed members from associating with Searchlight – and, in 1998, Leeds and Liverpool AFA was expunged by the new Committee, officially for ignoring this policy. 17. Expulsions didn’t stop the decline. There were some local re- 
tracings – eg Liverpool in 2000. But by 2001 AFA was a national organisation hardly existed.

Red Action’s analysis, back in 1994, was that, unless AFA adapted to the new BNP strategy, a struggle ‘would’ wither and die. AFA was geared for confrontation. Without confrontation AFA – as it then was – would have no sense of existence. It is clear that the re- 
tracings were created for this purpose – anti-police unions, strike support groups etc – usually came to exist once the struggle was gone. Despite efforts by some activists to keep things 
going and to generalise the struggles. So, this Red Action analysis was either 
right or a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Tactics Stagnate? It seems as if the decline in AFA nationally has been too slow to the JWCA. Apart from the refusal of many AFA 
activists to be hoodwinked into a strategy they disagreed with, the redaction of the energy of an important section of AFA into a new organisation, would, of itself, have made less time for keeping AFA going. But there were definitely other factors. If a tactic is made too easy then the declination eventually comes as. This happened with the ‘Stop the City’ days in the early

The JWCA today

So what about the JWCA today? Times have moved on. There are two types of question:

1. How do we change the JWCA’s strategic vision for building a working class movement?

2. How do we turn the JWCA into an anti-fascist organisation?

The first question is really beyond the scope of this article. Briefly, however, the JWCA has shown that, in some areas at least, it is still possible to organise and to maintain a core base, from more or less nothing, that can be turned into sizeable votes at election time. The conclusion on immediate working class struggles to support are not good. That community activists could learn from.

The second part of this question has some ideas.

With a view to the JWCA’s natural progression from aogy?

1. No search for the new committee is rather a struggle for national AFA organisation.

2. AFA public contact list had over 50 groups spread across Britain in 1996. The strongest Red Action groups used to be London, Manchester, and Glasgow. The JWCA made a strong showing in North London (London, Manchester and Glasgow (Stufebridge) council by-elections in 2000, which are nothing if not a test of the strength of a national movement. The JWCA, especially in North London (London is still the one place in the UK where AFA is considered to be a real political force), must be taken seriously.

The JWCA was strong in North London. AFA had this strength for a while but now is not even a presence in all areas.

Where now for anti fascist activism?

The JWCA may be many things but it’s not a national whole united socialist organisation. There is a need for an independent political force that can do the job. More importantly, this can be a struggle. Things are very different now when – AFA started, CPC centralised street work (and did a great job) was very much the AFA was much more rough and nascent type. Indeed, it was a tactic that the JWCA’s anti-fascist strategy.
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I have been involved in the anarchist movement since the mid-1960s, I came into a movement that appeared to be active and on the up. This vitality seemed to be accentuated by the forthcoming events of 1968. British anarchism seemed to be coming into its own, in a way not seen since before the First World War.

As I write, I have before me a photostat of the inside front page of Freedom from 26th October 1968. The day before a large contingent of anarchists, numbering several hundreds had marched under the flags of black and red and black banners on the massive demonstration against the Vietnam War. Under the heading Anarchist Federation of Britain there is a list of active groups or groups, with federations in Wales, Scotland, London, and Bristol at their head. The movement against the war, the campaign for nuclear disarmament, and the direct action campaigns had all reached a new level. The movement against the war, the campaign for nuclear disarmament, and the direct action campaigns had all reached a new level.

The events of Hungary 1956 were to have an even greater effect. The shift of leadership of the Communist Party and the gradual establishment of the new leaders. The movement against the war, the campaign for nuclear disarmament, and the direct action campaigns had all reached a new level.

It was the intersection of the two different groups which eventually provided both the core for the forthcoming increasing radicalisation and the base of the new groups of the extreme Left which were born or strengthened around this time. The Co-Exist! leadership of the Labour Party had justified their political and the fundamentalism of the class struggle and the apparent arrogance of the working class, The Tory leader Macmillan’s remarks that the British people “had never had it so good” epitomised this period of relative class peace and stability. A revolt, often inclusive and unarticulated, among young people against this complex repression was attracted to this new movement.

Involvement in action and debate and a wide variety of political views, many before encountered by these new activists meant at the broadest level, numbers of them providing the base for local Labour Party campaigns for the victory of Harold Wilson as leader of the Labour Party and the victory of the local Labour candidates. The second wave was the first larger number of young people whose first political experience was CND/CND and for whom the initial enthusiasm for the election victory of Wilson had been replaced by bitter disappointment. This disappointment was expressed in a rejection of orthodox politics, but it was often couched in extreme moralistic positions. It was one of the latter.

This sudden growth of the anarchist movement would have been possible only if the early experience of May 1968 of the dramatic increase of political militancy had not been a warning that the old political organizations were not capable of addressing these new challenges.

The second wave was the first large number of young people whose first political experience was CND/CND and for whom the initial enthusiasm for the election victory of Wilson had been replaced by bitter disappointment. This disappointment was expressed in a rejection of orthodox politics, but it was often couched in extreme moralistic positions.

The second wave was the first large number of young people whose first political experience was CND/CND and for whom the initial enthusiasm for the election victory of Wilson had been replaced by bitter disappointment. This disappointment was expressed in a rejection of orthodox politics, but it was often couched in extreme moralistic positions.
I have been involved in the anarchist movement since the mid-1960s. I came into a movement that appeared to be active and on the up. This vitality seemed to be accentuated by the forthcoming events in May 1968. British anarcho-syndicalism seemed to be coming into its own, and was not seen since before the First World War.

As I write, I have before me a photocopy of the inside front page of Freedom from 26th October 1968, the day before a large contingent of anarchists, numbering several hundreds, had marched under the banner of black and red flags, and a massive demonstration against the Vietnam War. Under the banner Anarchist Federation, of Britain, was a list of those three groups or groups with federations in Wales, Scotland, Ulster and South East, with a number of state groups.

Also, the view of all of this was far from the past. A slightly more mature and sober look at the Anarchist Federation of Britain reveals that it was a house of straw, soon to be blown to the ground by the Big Red Wolf of unfolding political events. Albert Meltzer comments: 'The looseness of structure of the Anarchist Federation of the late sixties is a phenomenon that was revisited in the early sixties - led to its disintegration into unrepresentative conferences, at which anyone could attend.' (The Anarchists in London 1935-1955)

Stuart Christie in his 'Edward Heath Made Me Angry' remarks that the AFB 'wasn't really a federation at all, more an ad hoc body convened for a particular purpose then disbanded again'.

This was indeed the reality of the AFB and its conferences, several of which I attended. The anarchist movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s, if one can judge from the pages of the Freedom of the time, appeared to be more cohesive and theologically united than was later the case. A small number of people were involved and, as I have been drawn, were involved in these meetings, which were mostly held in London. If this movement sometimes appeared unruly, exclusive and secretive, this may at least be due to the repression of the post-war years (the trial of the War Commentary editors) as isolation of the movement.

The events of Hungary 1956 were to have an effect in the shift of intellectuals and others out of the Communist Party and the gradual establishment of the New Left. The movement against the Bomb, expressed in the campaign For Nuclear Disarmament and the Direct Action Committee which later transformed into the Committee of 60, attracted another number of those extraparliamentary militants and increasing layers of disaffected young people. This struck a blow with the preceding period of 'pathy' used by the old Left to explain lack of movement within the workers class. The Gallicisation leadership of the Labour Party had justified their politics with the commodification of the class struggle and the apparent encouragement of the working class. The Tory leader Macmillan's remarks that the British people 'had never had its so good' epitomised this period of relative class peace and stability. A revolt, often inclusive and unarticulated, among young people against this complex system was attracted to this new movement.

Involvement in action and debate and a wide variety of political views, many before encountered by these new activists meant at the broadest level numbers of them providing the base for local Labour Parties to campaign for the victory of Harold Wilson as leader of the Labour Party and ultimately as Prime Minister in 1964.

The direct action tactics of the CND influenced others as the threat of The Bomb was replaced by a realisation that the problem lay in the nature and scale of capitalism. Many were still trapped in single issue politics, and were well-emphasised of the concept of non-violence, elevated to an abstract concept rather than a practical, exposed politics.

It was the interaction between the two different groups which eventually provided both the core for the forthcoming increasing radicalisation and the base of the new groups of the extreme. Left that were born or strengthened around this time. The CND proved to be a school of radicalism, whilst some of the broader layers, who had gone into the Labour Party or the Young Communist League (youth wing of the Communist Party) had become more disillusioned with these groups.

The small anarchist movement had not ignored the new movement. In fact many working class anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists had either left or entered other many local groups like for instance the Hackney Anarchist Group, the Manchester Anarchists and the Brighton Anarchists, who were very active.

It was no surprise that many who had been initially attracted to anarchism were deterred by its chronic disorganisation and lack of effectiveness. Some of these turned to groups like International Socialist Union (successor of the Socialist Workers Party) and the International Marxist Group. Digger Walsh, active in the Black Flag group of the period, was to be quoted in a national paper as lamenting the fact that the militants had gone over to the Trotskyists.

'Disillusioned local activity: often moving from one issue to another without ever even create a local programme of work over a period, characterise our practice. In the event of a degree of small scale organisation e.g. squatters (1966 and 1968) etc. The errors of the AFB. Another group that emerged within the AFB was the Organisation of Revolutionary Anarchists (ORA) originally conceived as a ginger group within the AFB. It argued for formal membership organisation and structure. I remember being involved in writing a leaflet produced by Briggington Anarchists for an AFB conference at the Townshend Hall in the East End of London that argued against such ideas and put forward the counter-argument that an organisation would emerge but as the result of natural organic growth of local groups starting up and eventually federating.

The increasing frustration with the procedural and ritualistic and vulgar humanism that both groups estranged themselves from the AFB, which was a basically socialist and tendentious decline. The AFA ran out of steam pretty quickly, whilst the ORA seemed to be full of dynamism and drive and able to produce a monthly paper that both reported on struggles in industry, amongst the unemployed and the squatters movement, and made a goal attempt at forming a working class history and as well as theory. The ORA had started moving away from the swamping as a result of the dockers and miners struggles and the influence of French libertarian communists.

In the pamphlet I quoted above you can read that: 'The AFB would not have attained their size and influence such as it is if a decent libertarian organisation had existed, it is a university history and theory of libertarian and Leonhard groups. The attempt by Cliffe (sic) to complete the AFB by contact and advice was of no real benefit. The result was this alliance increasingly unstable. But we do have any capacity to attract these
The Angry Brigade activities were meant as a protest against the actions of the movement and had overestimated its revolutionary capabilities.

Alongside these developments in the early 1980s, two new movements were more or less unaligned with the Angry Brigade actions. The general illusion that there was a mass movement capable of carrying out a revolution, common in many quarters, led these libertarian activists to challenge the notion that anarchism could be an effective strategy for the working class. The Angry Brigade activities were meant to provoke a mass movement and had overestimated its revolutionary capabilities. The Black Flag group itself had many more major critiques of the failure of the AFB. However, promised and much heralded, the group had failed to materialize. In fact, the Black Flag Group aligned themselves with the Angry Brigade through unions and other left-wing organizations in the pages of its journal.

Of course, the humanist and pacific elements that rejected class struggle continued to peddle their form of radical libertarianism within the pages of Freedom and Anarchy. Like libertarianism, it was one of its principal aims. Collective responsibility exercises itself in two ways towards and downwards. It makes an obligation of the individual to explain their acts to the collective, for the latter to explain their acts before the individual.

We were the stop the City demonstrantarians in 1954, which involved an alliance of anarchists, pacifists, ecologists and anti-establishment political activists. We were both exciting and inventive. We challenged the apathy and inertia of the period and the restrictions placed on us, and we must make every effort to reach out beyond the ghetto of activists. We were beginning to question this and argue that we had to go beyond the Stop Business As Usual and try to engage the public in the workplace and community.

The Great Minor Strikes of 1984 was a challenge for this movement as the Wapping dispute that followed shortly after. Some refused to be involved. As one said, "I am sorry all our aims and dreams are now seen in the eyes of class struggle...playing the capitalist money game." (The Broom, June 1986).

Others discovered that the class struggle roots of anarchism and reinforced the small class struggle anarchist movement. To its credit Black Flag advanced itself during both the miners strike and during Wapping. For a while it took on a fairly significant role in pages over extensive reporting of the struggles, moving away from its standard presentation model for investigative journalism and "armed struggle". In this way it performed a useful function. But even the most ardent would agree that most of these failed to offer a credible anarchist alternative and held fire on the Staghill leadership of the miners strike.

Despite the defeat of these struggles, class struggle anarchism was reinforced. The Direct Action Movement successor to the SWP welcomed many new members to the extent that it became the biggest anarchist organization within membership of 50. But again with the SWP in the 60s, it had problems with members of the Trotskyist movement. As a strategy, it advanced the classic anarchist tactic of building revolutionary organizations to the here and now but failed to get a grip with the reality of the workplace. Class War, which had resonated as a group in the 70s, was at a paper of the same name in the mid 80s transformed itself into the Class War Federation (CWF) in 1986. The latter group was born as a banner of the old SWP, which rejected the pacifist, humanist, and hippie that were dominant tendencies in Britain at the time. It represented a healthy kick up the arse of that movement. Again, like the Stop the War Coalition, it paved the way towards class struggle for the 21st century. It gathered towards organizational solutions in its development of a Federation. But it was trapped in a populism that was sometimes crude, and in a search for roots that would bring it satisfying attention to the media. In its search for such publicity, it went so far as to immerse itself in populist electoralism with its involvement in the Kennington by-election. These contradictions were eventually to lead to the break-up of the old CWF, which was offering a sometimes trenchant critique of their own political up to that time. However, some organizational alternative was offered beyond a conference in Bradford that attempted to reach out to other anarchists and to offer an organizational alternative approach at unity of those seriously interested in advancing the movement. Also, some moves were stillborn and many of those who had offered critiques of the old ways of organizing dropped out of activity altogether. A ramp remained that had carried on maintaining Class War as both a group and a paper in the same old way.

Other groups that emerged in the aftermath of the Minor Strikes were the Anarchist Communist Federation (ACF) and the Anarchist Workers Group (AWG). The former had its roots in Virus magazine that had begun appearing during the course of the Miners Strike and in the AWA/LCG of the 70s. It offered organizational resources, as it was an alternative group of anarchists committed to the class struggle. At first, it adopted Platformist positions but over the years moved further and further away from a doctrinaire Platformism, to the extent that it now talked of the Platform as one of several reference points for its politics. It, from the first, made a number of appeals for united actions with other class struggle anarchist groups, appeal that in the main fell on deaf ears. It had to construct an organization beyond a skeleton framework of small groups. And the AWG emerged from the DSA in 1986, and pulled in a few people who had left the CWA and the ACF. It rejected the mistakes of the ORA/AAW in its leftism (including its support for Trotskyist liberation struggles) and its rank and file movement, which had been another characteristic of that organization. It was far more confederatist than the ORA/AAW in the way that it related to the movement, and had far less longevity and level of activity. Again, as with other organizations, it attracted a number of activists, some of them ex-CP, who had no real understanding of anarchism and failed to go beyond leftism. It had criticized other anarchist organizations for failing to educate their new members and thus developing a two-tier system of experienced militants and raw new members. This did not fail to help. It thought that it alone could offer a solution to the problems of the movement. Like the ORA it imploded. This time there were none left to carry on, all its members dispersing into Trotskyist groups or disappearing into inactivity. One of the greatest mistakes it made was its support...
"The Angry Brigade activities were meant as a response to the actions of the mass movement. However, they had failed to understand the nature of this movement and had overestimated its revolutionary capabilities."
for the Saddam regime against the Americans in the first Gulf War on apocalyptic "anti-imperialist" grounds. Parallel to the development within the anarchist movement had been the emergence of the libertarian socialist organisation Solidarity, which had been created by ex-members of the Socialist Labour League in 1970. Solidarity had also become involved in the anti-racist movement via the Industrial Solidarity Committee of Croydon. Like the best anarchists, Solidarity had refused to endorse "non-violence" and had participated in the peace movement, "because it was the only place where direct action was being carried out". Solidarity was a theoretical engine room for the whole libertarian movement worldwide. The natural fear of the organisation after the experiences of the SLP meant that it was back to down in offering organisational alternatives to the SS, which had many very trenchant criticisms.

"We have to start thinking outside of the boxes of our little groups, and we have to start thinking big. We must start growing and growing up.

Looking back, it would have been useful if closer ties could have been developed between Solidarity and the different elements of left-wing politics, so that such activity could have intensified. Some joint work of this nature did take place in the 1960s, notably the London Solidarity Movement (in which libertarians worked together). But mutual suspicion, the magnifying of ideological differences and the failure to recognise shared viewpoints had their role to play in the failure of the libertarian movement of the period to construct a credible alternative to Leninism. 

Alongside the development of national organisations were various attempts at local and regional coordination. The libertarian upsurge of the 60s led not just to the growth of organisations but also the development of a number of groups. Some of these groups were a microcosm of the old AFB - class-struggle anarchists petrol-polluting, individualists and lifestyles. A development occurred in those groups - partly in response to the need for different activities of the class-struggle anarchist organisations - which resulted in the formation of specifically class-struggle anarchist groups. These groups were to lesser or greater extent limited by a parish pump anarchism which made them wary of national organisation to which they considered local and at best regional organisation. This of the attempts by local groups to construct regional federations as with the Scottish Solidarity Movement, the Scottish Liberation Federation and the Midlands Anarchist Network - were to be long-lasting. But attempts to federate the local groups on a national basis. The local groups were often also crippled by a suspicion of theory, an anarcho-realist which meant moving from the issue of one day to the issue of the next - all of this alongside an unwillingness to look at relevant organisational solutions.

Today we have a movement where a number of organisations exist as more as cliques than anything else. The original intention of uniting and organising the movement has ended in these organisations becoming too isolated from each other and from the rest of society. The crisis of Leninism has deepened, but what should have been a golden opportunity for British anarchism has not been effectively capitalised upon. Where before local groups had many or few members, a number of local groups have emerged. Will we repeat the mistakes of the predecessors and remain trapped in localism, to be epiphenomenal creations to be remembered by few?

Looking back after almost 40 years of anarchist activity, it would be excusable to feel dejected. The same mistakes have often been more repeated and carried on decade after decade. Indeed, the lack of continuity in the movement means that these same mistakes are often committed again. New forms of conformism have emerged within the anarchist movement, in particular individualism and institutionalism, and in many ways new forms of the old individualistic scoundrel. (In fact, these currently seem to be more prevalent in as with the new local and national organisations. But on the positive side, class-struggle anarchism appears to have strengthened itself within the British movement. New groups have appeared in a number of places. Some of these groups were a microcosm of the old AFB - class-struggle anarchists

porting pacifists, individualists and lifestyles. A development occurred in those groups - partly in response to the need for different activities of the class-struggle anarchist organisations - which resulted in the formation of specifically class-struggle anarchist groups. These groups were to lesser or greater extent limited by a parish pump anarchism which made them wary of national organisation to which they considered local and at best regional organisation. This of the attempts by local groups to construct regional federations as with the Scottish Solidarity Movement, the Scottish Liberation Federation and the Midlands Anarchist Network - were to be long-lasting. But attempts to federate the local groups on a national basis. The local groups were often also crippled by a suspicion of theory, an anarcho-realist which meant moving from the issue of one day to the issue of the next - all of this alongside an unwillingness to look at relevant organisational solutions.

Today we have a movement where a number of organisations exist as more as cliques than anything else. The original intention of uniting and organising the movement has ended in these organisations becoming too isolated from each other and from the rest of society. The crisis of Leninism has deepened, but what should have been a golden opportunity for British anarchism has not been effectively capitalised upon. Where before local groups had many or few members, a number of local groups have emerged. Will we repeat the mistakes of the predecessors and remain trapped in localism, to be epiphenomenal creations to be remembered by few?

Looking back after almost 40 years of anarchist activity, it would be excusable to feel dejected. The same mistakes have often been more repeated and carried on decade after decade. Indeed, the lack of continuity in the movement means that these same mistakes are often committed again. New forms of conformism have emerged within the anarchist movement, in particular individualism and institutionalism, and in many ways new forms of the old individualistic scoundrel. (In fact, these currently seem to be more prevalent in as with the new local and national organisations. But on the positive side, class-struggle anarchism appears to have strengthened itself within the British movement. New groups have appeared in a number of places. Some of these groups were a microcosm of the old AFB - class-struggle anarchists
for the Saddam regime against the Americans in the first Gulf War was eminently "anti-imperialist" ground. Parallel to the development within the anarchic movement had been the emergence of the libertarian socialist organisation Solidarity, which had been created by ex-members of the Socialist Labour League in 1966. Solidarity had also become involved in the anti-war movement via the Industrial Sub-Committee of Cio, like the best anarchists. Solidarity had refused to endorse "non-violence" and had participated in the peace movement, "because it was the only place where direct action was being carried out." Solidarity was a theoretical engine room for the other libertarian movements. It quite natural fears of developing as an organisation after the experience of the SLL meant that it was line-strangely in offering options to the 15, of which it had many very trenchant criticisms.

"We have to start thinking outside of the boxes of our little groupings, and we have to start thinking big. We must start growing and growing up.'

Looking back, it would have been useful if closer ties could have been developed between Solidarity and the different elements of the peace movement, so that joint activity could have intensified. Some joint work of this nature did take place during the war. Some groups, for instance the ATW, attempted in East London, e.g., via the East London Libertarian Federation and fed on to the 1966-67 occupy movement (via which libertarians worked together). But mutual suspicions, the magnifying of ideological differences and the futility to recognize shared viewpoints had their role in play in the failure of the libertarian movement of the period to construct a credible alternative to Leninism. Alongside the development of national organisations were various attempts at a local and regional coordination. The libertarian upsurge of the 80s led not just to the growth of organisations but the development of a number of groupings. Some of these groups were a microcosm of the old AFA - class-struggle anarchists lobbying pacifists, individualists and lifestyles. A development occurred in those groups - partly in response to ideas generated by class-struggle anarchist organisations - which resulted in the formation of specifically class-struggle anarchist groups. These groups were to a lesser or greater extent limited by a purity paranoia which made them wary of national organisations to which they considered or local and at best regional organisations.

In the attempt by the local groups to construct regional federations - as with the Northern Anarchist Network of the 80s, the Class Struggle Anarchist Network, the Scottish Libertarian Federation and the Midland Anarchist Network - were to be long-lasting. Not only were attempts to federate the local groups on a national basis. The local groups were often also crippled by a suspicion of theory, an sectarian mindset which meant moving from the issue of one day to the issue of the next - all of this alongside an unwillingness to look at coherent organisational solutions.

Today we have a movement where a number of organisations exist more as cliques than anything else. The original intention of networking and organizing the movement has ended in these organisations becoming for all intents and purposes independent of each other and from what passed for a movement. The crisis of Leninism has deepened, but what should have been a golden opportunity for British anarchism has not been sufficiently capitalised upon. Where before local groups had more or less, the same number of local groups in the same areas and in the same cities. Will these repeat the mistakes of their predecessors and remain trapped in localism to be ephemeral creations to be remembered by few.

Looking back after almost 40 years of anarcho-concentration, it would be useless to feel dejected. The same mistakes have often been repeated even 10 years later. Indeed, the lack of continuity in the movement means that there are no mistakes or AFA committees committed again. New forms of confusion and thought have emerged within the anarchist movement, in particular compartmentalism and incomprehension. From this we have to learn the lesson that both those disillusioned by Leninism and the newly radicalised youth are young enough to commit even again. A new revolution at the Labour government. We have to draw back into the movement those discouraged (or, in the past, by the heartbreaking failure of our movement. From many ways creased forms of the old individualist source. In fact these countries seem to be converging, as with the recent elections to the European Parliament. But on the positive side, class-struggle anarchism appears to have strengthened itself within the British libertarian movement to a certain extent. Some new local anarchist groups have emerged and emerged out to be a complementary but growing need. We should have the opportunity of joining together in a more coherent and active local group. It's more than the chance to start discussing these concerns. Dick Heath

The question of means and ends can be scrutinised on both the levels of theoretical identity and practical consequences. It entails a close relationship between these two different approaches, especially in the (theoretical) realm of principal politics. My aim here is primarily to briefly outline the fundamental ideological positions and political problems with regards to this critical debate, as well as the outcomes of its possible evolution.

A "sensible" means cannot be based on a generalized question "in the ends justify the means?". The real dilemma is, rather, whether this particular end justifies the particular means. The general answer can be traced to the basic tenet of utilitarianism: "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," (Jeremy Bentham, and what does that mean for the majority? However, although this is the basic approximation to the democratic political ideal there are at least two dangers that must accompany this utilitarian calculus of pleasure and pain. Firstly, determining what this "greatest happiness" actually is can only be a complex and daunting matter. Those claiming that they have successfully grasped the idea have sometimes used the principle as a dogmatic rule for establishing their own theories and arguments and subjects in the name of "The People". Secondly, there is an intense risk of creating a "tyranny of the majority" based on a simplification of this approach. A sexual minority deemed "perverted" by the general population can, for instance, be seen as an obstacle to "the happiness of the greatest number". If this happiness is (superficially and stylistically understood) of course. Despite the common misconception which associates tyranny of the majority with republicatory democracy, this type of "meritocracy" is primarily a form of total authoritarianism which in the form of dominant elites politically implement the people's lack of genuine democratic culture. Capitalism has no "higher end". Under capitalism and class rule in general, there is a fundamental and means and ends compatibility. Class rule is both a means and an end - monopoly and domination serves to ensure profit-making, which in turn serves proletrary to permeate and strengthen this monopoly and domination. There is a "higher end" in capitalism. However, this system contains a sharp and dynamic break from the previous, largely static epochs. In many ways it is a historically revolutionary era in which the political revolution has been achieved. If we are to perceive the (Dr. Tausen's) observation (especially in the first part of the "Communist Manifesto"). In its "free trade", nationalization and exploitation of the moral, he saw the most conducive to the development of the forces of production, which are a basic precondition for the birth of a higher social order. In this most glittering moments capitalism is self-destructive. From this perspective even Maitland's "Prison", seen as a classical example of the idea that the end justifies the means, has a certain redeeming potential. His monarchicalism was largely based on the unification of Italy (what was later to become known as "Risorgimento") against feudal limitations. It was frustrated transcending itself. "The Discourses," on the basis of a function such as a considerably less ambiguous progressive effort, introducing the principles of republicanism and civic order: important elements of nascent capitalism. One person's totalitarianism... The most important idea about the relationship between the means and the ends is, in the present times concerning nascent anticapitalist politics. I believe outlining some of the vital points made by Saul D. Already in his famous "Rules for Radicals" might shed more light on this subject. Firstly, he contends that "one's concern with the ethics of means and ends varies inversely with one's distance from the scene of conflict." The judgement must be made in the context, a particular place and time in which the action occurred. One person's "terrorism" (remember Margaret Thatcher's characterisation of Nelson Mandela's "involuntary actions") are often another's "freedom-fighters." Capitalism's "industry of consciousness" (mass media, politics, academia...) has always utilised common ethical principles in order to demonise the rebels that the ruling elites were against, playing on people's fears, propagating their differences and obscurities (especially with regards to class, nationalistic, religious and racial divisions). Alas! further claims that the concern with the ethics of means and ends increases with the number of means and ends available. A prominent example is Lenin's abandonment of the project of "war communism" and the introduction of the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921. Soviet Union was ruled by the civil war and foreign intervention (approximately ten million people died in the war and from famine). The economy was devastated. Bolsheviks faced growing discontent from the peasantry (who was too large to ignore) and the workers (whose independent action threatened the
dominance of the party leadership, and were therefore brutally crushed.

Thirdly, Almkvist emphasizes that, from a historical perspective, ideas or theories strongly influence the external outlook. "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been in the hands of the party in power," History is written by the victors as the saying goes.

Self defence or self indulgence?

The most important consideration should be given to the difference between self-defence and self-indulgence of the dominant class.
The defence of London during the bombardings of the French army and the German people lived up to the standards of the Allied forces, or the persecution (ethnic cleansing) of the German population from what is now western Poland, Silesia or Upper Silesia.
Parliamentary resistance in France or Yugoslavia cannot be morally equated with their merciless revenge following the defeat of fascists and their collaborators.

Another point we should bear in mind is that the "great traditions" with which are selected largely depends upon the character of the opposition. It is evident that, for example, the support of national corporations and military opponents should be identical, and that there are also big differences between corporate soldiers (citizens in arms) and the military allies (professional soldiers and mercenaries who perceive their military activity as a career; they have less or no connection with the domestic population, are better trained, more accountable, more brainwashed etc.). The implications of these variations are much more intricate and dubious, and no amount of conventional wisdom can fully help us to find a solution.

Finally, Almkvist notes that any effective means are automatically judged by the opposition since they are often made illegal. As J. Rowse succinctly put it in his Social Contract: "Law is a very good thing for men with property, and a very bad thing for men without property." It is illustrative that, while not authorized by the union leadership ("union strikes") they are not considered illegal. There is certainly some truth in the popular anarchist saying: "If voting could change anything, they'd make it illegal."

Revolutionary transition

The question of revolutionary transition is a major debate (largely overlapping) that have particularly occupied the attention of political scientists and others. This problem of revolutionary transition and the question of revolutionary violence.

Put simply, the problem of revolutionary transition has historically been marked by the essential conflict between the revolutionary goals of the working class and the methods used to achieve them, with the revolutionary process being driven by the historical and political conditions of the state as opposed to the libertarian communist conception of the "abolition of the state" as advanced from below.
The basic libertarian socialist claim made by Marx (and Karl Kautsky before him) that "the emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself." Lenin’s conception of the dictatorship in the name of the proletariat (manipulatively called "the dictatorship of the proletariat") and the methods used to carry through the historically centralized role of the Bolshevik Party and the class struggle have only been seen, for example, in Hungary (the "Kronstadt rebellion"). Although they

violence in Michael Bakunin, who seems to have somewhat romanticized destruction and illegality. "The urge to destruction," he wrote, is the "highest" goal of the proletarian revolution. The strain of thought often resulted in nihilism, for example "propaganda of the deed," i.e. "sacrificing a good person in order to make the people aware of the necessity of political revolution.

A more nuanced and analytical approach was offered by the "cynical" Marxist like Georg Lukács who, in his History and Class Consciousness criticized both the romanticism of illegality and the acceptance of the bourgeois-liberal standpoint. Efforts to link with regards to approaching the ultimate revolutionary goal (while recognizing the specifics of the concrete situation) have been made by Lenin (and Trotsky).

In early modern times, beginning with the American bourgeoisie Adain Ballou, Henry David Thoreau and William Lloyd Garrison, who later influenced Leo Tolstoy's Christians pacifism, the idea of nonviolence resistance existed in a rather abstract "enlightenment" context. It found more pragmatic expression in Gandhi's and his colleagues' relatively successful methods of non-cooperation and nonviolent action (boycott, strikes, satyagraha etc.). However, due to its doctrine of "passive resistance", the theory of the advantage of direct struggle, he failed to prevent traditionalists from "ruin" of which the voluntary action, including himself which finally led to mass religious and communal strike between Hindus and Muslims (no non-Muslims in India being a major cause) with millions killed and many more forced to flee from their homes.

Near to the same time the Danish reformist Theodor Gramsc's "antimilitarist" Bart de Ligt earned his reputation as a proponent of more radical social change. This radicalism, unmerited factory occupations, acts of diversion, sabotage and the general strike, theoretical approach, although from a peaceful and revolutionary alternative to conventional armed struggle. As well as believing that violence encourages authorities or a revolutionary social conscience, and not by the doctrines of the "rules of the game" in which one party controls all the other, a movement against the social solidarity of the state. Already in 1933, long before technological developments such as robots and nuclear weapons that are different from the earlier under the framework of the European "2 Future Combat Systems" programme, Ralph Chronin of the Industrial Workers of the World stressed the need for the creation of creative new kind of military which would adapt to the charging characteristics of the capitalist system. Similarly to de Ligt, his answer to both reformists and arms inspectors was the strategy of a revolutionary general strike (including unarmed factory occupations), enforced by the authority of power which claims that workers can "hold their areas and the world will stop working".

Embracing the experiences of relatively successful armed resistance at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century (particularly the "violent revolutions" in

Revolution in Eastern Europe

(barely) won the Civil War and (partly) defeated the foreign interventionist forces (largely due to Soviet Union's geographical position and with the help of Ukrainian anarchists and peasant militias, but also the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk). Stalin managed to take over after Lenin's death in the party's control. Trotsky himself led practically all the members of the old revolutionary guard (with the notable exception of Aleksandra Kollontai) and qualitatively and qualitatively advancing the reign of terror. Those who make revolution have only way to dig their own graves" howled the prophecy of the Jacobin leader Saint-Just. The ensuing years seem to further support: Michael Bakunin's claim that "dictatorships tend to perceive themselves as armies.

There have been some attempts to develop a modified revolutionary platform conducive both to radical democracy ("socialism from below") and disciplined party structure and more classical political activity ("socialism from above") led by Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht in Europe, Daniel De Leon, one of the founders of the WWP and the Social Labor Party in the USA as well as James Connolly in Ireland in a somewhat more syndicalist manner.

These efforts failed to take a stronger root.

Violent or non violent struggle

The approaches to the question of revolutionary violence can be separated into three basic block: proponents of violent struggle, "cynical" Marxist and proponents of nonviolent struggle.

One of the most famed proponents of
dominance of the party leadership, and were therefore brutally crushed.

Thirdly, Alinsky emphasizes that, for a historical perspective, new or old ideas strongly influence the ethical outlook. The "living ideas of the day" are morally equated with the xenoterroristic bombing of Dresden (not for, in fact, the bombing of Tokyo, Hamburg, and Berlin by the Allies' forces, or the persecution (ethnic cleansing) of the German population from what is now western Poland, Slovenia, or Yugoslavia). The former cannot be morally equated with their previous role following the defeat of fascists and their collaborators.

Another point we should bear in mind is that the "living ideas of the day" are selected largely depends upon the character of the opposition. It is evident that, for example, the domestic and foreign policies of military opponents should not be identical, and that there are big differences between conscript soldiers (citizens in voluntary and involuntary) and the standing army (professional soldiers and mercenaries who perceive their military activity as a career; they have less or no experience with the domestic population, are better trained, less accountable, more brainwashed, etc.). The implications of these variations are much more intense and dubious, and no amount of conventional wisdom can fully help us in this task.

Finally, Alinsky notes that any effective means are automatically judged by the opposition and consequently are often rejected as illegal, as if it were a new Miguel. It is illustrative that strikes are not authorized by the union leadership ("professional strikers") are therefore considered criminal by the military, and there is some truth in the popular anarchist saying if voting could change anything, they would make it illegal.

Revolutionary transition

The decision to put forward such debates (largely overlapping) that have particularly occurred the attention of political scientists and philosophers, as well as the problem of revolutionary transition and the question of revolutionary violence.

Put simply, the problem of revolutionary transition has historically been marked by the existential conflict between the "revolutionary" and "working class," which was based on the notion of "revolutionary" dictatorship and a very general definition of the state as opposed to the libertarian communist conception of the "abolition of the state." The basic libertarian socialist view is that "the state is a combination of things that make misery."

The "real" violence that has been committed by Marxists (and sometimes even the bourgeoisie) can be seen as a combination of things that make misery. Marxists have often been accused of being responsible for the death of millions of people. However, the idea of revolutionary violence is a concept that is often viewed with suspicion by the ruling class. Despite this, the history of revolutionary violence is a complex and often contradictory one.

Violent or non-violent struggle

The approach to the question of revolutionary violence can be separated into three basic blocks: proponents of violent struggle, "circuit-breakers," and proponents of non-violent struggle.

One of the most famed proponents of violent struggle is Michael Bakunin, who seems to have somewhat romanticized destruction and illegality. The urge to destroy the existing order was a direct consequence of the strain of thought often resulted in nihilism, or simply "propaganda of the deed," i.e., "sabotage," which at some point came to be defined as some form of political violence. Although they may have been carried out through the highly centralized rule of the Bolshevik Party and the cruel suppression of dissent, as a result of the "Kremlin rebellion," it is clear that the basic libertarian socialist view is that "the state is a combination of things that make misery."
Guerrilla Marketing.

We all know somebody desperately trying to get attention for their cause. Whether slapping around the биле at speakers' corners or shoving crudely xeroxed flyers under windscreen wipers, getting the word out without stooping to using money seldom achieves critical mass.

Stories of grassroots publicity successes or clever (and priceless) headline grabbers like Fathers 4 Justice and British hunting supporters are usually the exception that proves the rule. The general public's attention is a commodity traded on by global corporations and cutting through this monopoly requires a strategic effort.

So how do you reach the masses? Those people walking up and down the streets all day. Your agenda might be just the only thing missing from their lives. Why would somebody who doesn't agree with you go to the trouble of talking to your party or subscribing to your newsletter? Reaching the general public has been necessary for the last half a century, ever since computers were the releasing of the word's hopeful inspiration, making John Swallow, bureaucratic dinosaurs like public attention, except maybe for public scrutiny and pc outrage. And, for a public more indifferent than the world has ever seen, getting up to hear, let alone accept, new ideas requires militant precision.

To be guaranteed by the twenty gage of attention and authority, the nice people who own the world's stocks use a cleverly named little industry called public relations. Think of it as the American version of the public relations firms. Here's how it works: You call up the PR firm and they agree to do a certain amount of work for a certain amount of money. The PR firm then goes out and does the work, which may include writing press releases or preparing speeches for you.

Before deciding on how to get attention, you have to create a concise message. This is what people will find out before they even know you exist. It will get noted into either the 'yes' or 'no' column in their brain - as it must encompass everything you believe, but in a concise and non-threatening way. How many articles, anecdotes, flyers and websites do you dismiss because they don't seem aimed at you? Whether tuning into sports, car insurance or Christianity - flyers that talk to me if I am already on their side get ignored. In the same way, communiques and press releases that seem to exclude too many people are disregarded. This is because the general public need to be intrigued, not convinced. Challenging their preconceptions requires the same kind of skill as giving antibiotics to a dog. Your message must be wrapped in a delicious slice of compelling or eye-catching bollix. As a guerrilla, you will have to think of this message as the soothing balm for the eyes of your audience.

The mainstream media is the packaging. It's a way of putting your central message within the media-friendly, superficial brain candy. Being too direct can drive away the media, and often just hearing the name of your cause or organisation will inform the right people that you exist. This means that often, you can gain media coverage by getting the media more of what it likes, round-the-clock, insightful, plain, something that seems almost too obvious. Look into the mainstream outlets (newspaper) that are read by people who are likely to agree with you. Get a feel for the kind of stories they seem to like for. Some like public opinion polls (easily obtained on the internet or the street). Others want spectacular images. Most just want something related to the current news cycle but with a different angle. However, it is always about more of the same. Vapid but necessary.

You can play the game up to this point to surprise yourself with the amount of attention your ideas receive. It's the only way to win. It's how the world is fed in a brain which is 98% water. What is new information is the appearance of public support, pretty girls and social media. And, with usually descriptive and interrelated content, the process can be used for social change.

Think of 'your' book or 'angle' as the batman costume your put on your story. It's what dressing up your material in intrigue and novelty to quickly grab and hold attention. This also requires that you are sticking fairly closely to the trend of stories the journalist usually discusses. You will angle or 'spin' your story differently depending on the different audiences. This is also a great way to get attention in surprising publics that can lead to broader media interest.

News outlets, for example, might care about a significant and growing public concern. Reducing all this to a specific entity, especially if there are statistics, video, pictures or even quotes backing it up. As an example, say you are able to get a huge grant to help fight AIDS. This could be used to change the discussion of AIDS to something that targets women's health.

This process, however, needs a lot of work. It involves understanding the readership and the existing trends. It requires persistence and attention to detail. Your first task will be to make a list of press outlets, radio stations and even TV producers you want to take interest. You want to aim high but make sure you also have plenty of smaller publications and more obscure outlets which are more likely to give you a chance. Contact information for journalists, or at least some sources, is readily available online and in books available at your local library. Though you might have to get some down from the nice updated pages of the book store. Remember that journalists are partners in the process and getting their attention requires capturing their interest in less than a minute. Standing out to them requires preparation. Once you do call them up, the higher the degree of interest you have, you'll be able to achieve is when they ask you to email them more information about your story. Though, in most cases, you will be enrolling them in the first instance, since a great deal of journalists simply won't take phone calls. With tight deadlines and travel, they're a lot more likely to prefer email. It is why you will need to prepare a short and informative email that contains almost no opinion and the kind of 'hook' journalists crave.

The bank to the people responsible for keeping popular audiences in their drooling stratospheres of passive amusement. This process will mean you have to find a way to create these things using the resources available to you. Online polls can offer compelling statistics and you can be widely accepted and welcomed by print and even radio outlets. Video of action, especially when it's coming from your home town, will still be accepted.

So what does this mean for your media strategy? To reach the mainstream media, you need to think in a different way. You need to think in terms of how your message can be presented in a way that will catch the attention of the people who are most likely to listen. The mainstream media is the packaging. It's a way of putting your central message within the media-friendly, superficial brain candy. Being too direct can drive away the media, and often just hearing the name of your cause or organisation will inform the right people that you exist. This means that often, you can gain media coverage by getting the media more of what it likes, round-the-clock, insightful, plain, something that seems almost too obvious. Look into the mainstream outlets (newspaper) that are read by people who are likely to agree with you. Get a feel for the kind of stories they seem to like for. Some like public opinion polls (easily obtained on the internet or the street). Others want spectacular images. Most just want something related to the current news cycle but with a different angle.

About Websites

Most of your site contain plenty of text talking about your area of interest, but it's all about using their tools to turn the machine around.

"Where advertising requires the client to pay for space and airtime, PR exists to force organisations' agendas on consumers through the mainstream media, which is comprised largely of messages 'sold in' to its outlets (magazines, radio, newspapers, television and popular online portals) - nauseating yes, but it's all about using their tools to turn the machine around."
Guerrilla Marketing.

We all know somebody desperately trying to get attention for their cause. Whether slapping around the bible at speakers’ corners or showing crudely xeroxed flyers under wind screen wipers, getting the word out without stooping to using money seldom achieves critical mass. Stories of grassroots publicity successes or clever (and priceless) headline grabbers like Fathers 4 Justice and British hunting supporters are usually the exception that proves the rule. The general public’s attention is a commodity traded on by global corporations and cutting through this monopoly requires a strategic effort.

Reaching the mainstream media

So how do you reach the masses? These people walking up and down the streets all day, ‘Your agenda might just be the only thing missing from our lives. Why? Because...’

To be warned by the twenty-glow of attention and authority, the nice people who own the world’s stocks use a cleverly named little industry called public relations. Think of market relations - it’s like that but with the public looking on. A patronising kind of ritual.

Where advertising requires the client to pay for space and airtime, PR enlists to force organisations’ agendas on consumers through the mainstream media, which is comprised largely of messages ‘sold’ into its outlets (magazines, radio, newspapers, television and popular online portals) - annoying yet, but it’s all about using their tools to turn the machine around.

Before deciding on how to get attention, you have to create a concise message. This is what people will find out before they even want to know you exist. It will get noticed by either the ‘Yew’ or ‘nope’ in their brain - so it must encapsulate everything you believe in, but in a concise and non-threatening way. How many articles, anecdotes, flyers and websites do you dismiss because they don’t seem aimed at you? Whether listening to music, car insurance or Christianity - flyers that talk to me as if I am already in their shoes get ignored. In the same way, communicators and press releases that seem to exclude too many people are disregarded. This is because the general public need to be intrigued, not confronted. Challenging their preconceptions require the same kind of a ‘nudge’ as giving antibiotics to a dog. Your message must be wrapped in a delicious slice of compelling or eye-catching bollocks. A good PR guerrilla will know this of my little shell as the packaging. It’s a way of putting your central message within a media-friendly, superficial brain candy. Being too direct can drive away the media, and often just hearing the name of your cause or organisation will inform the right people that you exist. This means that you can gain media coverage by giving the media more of what it likes, round-the- ‘insightful’, ‘prickly’, ‘something that seems new’. Look into the mainstream outlets (newspapers) that are read by people who are likely to agree with you. Get a feel for the kind of hooks they seem to like for. Some like public opinion polls (easily obtained on the internet or the street) Others want spectacular images. Most just want something related to the current news cycle but with a different angle. However, it is always about more of the same. Vapid but necessary. If you can play the game up to your personal agenda, you might be able to sell in the amount of attention your ideas receive. It’s the only way to win. Is the whole world in it, fed its brain candy and almost all the time we ever learn will start out as an agenda, carefully wrapped in a layer of interesting and colourful characters, the appearance of public support, pretty girls and lots of food. And, although usually deceptive and manipulative, the process can be used for social change.

Think of your ‘hook’ or ‘angle’ as the batman costume you’ve put on your story. It’s what dresses you up in night clothes and intrigue and novelty to quickly grab and hold attention. This also requires that you are strikingly close to the sort of stories the journalist usually discusses. You will angle or ‘spin’ your story differently depending on the outlets’ audiences. This is also a great way to get attention by surprising publications that can lead to broader media interest. News outlets, for example, might care about a significant and growing public menace that you’ve written about in a specific entity, especially if there are statistics, video, pictures or even quotes linking it up. As an angling for something that isn’t able to give fashion journalists a new and different story by talking about how direct action or anarchist-syndicalism is interesting for them. This is, after all, an intrinsic part of the mainstream media. That is, of course, a terrible mistake for a couple different reasons, which is still not to say that some journalist at some publication that reaches hundreds of thousands of ordinary people could want to hear more about this story. The DA or anarchist-syndicalist ideas would still be getting public attention and while the punks might encounter many new posters, the precise ideas of anarchist-syndicalism could be clearly explained on the website members of the public would now want to see. Remember that most of what the proletariat hears about arts gets by through a process similar to this.

Once you have packaged your message, or at least figured out the ideas you’re trying to present, it’s time to think about turning them into something that will fly. While you may be tempted to fire up the old typewriter and produce a detailed manuscript, there is a crucial rule to follow. If you are within content that will appeal to the media it is always a careful balance between getting out for start-up or tightly grabbing your ideas as bad in the swift embrace of obscurity. Remember that for journalists, nothing is more captivatingly well-conducted, well-produced audio segments and eye-catching video equal money in the bank to the people responsible for keeping popular audiences in their sheltering stratosphere of passive amazement. This is why you have to find a way to create these things using the resources available to you. Online polls can offer compelling statistical facts and be readily accepted and welcomed by print and even radio outlets. Video of action/s, especially when it’s actually taking place ourselves, can build a home - especially since the number of all this starts with that email. Don’t forget to answer any potential questions a journalist might have here and add some background info with a hook. You will also want to include a link to your website, though most journalists will call you up if they have more questions.

About Websites

Many of your site contain plenty of text talking about your...
As much as societies in Britain might look through history books, dwelling on the rhetoric of the working classes of France, Italy, Spain etc., there's one thing we can't forget: our own history of revolution is not too shabby.

Sure, it's easy to spend endless nights working over the Paris Commune or the CNT's role in the Spanish Civil War but the result is the same. You feel embarrassed and ashamed at your lack of involvement in actual struggle as you plod over those sameforeignerstheirstruggles where there are never any arguments because they're all just so revolutionary and want to have a revolution every night. Right? We look at our own relationship with the class and feel shame. We've just never been as close as the Italians. Is it us? Is it them? We struggle to think of the good times. Where were we ever happy?

But the class in Britain has an enriching history of struggle against any country, though obviously I'd rather it be in a struggle than in Russia. In any case, the real story: the last time we had a revolution was in 1905. That was the Russian revolution, 1917. We were probably the closest we've ever been to revolution with general strikes, workers' councils and urban direct action. Post-West, 1660. We saw more self-activity working class Jews took a 'No Platform' approach to dealing with the fascist threat (in fact, you could argue that fascism has been dealt with more thoroughly in Britain than anywhere else in the world) and we saw various urban riots and strikes across the country, for instance the 1975 miners' strike which brought down Ted Heath's Tory government.

Of course, shit happened. You could probably describe the Thatcher/Reagan era as the most successful period for Western capitalism ever. Not only did they manage to almost totally smash domestic resistance but they also managed to cause the collapse of our own real empire (and simultaneously open up new markets for themselves). With the organ of working class opposition crushed and being the last superpower left standing, it must have been champagne and cigar roll ever since.

In Britain, the climax of this period of struggle was the 1984-85 miners' strike which ended not just in the defeat of the miners but also the defeat of the entire British labour movement. It is a defeat from which we will not yet recover. Apart from Poll Tax, we've been on the end of 20-odd years of defeat. Our union council, instead of coming together and standing for the working class, has been rent by a political vacuity in working class communities which only seems to be being filled by the far right (well, they're the only ones having a go anyway). This is the context in which we're operating.

Yup, we've heard it all before, the old political vacuity schtick. Labour has abandoned the class, the Unions have abandoned the class, and so on. To be honest, it's a bit like being a capitalist and being told by the workers: "What are you doing? We want to be main force of production!" We should know by now that the way to build a revolutionary movement is not by telling the workers to do that and expect them to follow. We should know by now that the way to build a revolutionary movement is not by telling the workers to do that and expect them to follow.

The former is also another blind alley often walked by revolutionaries. We know that the way to build a revolutionary mass movement is to organise institutions of working class power in our workplaces and communities. I know that we know this because we're always saying it. But how much do we actually do to radical working class politics? Looking at the activities of a lot of anarchists and socialists, I'd say not a lot.

Our relationship with the class is almost non-existent at the moment and it is because we don't see the work that the class is doing for everyday lives. We have left workplaces and communities and have begun to form local federations of which we want to be part. That's real and generally just tail-end anti-war demonstrations, trying to pick up a few disillusioned people who want to join our ever-growing army of newsletter subscribers in the hope of picking up yet more disillusioned Trots. A slightly curtailed description of revolutionary activity in Britain perhaps, but I think (if you look honestly, you'll agree that the reality is not at all different. A bit depressing, but because capitalism creates the conditions for its own collapse, we have hopes). The working class will get it together eventually and it'll all come right in the end. No need to worry, rightly.

Wrong. Capitalism might create the opportunity for revolution, but it's still us, as a class, who have to seize that opportunity. Victory is not assured and the working class has to practice the ideas of libertarian socialism in their day-to-day experience in non-revolutionary times, for a revolution to ever be successful.

The former is also another blind alley often walked by revolutionaries. We know that the way to build a revolutionary mass movement is to organise institutions of working class power in our workplaces and communities. I know that we know this because we're always saying it. But how much do we actually do to radical working class politics? Looking at the activities of a lot of anarchists and socialists, I'd say not a lot.

As for the third, well, that's slightly more complicated. Though revolutionary organisations are not the most militant and politically consistent sections of the working class, they AREN'T the institutions of working class power. All they can be is a propaganda front, by encouraging the spread of communist tendencies within the working class, they're participating in supporting working class struggles. But the actual events of movements must be carried out by the working class through its own organisations.

In the community, these institutions are residents' associations, holding meetings open to all in the community, broadcasting relevant news through the radio and beyond through a federation of residents' associations (an example of a working class, current example would be the Hastings Federation of Residents' Associations in London - www.hastingsresident.org). These RA's would take action on a wide variety of issues, not just to do with housing but also things like anti-social crime, traffic issues, local elections etc.

In the workplace, the institutions of working class power are unions, precisely directly democratic but (for the present time anyway) more likely to be bureaucratic TUC unions. That said, unions only give us strength if we have a strong class and move power pushing the leadership through its own militant self-activity in solidarity strikes and other collective action outside of official union context.

But how to build it? And more importantly, how to build it now, when revolutionary politics aren't exactly popular?

We'll suppose it would be a two-pronged approach. Firstly, we obviously need to start strengthening and (sadly in many places) setting up the institutions outlined above. Okay, so they may not be revolutionary now (or ever), but the collective action that takes place within them can have a massive impact on these who take part, radicalising many workers.

And who knows where these organisations will go? In more revolutionary times, RA's could fight for direct community control. Strong rank and file movements within the unions could attempt to split off from formal union federations. We don't know how these could end up, but organisations that seem reformist now could turn to

Continued on page 29
As much an attraction in Britain might be the rich history of the working classes of France, Italy, Spain and there's no one thing we can't forget. Our history of revolution is not two decades shy.

Sure, it's easy to spend endless nights working over the Paris Commune or the CNT's role in the Spanish Civil War but the result is the same. You feel embarrassed and ashamed at your lack of involvement in actual struggle as you pride over those very foreign and their ideal struggles where there are no arguments because they're all part so revolutionary and want to have a revolution every night. Right? We look at our own relationship with the class and feel ashamed. We've just never been as close as the Italians. Is it us? Is it them? We struggle to think of the good times. Were we ever happy?

But the class in Britain has an even richer history of struggle than any country. From the 1490s, we've been engaged in revolution with general strikes, sit downs, urban unrest widespread. Post-WWII saw more active working class movements, but these were not just in the defeat of fascism but also the defeat of the entire British working class movement. It was a defeat that was not just about fascism but also about the abandonment of the working class by the left and the failure of the working class movement to achieve the victories that were won.

In Britain, the climax of this period of struggle was the 1958 miners' strike which ended not just in the defeat of the miners but also in the defeat of the British working class movement. It was a defeat that was not just about mining but also about the failure of the working class movement to achieve the victories that were won.

The class in Britain has been the most successful for Western capitalism ever. Not only did they manage to almost totally smash domestic resistance but they managed to ensure the collapse of their only rival empire (and simultaneously open up new markets for themselves). The workers of the working class opposition crushed and the last superpower standing, it must have been a great loss, and I'll leave, perhaps, a few decades of revolutionaries are still out in the world to do something and their hopes seem now to have increased from my own views on their aims.

The class will always get something for the people as well. It's a bit depressing, but because capitalism creates the conditions for its own collapse that hope is there. The working class will get it together eventually and it'll all be right on the night. No need to worry, right?

Wrong. Capitalism may create the opportunity for revolution, but it's still us, the class, who have to seize that opportunity. Victory is not assured and the working class movement has to practice the ideas of libertarian socialism in their day-to-day experience of non-revolutionary times if a revolution is ever to be successful.

The former is another blind alley often walked up by revolutionaries. We know that the ideas of libertarian socialism are important to the working class movement but if we don't build a revolutionary movement, in this day-to-day experience of non-revolutionary times, the working class movement can only be limited.

The revolutionary movement is not just about the working class. It's about the whole class and the entire society. It's about the self-organisation and self-activity of the working class and the entire society. It's about the whole class and the entire society.

Just as in those dark days of the past, when we had dreams of revolution or even just a good relationship with the working class, it was still not enough. And just like we couldn't have the revolution on behalf of the working class, we can't create the suitable conditions for building a mass movement towards a new society. As all good Marxists should know, capitalism creates the conditions for its own destruction and it only takes a matter of time before we see a new, more active working class movement against capitalism and the state.

From this point, it has been common for politicians to go one of two directions: Substitution of self-sacrifice or self-gratification — when the class is in retreat, it's not uncommon for impatient revolutionaries to adopt an activist 'fick it till it breaks' mentality. The idea here is that if we don't do enough to break through the collapse of our class and community (and simultaneously open up new markets for ourselves), the organised working class opposition will be crushed and the last superpower standing, it must have been a great loss, and I'll leave, perhaps, a few decades of revolutionaries are still out in the world to do something and their hopes seem now to have increased from my own views on their aims.

Apart from Poll Tax, we've been on the end of 20 years of defeat.
It was a nation at war, with a militant insurgency fighting the night of the US military. And yet it went to the polls. Officials of the occupying power said they were surprised and heartened today at the turnout of "voters" despite of a "terrorist campaign to disrupt the voting." A "successful election has long been seen as the "keynote" in the President's strategy of "encouraging the growth of constitutional processes." The hope here is that the new government will be able to manage with a confidence and legitimacy. This "could have been dashed either by a small turnout, indicating widespread fear or a lack of interest in constitutional development, or by... dissipation of the ballots." The high turnout "was a welcome surprise" and even higher than the previous US Presidential election.

In this year's reporting of democracy in action about Iraq today? No, it is from The New York Times first the South Vietnam presidential elections in 1967 "U.S. Envoyed by Vietnam Vote" (p. 3). Like today, the media pointed to the size of the popular vote and the ability of the Viet cong to deter the election machinery as the "two salient facts." Strongly, the election locked the generals who have been ruling South Vietnam since a military coup ten years ago. "The administration view... diminished the significance of the constitutional step" that had been taken. So it spoke of Bush, Blair and the media being all a gusher over the successful Iraqi election, it is useful to remember the fact that the US has systematically held "successful" elections in the countries it is occupying whose electorates it is baffling. The term for this process is called "demonstrations." An attempt to show that US commitment to democracy is deeper than lip service. Yet it is only the appearances of democratic norms and its end result is not in question. And that is the case here.

A little relevant history

Under all the politicians back-patting each other, it would be prudent to ask whether the Bushistas initially opposed one another, one vote elections of this sort. First, it was going to turn Iraq over to Chalabi within six months but that fell through. This was replaced by the action that US Vice President Dick Cheney would exercise personal rule for a few years. In November 2003, Bremer announced council-based elections in May 2004. This election would have been restricted to the US/UK created provincial and municipal governing councils, the members of this small elite being "undoubtedly pro-American." This was when people power kicked in. Grand Ayatollah Ali Sistani insurgency movements took advantage of this and demanding free elections mandated by a UN Security Council resolution, Bush was reportedly "extremely offended" at these demands and Bremer was soon ordered to get his appointed Interim Governing Council to fight Sistani. Sistani then brought thousands of protestors into the streets in January of 2004, demanding free elections. Faced with a massive show of popular rebellion, Bush cared in on one issue - the timing. He got the election postponed to January 2005.

So if it had been up to Bush and Blair, Iraq would have been a beneficent dictatorship under Chalabi or, at best, it would have staged managed elections based on the votes of baseline of pro-American notables. It was people power that changed the equation, not the (non-existent) benevolence or democratic deals of US imperialism.

And why was the delay? The official rationale was that the US objected that they could not use UN food rations for registration, as Sistani suggested. Yet, in the end, that is more the reason they did use. The real reason is obvious: shaping a nation state in line with the needs of US imperatives takes time. The Bushistas recognized that this information and a "democratic Iraq" would not stand for the strategic value the war was fought for: controlling the oil reserves and establishing military bases to project US imperial interests in the Middle East. Quick elections would have scuppered those plans and so the US rejected them.

Elections, but not democracy

So after having elections thrust upon them by people power, the US worked hard to ensure that the processes they put in place made sure the occupation would continue, with no matter the result. That the result was an overwhelming victory for Bush and Blair, the election itself fell totally short of accepted electoral standards. If it had been held then America would have been the first to denounce it. Apparently Bush is to be portrayed as the bringer of democracy to Iraq by the simple fact that this so-called election took place.

The occupying forces have been unable to provide the necessary security for truly believable democratic elections but that has its advantages. An under-reported, but extremely significant, fact is that in the first elections that were held under a state of emergency that lasted months and that the candidate's "identities" had been withheld for security reasons until just before the election. This meant no public campaigning, no speeches, no basis for choosing between the candidates and no elections. So people were voting for people they did not know who belonged to parties whose policies were not known. In addition, there was an US-appointed election commission. Such facts have not got in the headlines.

All this undoubtedly helped the current US-appointed prime minister who ran under the slogan of a "strong leader for a safe country." He has huge name recognition in a field where most candidates had little chance or time to get themselves known. Television coverage also favoured Alawi, who was constantly in the news as well as being the only one paying the airwaves on the satellite channels. The role of funding from US sources must have been significant. Sadly for the Americans, the "strength" of their candidate (and the (purple) finger) and the not less than 14% of the vote is to the advantage provided by the US occupation.

Bush did say that American forces would withdraw from Iraq if the new government that is elected on Sunday asked him to do so but added that "it seems more like the leadership that understands that there will be a need for coalition troops at least until Iraqis are able to fight for their own survival. Few Iraqis "understand that there will be a need for" the occupation of their country. According to roughly 12% of Sunni Alawis (6% of Shiites) US forces will withdraws either immediately or after an election government in in place. Even the Kurds want the US to leave. A genuinely democratic election would have to reflect this fact.

Yet it is very telling that the US would allow those seeking an immediate or absolute end to the presence in Iraq of its highest officials. The US Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, was able to gloss over the occupation's impact on Iraqi society. Even the US military was finally able to accept a government. In this way the current US government has been able to avoid a key role in the events described in the Bush administration's decision to support the elections and, consequently, ensure US interests are served.

Then there is the Sunni boycott of the vote. There is scope for making up the "Sunni deficit" by appointing Sunni to the leadership of the new government. If they did, then the occupiers have a powerful weapon to get what they want as representatives of all three communities need to agree to the proposals. If they ignore the Sunnis then "they are a potential veto as any government will be to put a referendum in the autumn. If more than a third of voters in three of Iraq's 18 provinces vote it down, the draft fails. Sunnis form a majority in at least four provinces. That could be a long-term problem for the US, but in the short-term the appointment of Sunni has obvious appeal.

Deterring Democracy

In the March 16th election, the fact there was no government was dutifully reported. Why was this the case went unmentioned. The BBC news failed to mention why, their reporter Jim Mair in Baghdad said that coalition politics was a novelty in a country ruled by a tight dictatorship for decades, and the learning curve has been steep. The implication was clear - it is still the fault of the Iraqis themselves. This, however, is not the case.

In any democracy worthy of the name, if a party has 50% in parliament it gets to form a government. This was the case with the last US Presidential election (ignoring for the moment the issue of voter rigging). Not so in Iraq, where a two-thirds majority is required. That means that the United Nations Alliance, a coalition of Shi'ite parties, that has about 50% of the members of the Iraqi parliament is not able to form a government. It was three months after the election when a new government was finally agreed (and then only a partial one).

Thus the Iraqi democratic process has been gridlocked by this need for supermajorities, a provision imposed by the American occupiers. Why? Simply to secure the continuation of the US occupation and the furthering of US interests by means of a non-colonial device. It is an anti-democratic mechanism used to thwart the will of the majority of Iraqis (who braved great danger to vote) and to give the US occupation forces a mandate behind the scenes that made it sure that democracy was not really an option. For the Bush junta, the Iraqis are not considered really for any form of self-government not approved of by Washington.

Ironically, the Bushista's own elections in Iraq confirm Bush's own demise claiming that the election "was a success... because you cannot hold free and fair elections under foreign military occupation."

The ideological war

Of all which suggests that those who need to turn the issue away from war onto democracy are missing the point. For example, pro-war leftist David 

"American conservative think that "now, is all... that matters. Whether you were for or against the war, for or against Blair, for or against Bush, you did not support democracy in Iraq? The rest is air." "Now it's time for the war critics to move on. The war is won and it is time to move on."

The implication is clear - it is still the fault of the Iraqis. Saddam had elections. It did not make his regime democracy. And no to the elections are playing their role in the ideological war being waged to legitimise the occupation. That you can oppose the sham of the US run elections because you favour real democracy will never be forgotten. Yet, democracy in Iraq is a noble goal but a democracy shaped by US imperial interests will hardly inspire or be a genuine democracy. Do not forget that the Iraqi National Assembly has limited powers nor that the US is well practiced in corrupting regimes with elected parliaments but where real power remains with the military (or itself). As long as the state remains a dictatorship, the politics of the interests in big business (then a little formal democracy is perfectly acceptable)

So now the Iraqis can also get the job of electing politicians who say one thing in opposition but then are totally silent in office. They too, can experience the kind of democracy in which they protest in their hundreds of thousands against a policy yet become central government simply ignore them. And
It was a nation at war, with a militant insurgency fighting the night of the US military. And yet it went to the polls. Officials of the occupying power said they "were surprised and heartened today at the sizable turnout despite of a "terrorist campaign to disrupt the voting. "A successful election has long been seen as the "keynote" in the President's strategy of "encouraging the growth of constitutional processes." The "hope here is that the new government will be able to manoeuvre with a confidence and legitimacy." This could have been "dashed either by a smallincident, indicating widespread scores or a lack of interest in constitutional development, or by... disruption of the ballots." The high turnout "was a welcome surprise" and even higher than the previous US Presidential election.

In this joyous reporting of democracy in action about Iraq today? No. It is from the New York Times which quoted the Süddeutsche Zeitung's "U.S. Economic and Military Cooperation" (pg. 138: 10th March). But it is important to be reminded that the reality of democracy in Iraq is far different from what is being reported. The current government of Iraq is not a democratic government. It is a government that has been imposed by military force from outside. The elections held on March 26th were forced on the Iraqi people by external occupiers and were not a reflection of the will of the Iraqi people. The elections were not a democratic process, but a means of consolidating US and other foreign powers' control over Iraq.

In this context, it is important to remember that democracy is not just about elections. It is about the participation of the people in the decision-making process, the protection of human rights, and the rule of law. The US government's actions in Iraq have been far from democratic. They have been characterized by violence, repression, and the violation of basic human rights. The US government has also been accused of interference in the electoral process, with reports of fraud and other irregularities.

The situation in Iraq is a reminder of the complexities of democracy. It is not enough to simply hold elections. The process of democracy requires the establishment of institutions that can ensure the protection of human rights and the rule of law. It requires the participation of the people in the decision-making process. It requires the establishment of a system of checks and balances to ensure that power is not concentrated in the hands of a few.

It is important to remember that democracy is not a one-time event. It is a process that requires ongoing effort and commitment. It requires the establishment of institutions that can ensure the protection of human rights and the rule of law. It requires the participation of the people in the decision-making process. It requires the establishment of a system of checks and balances to ensure that power is not concentrated in the hands of a few.

In the case of Iraq, the US government's actions have been a failure. They have been characterized by violence, repression, and the violation of basic human rights. The US government has also been accused of interference in the electoral process, with reports of fraud and other irregularities. The situation in Iraq is a reminder of the complexities of democracy. It is not enough to simply hold elections. The process of democracy requires the establishment of institutions that can ensure the protection of human rights and the rule of law. It requires the participation of the people in the decision-making process. It requires the establishment of a system of checks and balances to ensure that power is not concentrated in the hands of a few.
they too can see their representatives bend over backward to ensure corporate profits and power while speaking platitudes to the masses.

And, of course, once our elected representatives are treated to unloading and glib speaking against this apathy with comparisons to the brave words of Iraq. That these voters may become just as apathetic and just as apathetic a few months from now, when faced with lying politicians who ignore their wishes in favor of corporate and imperial power goes without comment.

Democracy for who?

We have a taste of this process at work in Iraq today. The election of December 21, 2003, Iraqi Finance Minister Abdul Mahdi Muhammad informed the Interim Authority that in order to attract new oil prices, it is necessary to issue a new oil law that would open its national oil company to private foreign investment. In other words, to all of those who have been dedicated to the reconstruction of Iraq, Mahdi said, it should be noted, that in the elections the onerousness of the Supreme 7, the onerousness of the Interim Authority, the ruling Shia political party and which also belongs to the United Arab Alliance which constituently informed his followers to vote for. But, Mahdi said, once the election commission pointed to the fact that the Interim Authority would continue in office thereafter, unless reassured from office pursuant to law. In other words, the branch of the Iraqi government which can block the actions of the National Assembly was installed by the occupiers. All legislation, including the constitution of the Iraqi state itself, will be those occupying the acceptable actions.

Keeping Iraq ‘free’ and friendly

Once the Iraqi Assembly meet, the US occupied two-thirds majority role worked its magic. After more than two months of deadlock, Speaker of the US Congress, and prime minister all were selected. All were members of the US appointed government. The Assembly Speaker is Haitham al-Askari, the industry minister in US appointed Jafar al-Issawi’s government and a member of his own party. Last year, the Iraqi Islamic Party (of which he is member) was abolished by the government to protect the US against a popular uprising on Fallujah. As a result, al-Issawi refused to resign his post as industry minister and support the US, and as an industry minister, he led the privatization program for the US appointed interim government. He included a change in Iraq’s investment law, allowing foreign investors to enter the Iraqi securities market and own up to 50% of publicly held companies. This suggests that the will of the Iraqi people will continue to be ignored in the new "democratic" Iraq.

The President is the Kurdish leader Jalal Talabani. The Kurds are probably the only ethnic group in Iraq which does not hate the Americans. Indeed, the Kurdish parties oppose any attempts for the withdrawal of foreign forces from Iraq, which is the US position. As the US, the Talabani himself is a member of the governing coalition of the US-appointed government. Thus, after the new government was finally formed, he stated that he did not think Iraq was occupied and rejected calls for the US to leave immediately.

The new "democratic" Iraqi government is corporate-friendly. The new officials all have a track record of working with private companies. In the US economic and political goals.

Mission Accomplished?

The Iraq War has been fought in the name of democracy and freedom. In the US, it is said that the war was fought to free the people of Iraq from the rule of Saddam Hussein, who the US considered to be an enemy of democracy. However, the US government has done little to promote democracy in Iraq. Instead, it has worked to install US-friendly leaders and support the country's oil industry, which is dominated by US companies.

One of the main goals of the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003 was to establish democratic institutions in the country. However, this goal has not been achieved. The government is dominated by a few powerful figures, and political opposition is suppressed. The country is still governed by a US-appointed government, and democracy is not fully established.

The Iraqi people are still facing many challenges, including poverty, unemployment, and corruption. The US-led war has also led to the displacement of millions of Iraqis, who are now living in refugee camps or have fled the country.

Despite these challenges, there are some signs of progress. The Iraqi people are increasingly aware of their rights and are demanding greater participation in political life. The country is also making efforts to rebuild its infrastructure and economy.

In conclusion, while the US-led war in Iraq has not fully achieved its goal of promoting democracy, there are some positive developments. The Iraqi people are increasingly aware of their rights and are demanding greater participation in political life. The country is also making efforts to rebuild its infrastructure and economy. These developments give hope for a brighter future in Iraq.
they too can see their representatives bend over backward ensuring corporate profits and power while speaking platitudes to the electorate.

And, of course, our elections are treated as meaningless and gerrymandering apart from a history of corruption with comparisons to the worse states of Iraq. Those voters may become just as unfairly represented as the people they have faced with, lying politicians who ignore their wishes in favour of corporate and special power-given without comment.

Democracy for who?
We had a taste of this process at work in Iraq before the election. On December 23, 2004, Iraq's Finance Minister Abdul Mahdi informed us that Iraq does not want to issue a new oil law that would open its national oil company to private foreign investment. He went on to add, to one of the officials that provides 95% of all Iraq's revenue. As he explained: "I think this is very promising to the American investors and to American enterprises, certainly to oil companies.

As I wish to see that Iraq's army is reduced. It is necessary, in terms of security, to reduce our forces before the elections. Before the election, the Iraqi government must guide our forces to their objectives. In other words, the branch of the government that can block the actions of the National Assembly will be signed by the occupation. All legislation, including the constitution of the Iraqi state itself, will be those acceptable to the occupying forces.

Keeping Iraq 'occupier-friendly'
Once the Iraqi Assembly meets, the US imposed two-thirds majority rule worked its magic. After more than two months of negotiations, a new government is formed. Despite the fact that most of the US-sponsored laws were not acceptable to the Iraqi people. The Assembly Speaker is Hajim Ali al-Maliki, the industry minister in US-appointed Iyad Allawi's interim government.

Mission Accomplished?
Even a high turnout does not change the fact that the 2010 IAS elections were fraudulent. In fact, the United States and the United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon, acknowledged the election's outcome, saying: "These elections are a testament to the resilience and determination of the Iraqi people."

On the other hand, the Iraqi government must guide our forces to their objectives. In other words, the branch of the government that can block the actions of the National Assembly will be signed by the occupation. All legislation, including the constitution of the Iraqi state itself, will be those acceptable to the occupying forces.

The new "democratic" Iraqi government is occupying friendly. The new officials all have a track record of working with proven rebels, whether not being appointed by the Americans and, moreover, in advancing US economic and political goals.

Believable goals have been achieved. Access to Iraqi oil. For example, has been achieved (drawing economic advantage by insurgents). They are being used as a weapon, but at the same time, despite a legitimate cause. The price for this service is the cost of military presence and the cost of our resources.

Say, democratic government is also based on "economic". Without the means of coercion represented by the gun, it would simply be ignored. Ignoring the people is not a viable solution. Democratic state violence has the consent of the people. Therefore according to a recent survey, 95% of Iraqis believe that the US military attacks in Iraq are a legitimate form of resistance. Does support for violence make it more acceptable? Can the occupation become legitimate only if the state decides to maintain the political and economic influence of a few over the many? Apparently.

A spokesman for the US-controlled district of the election would show the civilians a clear distinction between the occupation and its purpose, but instead it is packed by the extreme Islamist terrorists (in Iraq). Those segments of the insurgency that targeted ordinary civilians have no reason to despair for US imperialism. Therefore, the influence of US newspapers, as well as the US electoral team, is desired to respect the will of the people.

Yet this should not blind us to the political impacts of the vote. The constraints in the election and the constraints it has faced. The elections that will ultimately matter for Iraq are those organized and supported by Iraq's people. They will be elected to hold, with confidence, their elected representatives as the US and UN-appointed CAA agent as president. It will take time. But the time will come and it will come in Iraq. It is a matter of time. But that will create genuine democracy, only a representative democracy. Could the US, like Bush, talk about "liberty" and "self-government", mean "unofficial numbers." Yet representative institutions do not create liberty. It is a question of whether the United States is interested in maintaining a foothold in the stream.
petrol and natural gas) is also subject to international agreement. EU policies have to be integrated in the international regulatory system governed by the World Trade Organization (WTO), previously GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). EU policies of free trade goods, protectionism. As this is also the driving philosophy behind the EEC (European Economic Community) and its predecessors, it was expected that the Community would be under the WTO's auspices. This has not yet come to pass, but the threats to the EEC continue to exert pressure on the Community as to the European Union, which is increasingly isolated by its self-sufficient market.
petrol and natural gas) is also subject to international agreement. All EU policies have to be integrated in the international regulatory system governed by the World Trade Organization (WTO), previously GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). The WTO’s principles include non-discrimination, freedom of trade, and protection against subsidies. The ECSC (European Coal and Steel Community) would compete with the Community Union to be amongst the GATT/WTO’s best pupil. This has in fact already been done as a direct threat from Nato and the EU. An analysis of the draft of the constitution for the EU considers a "plebiscite" to its glory.

If we could, for instance, disregard the fact that much of the modern EU is still dependent on the U.S. for arms, NATO, and the U.S. military, it would be impossible to overcome our lack of economic power and international significance.

With the creation of a customs union in 1986, the EU has taken a significant step towards the establishment of a common external tariff. The EU has also established a common agricultural policy, which has been responsible for the majority of trade with non-member countries. The EU's economic and monetary union has been further developed, and the euro has been introduced as the single currency for all member states.

The establishment of the European economic and monetary union (EMU) has been a significant step towards the establishment of a single market. The single market is a key element of the EU's internal market, which aims to create a single economic space for goods, services, capital, and labor.

The establishment of the euro as the single currency for all member states has been a significant step towards the establishment of a single market. The single market is a key element of the EU's internal market, which aims to create a single economic space for goods, services, capital, and labor.

The euro was introduced in 1999, and by 2002, all member states except the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Denmark had adopted it as their currency. The euro has been widely accepted as a replacement for the national currencies of the participating countries, and it has become the most widely used currency in the world.

The establishment of the euro has also had a significant impact on the economy. It has helped to reduce exchange rate volatility and has made it easier for businesses to trade across borders. It has also made it easier for citizens to travel and to hold savings in a single currency.

Overall, the establishment of the EU has been a significant step towards the establishment of a single market and a single currency. It has helped to create a more integrated and efficient European economy, and it has also helped to reduce economic and social inequalities across the continent.

The EU has also played a key role in promoting democracy and human rights. It has supported the development of democratic institutions in new democracies, and it has played a key role in promoting human rights and the rule of law. The EU has also made significant contributions to the development of the European Union, including the establishment of the European Convention on Human Rights, and the establishment of the European Court of Human Rights.
Arthur J. Miller

Come with me for a moment upon an old rusted steel ship. Up the gangway to the main deck, then into the main hold and down to the bilge where the tompo welts the tops of small openings to a ballast tank. Yesterday we had removed all the casts from the lid of the tank. This morning a marine chemist tested the air of the tank and certified that it was safe for work.

Before going into the tank we took a pulley block and stowed it through one of the hatches in the lid so that no one could be laid on the tank as we were there. We do that because there are no hole watchers. We climb down into the tank, which is about four feet deep. On our hands and knees we crawl through the dold and through the lighting holes that divide up the tank structurally. Where pipes go through the lightning holes, getting through them is hard and some people just can’t do it. Our conditions are not so stiff I cannot make a slit. The heavy vibration from the power saw adds to the stiffness. The stiffness comes from many years of such work, hours after hour of abuse of my hands. Year after year. I have had surgery on both my hands and that did relieve the pain I was having, but both of my hands are permanently damaged.

It is at best in the tank and the longer we work the hotter it gets. Soon we are drenched in sweat. Hour after hour of bearing suit and pulling the pipe out and putting the valve lines on. From the pipe to the valve. We take out a wrench to fit in a back up for the cap side of the bolt so that the bolt does not move as we take off the nut. Another wrench for the nuts on the side of the bolt. Each bolt is rusted out and will not come loose by hand so we have to use a pipe wrench. It is a power saw to be the best. Because of the rust we must take out the nuts all the way. We must then clean the valve and the tail suction piece off the valve. And then remove the valve and off the rest of the piping. We inspect the inside of the piping and find that it is rusted out and then we cut the piping out with a power saw until we reach the forward hold. We cut the pipe into sections that are long as we can make them and still able to get them out of the hold. These sections of pipe are used to fabricate new pipes in the ship. When the new pipes are ready we must drag them down into the tank along with the new valve and cut the system back into place. We use a welder weld in the joints connecting the sections of pipe. My hands begin to get stiff from all the hammering and holding the wrench that sends a shock wave through my hands when I hit the wrench against the nut. By the end of the day my hands were so stiff I cannot make a slit. The heavy vibration from the power saw adds a stress. The stiffness comes from many years of such work, hour after hour of abuse of my hands. Year after year. I have had surgery on both my hands and that did relieve the pain I was having, but both of my hands are permanently damaged.

I am a shipyard worker from the 1970s, a simple shipyard worker and a member of the IWU for 35 years. This writing seeks to give a different perspective on the IWU's 100 years, one that is grounded in the reality of the working class experience.

The IWU was formed in 1900, just this year. Who could have predicted such a thing? But when you think about it, who could have predicted such a thing? And what about this IWU thing? Because the IWU was founded and exists for 100 years based upon the one thing they have a hard time understanding and acknowledging: the direct experiences of rank and file workers who work to organize for a better life. Meanwhile, in the mindset of political and intellectual interpretations of the IWU, there needs to be other voices...

"Everything that we do to improve our way of life involves a struggle with the class of folks who lie off our labor. The business unions may help us gain more nickels and dimes from our employers, but the Wobblies want more than just a few more crumbs off the industrial table, we want peace that will come from an end to class conflict. That is why our Preamble says:

'This is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capital. Since the army of production must be organized, not only for the everyday struggle with capital, but also to carry on production when capitalism shall be overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.'

Some time ago I asked myself why I continue to be a Wobbly year after year in the face that on many jobs I have worked the shop in organized by other unions. I have been a member of the AFL-CIO business unions with their limited vision and their top-down form of organization. Being a Wobbly keeps one grounded in the concepts of what a union should stand for and how a real union should function. Though I have been active in other unions I have had some no influence on any of them..."
disconnected the reach rod that is attached to the top of the valve. We take out a wrench to fit a back-up for the cap side of the bolt so that the bolt does not move as we take off the nut and another wrench to the nut side. One of us holds the backup wrench while the other works the side of the bolt. The bolts are all rusted out and will not come loose by hand so we have to use a fireproof pipe to beat them loose. Because of the rust we must be sure the nuts all come off the way. We then must disassemble the tail suction piece off the valve. Then remove the valve. We inspect the inside of the piping and find that it is rusted and refusing to cut the piping out with a power saw until we reach the forward goldhead. We cut the pipe into sections that are as long as we can make them and still be able to get them out of the hole. These sections of pipe are used to fabricate new pipes in the ship. Where the new pipes are ready we must drag them down into the tank along with the new valve and the system back together and have a welder weld the pipes connecting the sections of pipe.

My hands begin to get stiff from all the hammering and holding the wrenches that sends a shock wave through my hands when I hit the wrenches with the maul. By the end of the day my hands are so stiff I cannot make a fist. The heavy vibration from the power saw adds to the strain. The stiffness comes from many years of such work, hours after hour of abuse of my hands, year after year. I have had surgery on both my hands and that did relieve the pain I was having, but both of my hands are permanently damaged.

It is bent down in the tank and the hotter we work the hotter it gets. Soon we are drenched in sweat. Hour after hour of beating nuts off and pulling old pipe and valves loose can make it seem like the world will never end. Because the valve is set to rail we are working 12-hour days until the job is done. Then they kick us out of the tank. We work like we are driving a pipeline to the end of the world.

Welcome to my reality of working class experience.

What does the IWW mean to me as an industrial worker? It means the only hope for real industrial change. What do I think of the IWW’s 100th Centennial? One hundred years of workers like me resisting our bosses and trying to make a decent life and decent working conditions for all workers.

From the belly of ships to the grime pits of fast food joints, we labor for the benefit of a few. From the dark haunts of construction we get them out of the hole. The cabal of office workers, our conditions serve to maximize profit. From the long-haul truck drivers to the janitors of office buildings, we are dehumanized as lowly sections of the rich. From the hot steel furnaces to the farms where our food is grown, in our human existence only has value our production. From every job from all the lands of the world, we suffer as a class to satisfy the greed of a few. Must this forever be the doomed fate of working people? Not! We can as a class organize together and weave the tools of production and create a society where there is honor and respect for labor; where our conditions are set by us the workers who do the work. Our toil will no longer benefit a few parasites but rather we will labor for the well-being of all. That is the hope the IWW brings to the working class even in the harshest of times.

I received a request to write something on the subject of the IWW’s Centennial and why the IWW is still relevant today. I knew I was a longtime Wobbly and they

wanted my perspective on the subject. My first thought was to tell them that there have been many things written about the subject by intellectuals. When I thought about which ones I could recommend, it hit me, maybe I should write on the subject because it would be different than most other writings on the subject and maybe something different is needed.

Many historians and advocates of various political philosophies will write or talk about the IWW’s first hundred years in many different ways. The words they write will be guided by their own personal agendas. More often than not, such writings will lack a true understanding of the IWW, because the IWW was founded and existed for 100 years based upon the one thing they have a hard time understanding and acknowledging: the direct experiences of rank-and-file workers who sought to organize for a better life. Somewhere in the modernity of political and intellectual interpretations of the IWW there needs to be other voices.

"Everything that we do to improve our way of life involves a struggle with the class of folks who live off our labor. The business unions may help us gain more nickels and dimes from our employers, but the Wobblies are the folks who live off our labor and stand outside the industrial table, we want peace that will come only from an end to class conflict. That is why our Preamble says:

'It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized, not only for the everyday struggle with capitalists, but also to carry on production when capitalists are overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old.'

Since I have been asked why I continue to be a Wobbly year after year it is true that on many jobs I have work the shop in organized by other unions. I have been a member of the AFL-CIO business unions with their limited vision and their top down form of organization. Being a Wobbly keeps me grounded in the concepts of what a union should stand for and how a real union should function. Though I have been active in other unions I paid dues to, there still a shake or contradiction in being a dual unionist.

Before going into the tank we take a walk and get it through one of the holes in the lid or on one or two bolts the lid does as they were. We do that because there are no hole watches. We climb down into the tank, which is about four feet deep. On our hands and

know we are crawling through the darkness and through the lightning holes that divide up the tank structurally. Where pipes go through the lightning holes, getting through them is hard and no one person just can’t do it. We have to get them out of the hole. These sections of pipe are used to fabricate new pipes in the ship. Where the new pipes are ready we must drag them down into the tank along with the new valve and the system back together and have a welder weld the pipes connecting the sections of pipe.
It has always been the experience of working people that as individuals or as small organizations little could be gained. It was only when working people united together and supported each other in universal solidarity did we workers ever stand a chance against the employing class.

It was found that the old craft style of unionism only had a limited effect and only for a limited number of workers. In craft unionism the workers on the same job were divided into different unions and many workers were left unequipped. Out of that experience came the concept of industrial unionism where all the workers in an industry are organized into one union. Unions such as the Western Federation of Miners and the American Railroad Union pioneered the idea of industrial unionism here in America and those experiences inspired workers to create the industrial unionism of the IWW.

Even with industrial unionism advancing the power of organized labor, workers quickly found that single-shop or single- shop organizing had its limitations and that those limitations became clearer as the companies of the employers realized. This class became larger and west well beyond limited geographic areas. Out of that realization came the concept of creating national and international industrial unions and the concept of industrial organizing and industrial action.

It was realized that there needed to be an organization that united the industrial unions and that would directly seek to organize those that have yet to be organized. This was necessary in order to build a labor movement that could stand up to the organized power of the employing class. Attempts were made to create a new type of labor organization such as the American Labor Union, which the Western Federation of Miners tried to create.

In 1905 veteran unionists gathered together to try to create an organization based upon their collective union experience that would include those things they had come to realize a labor union needed: universal working class solidarity, industrial unionism, industrial organizing and action, an organization that would seek to organize all workers and an organization that would not only organize workers but provide them with the necessary tools to control their employers. The result was the organization of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW).

The direct experiences of labor struggles showed that the existing economic arrangement meant limited gains for working people. Without the creation of our own world we will never gain in aclass struggle.

Contrary to what many have written about the IWW, it was not born out of a coming together of different political philosophies. The IWW came about as a direct result of the experiences of working people who tried to organize labor unions.

When I could not find work in shipyards, I worked other jobs, roughneck on a wildcat oil rig, long haul and port truck driver and as an environmental technician at some nasty toxic sites and on ships. This is where my Wobbly perspective comes from, not out of some damn book.

The IWW, like the class struggle of which it is a part, cannot beGMF in the isolation of a few events or individuals. The class struggle is a long journey down the road of class struggle. We need to be ever mindful of the way we are going to be used by others. If we know what words out of books on the IWW, we did not know or understand the IWW, I guess I was like some in the Wobbly movement. A real live Wobbly, when he was done ranting, his nonsense, he told me I had five minutes to speak. How could I explain the truth of the IWW in that time? So I did not use up that five minutes of time later. I got up there and said, "Labor unions are to workers as antipodes are to India. Don't you believe a word they say?" And as I looked out at the shocked expressions upon the faces of everyone there, I worked out I can't do damn museum piece nor anyone's eluded.

The IWW believes in the idea of building one Big Union of the working class. But in practice Wobbly's have supported and do support the struggles of all workers against their bosses no matter what organization they may belong to, and we have tried to educate working people to the great idea of universal working class solidarity. In that spirit the IWW has followed the long struggle for universal solidarity.

The IWW's goal is to create the union that is based upon the union's own experience. The IWW is a union of workers, for workers, and by workers.

Universal working class solidarity is something that you will not find much of in the business unions. It is not uncommon for business unions to scab on each other by creating picket lines or handing out false information about the work that striking workers would have done. Though a few unions may have organization and the Wobbly tradition, below I have written what I believe the Principles of Universal Labor Solidarity should include.

Principles of Universal Labor Solidarity:

1. Every worker on every job throughout the world has a right to organize with their sister and fellow workers in any labor organizations.
2. Every worker throughout the world has a right to a living wage, safe and sanitary working conditions and health care coverage.
3. Every worker throughout the world has a right to a political voice to prevent harassment and discrimination based upon race, sex, nationality, religion, and sexual orientation.
4. Every worker throughout the world has the right to refuse, to participate in or support the work that one of the workers of one country is used to fight and kill working people of another country.
5. Every worker throughout the world has the right and responsibility to improve the environment of the world.
6. Every worker throughout the world has the right to their labor at the same pace advances the above principles.
7. No worker throughout the world should ever be a slave.

A. No worker should ever cross the picket line by forming a union.
B. No worker should ever supply a stock on strikes with goods or services.
C. No worker should ever handle labor goods.
D. No worker should ever consume labor goods.
E. No worker should ever do the work that striking workers would have done.
F. When ever workers are faced with government repression because of their actions, we should all have the right to take their labor in the companies and industries following from that repression and a universal boycott should be in place of all goods going to that country, coming from that company or on the company.

G. Every strike or job action in a class action and should be support with direct solidarity unless that action violates the Principles of Universal Labor Solidarity.

Wobbly's have always understood that resistance to the employing class and the governments that work directly in their
school and work full-time for my survival. Finishing high school was not an option for me of what I wanted to eat.

I have worked a string of jobs that I would not care to see anyone be forced to endure. It was I who worked myself into the rebel against it, the dehumanizing conditions of labor. I worked assembly line, as a farm worker, washing dishes until I landed a job in the hard rock mining industry. At Bunker Hill Mining Company, I was a miner, I saw just how far the workers could be subjected to abuse by their employers, fifty-six percent of the miners that worked over the years had come down with kidney disease due to lead poisoning, including myself, and hundreds of children who lived in the area were sick as well. Five miles down the road at the Sunshine Mine, the miner of ninety-one miners was called an industrial accident. At that point I decided I wanted to learn a trade so I became a marine pipeliner. Since 1974 I have worked in southern ships on the west, east, and gulf coasts. When I could not find work in ships I找了 other jobs in welding, rubber, farm work, long-haul truck driver and as an environmental technician at some nasty toxic sites and at oil spills. This is where my Wobbly perspective comes from, not out of some damn book.

As a young Wobbly my members were older Wobbly's who were still around, people like Gilberto, Mark, Danny, Joe, Carl, and Fanny Keller. Paul Ware, Walter Westman, Frank Corderell, Fred Thompson and others. From them I learned what being a Wobbly was all about and I learned Wobbly history that you will not find in any books. The thing I never forgot about was that there was one class of Wobblies and no matter if you joined years ago or you joined today, everyone Wobbly in a Wobbly, these are no second class Wobblies. And that every worker no matter how low they were, no one was ever against them. I was never against their fellow workers like scales and cops, were just as much a worker as any other worker.

Though there were many workers in the history books, to me they were the real working class heroes of the IWW because they never gave up on the class struggle.

Contrary to what many have written about the IWW it was not created out of a coming together of different political philosophies. The IWW came about as a direct expression of the struggles of working people who tried to organize labor unions.

It has always been the experience of working people that as individuals or as small organizations little could be gained. It was only when working people united together and supported each other in universal solidarity did we workers ever stand a chance against the employing class.

It was found that the old craft style of unionism only had a limited effect and for only a limited number of workers. In craft unionism the workers on the same job were divided into different unions and many workers were left unorganized. Out of that experience came the concept of industrial unionism where all the workers in an industry were organized into one union. Unions such as the Western Federation of Miners and the American Railroad Union pioneered the idea of industrial unionism here in America and these experiences inspired workers to create the industrial unionism of the IWW.

Even with industrial unionism advancing the power of organized labor, workers quickly found that single-shop or single- shop organizing had its limitations and that those limitations became even clearer as the companies of the employers of this class became larger and west well beyond limited geographic areas. Out of that realization came the idea of creating national and international industrial unions and the concepts of industrial organizing and industrial action.

It was realized that there needed to be an organization that united the industrial unions and that would directly seek to organize those that have yet to be organized. This was necessary in order to build a labor movement that could stand up to the organized power of the employing class. Attempts were made to create a new type of labor organization, such as the American Labor Union, which the Western Federation of Miners tried to create.

In 1905 veteran unionists gathered together to try to create an organization based upon their collective union experience that would include those things they had come to realize what a labor movement needed; universal working class solidarity, industrial unionism, industrial organizing and action, an organization that would seek to organize all workers and an organization that was important for the struggle to build up the organized power of the employing class. Attempts were made to create a new type of labor organization, such as the American Labor Union, which the Western Federation of Miners tried to create.

The direct experiences of labor struggles showed that the existing economic arrangement meant continued class conflict and limited gains for working people. No where in the creation of our world was it written in stones that we were a small class of people who had the divine right to own the means of production within society and that those who lived in any working class, was doomed to forever for the same class of owners. This economic arrangement made the employment experiences very rich and condemned those that did all the real work of society to poverty and faced with forever being in a state of class conflict in order to improve their lives and to protect the improvements they have gained. Not wanting to leave future generations an inheritance of poverty and class conflict, many good unionists came to believe that the organized labor movement needed to do more than just gain concessions from the bosses be able to take care of their own, that the only economic system that could create industrial peace was one where the employers created their production.

In 1905 veteran unionists gathered together to try to create an organization based upon their collective union experience that would include those things they had come to realize what a labor movement needed; universal working class solidarity, industrial unionism, industrial organizing and action, an organization that would seek to organize all workers and an organization that was important for the struggle to build up the organized power of the employing class. Attempts were made to create a new type of labor organization, such as the American Labor Union, which the Western Federation of Miners tried to create.

The direct experiences of labor struggles showed that the existing economic arrangement meant continued class conflict and limited gains for working people. No where in the creation of our world was it written in stones that we were a small class of people who had the divine right to own the means of production within society and that those who lived in any working class, was doomed to forever for the same class of owners. This economic arrangement made the employment experiences very rich and condemned those that did all the real work of society to poverty and faced with forever being in a state of class conflict in order to improve their lives and to protect the improvements they have gained. Not wanting to leave future generations an inheritance of poverty and class conflict, many good unionists came to believe that the organized labor movement needed to do more than just gain concessions from the bosses be able to take care of their own, that the only economic system that could create industrial peace was one where the employers created their production.

The WOB and the class struggle of which it is a part, cannot be looked at in the isolation of a few events or individuals. The class struggle is a long journey down the road of liberation and each step down that road adds experience and knowledge making further steps possible. As long as working people struggle against their exploitation not part of their struggles is a failure because, in the long run, all of their struggles together is what will help us working people reach our collective goals. Each stage the IWW went through in its one hundred years was an important stage for our organization, even when we reached our lowest point of membership in the mid-to-late 1930s, those Wobblies who remained did an important job of keeping the organization and our ideas alive for the next generation of Wobblies.

Each Wobbly struggle is important. From the massive grand Lawrence Textile Strike in 1912, all the way to the smallest fast-food strike, each worker is important and every struggle is worth fighting. We do not say "an injury to one is an injury to all," rather we say "an injury to one is an injury to all." All the IWW struggles throughout our one hundred years have been the result of the efforts of union and Wobblies and that has not been what the books tell you. They say that our struggles have been the result of a few leaders. The history of the rank and file Wobblies is the history that has yet to be written.

A few years ago I was asked to speak at a college where the film "The Wobblies" was being shown. After the film a college labor history professor said he had five minutes minutes of the IWW. He did not understand our history, which has been made by all our members. He did not understand that the IWW is not about a bunch of historical events but rather the IWW is a long journey down the road of class struggle. He meant to say, oh we are just moved by ideology rather than the collective working class experience. That he knew words out of books on the IWW, he did not know or understand the IWW. I guess I was like some manuscript piece, a real live Wobbly, when he was done ranting his nonsense, he told me I had five minutes to speak. How could I explain the truth of the IWW in that time? So I did not use up that five minutes at all. Rather I got up there and said, "Labor historians use workers as anthropological tools to India. Do not believe a word they say." And as I looked out at the shocked expressions upon the faces of everyone there I walked out. I can't do museum piece nor anyone's cake.

The IWW believes in the idea of building a One Big Union of the working class. But in practice Wobblies have supported and do support the struggles of all workers against their bosses no matter what organization they may belong to, and we have tried to educate working people to the great idea of universal working class solidarity, that the struggle of the One Big Union has also come to mean the organized solidarity of the working class.

Universal working class solidarity is something that you will not find much of in the business unions. It is not uncommon for business unions to scab on each other by creating picket lines or handing out workers to strikers to help the weak that striking workers would have done. Though a few unions may have gained a little by breaking the back of whole industries, the labor movement has greatly suffered because of it. Based on my experiences and the Wobbly tradition, below I have written up what I believe the Principles of Universal Labor Solidarity should include.

Principles of Universal Labor Solidarity:

I. Every worker on every job throughout the world has the right to organize with their sister and fellow workers in their own craft and in their own environment.

II. Every worker throughout the world has the right to a living wage, safe and healthy working conditions and health care coverage.

III. Every worker throughout the world has the right to a pension, housing, unemployment benefits and social security.

IV. Every worker throughout the world has the right to refuse to participate in or support wars where working people of one country are used to fight and kill working people of another country.

V. Every worker throughout the world has the right and responsibility to provide for the environment.

VI. Every worker throughout the world has the right to challenge those in power.

VII. No worker throughout the world should ever be a slave.

A. No worker should ever cross a picket line.

B. No worker should ever supply a shop with goods or services.

C. No worker should ever handle slave goods.

D. No worker should ever consume slave goods.

E. No worker should ever do the work that striking workers would have done.

F. When ever workers are faced with government repression because of their right to organize and striking they all have the right to withhold their labor from the companies and industries profiting from that repression.

G. Every strike or job action in a class action and should be support with direct solidarity unless that action violates the principles of Universal Labor Solidarity.

Wobblies have always understood that resistance to the employing class and the governments that work directly in their
Paint the town red.
Join the Industrial Workers of the World!

interests take many different forms. Thus, through the power of the IWW is creating a revolutionary industrial organization, which will have actively cooperated with other forces of reorganization and at times even given up their lives for. Wobbly fought in the Mexican Revolution, and fought the fascists in Spain. Wobblies have been active in such social movements as: free speech, antitrust, civil rights, antiwar, and defense of the environment. Wobblies resisted segregation laws in the South of the U.S. years before the Civil Rights Movement started in the 1950’s. Wobblies have actively supported indigenous peoples’ resistance. Wobblies have actively worked in support of political prisoners from Money-Billings and Sacco-Vanzetti, from the old days to Leonard Peltier and Mumia Abu-Jamal of today. Wherever you find resistance you are sure to find some Wobblies. These were many Wobblies in the streets of Seattle during the 1999 protests against the WTO and many Wobblies working to save the redwood old-growth trees.

Though the history books seem to think the IWW was a in U.S. labor organization, this is not true. The Industrial Workers of the World, as its name suggests, is an organization of workers around the world. IWW organizations have existed on every continent on the face of the earth and have had almost organizational and industrial action in such countries as China, South Africa, Mexico, and Australia, to name a few. The IWW understands that the working class and their organizations go far beyond borders of nations and that knowing that this is the responsibility of each and every worker.

The State of the Movement

How do you judge the strength of a political movement? By the number of people who follow it? By how well it fairs against other ideas? By its longevity or influence? Or by how well it explains the world we live in and its relationship to everyday life?

Painted against any of these British Marxist looks a dead duck. This is not irrelevant to any assessment of the strength of contemporary anarchism. For much of its modern history anarchism has been in the shadow of Marxism. This is not only the case. Marxism-Leninism appears in terminal decline in Britain. While the conviction of the IWW and the radical political movement, in the shape of Respect, the Marxist Party in Britain, has now tiny and shrinking.

The IWW is in serious trouble with its membership and mounting financial debts. It has wound down most of its few organizations from the IWW to thrive in its relatively recent history. Although Galloway won in the Bethnal Green and Bow ward in London’s East End, and Respect scored highly in the general election in three other seats under the name of Muslim and (anti-war) vote, this was the last of the movement in Britain.

So that my friends is my perspective on the IWW based upon the working class experience that I have lived. I wish all Wobblies a happy 100th birthday! Green is my view, the organized working class that needs to make the industrial change. First, because the economic system must change, for there’s no way to reform the greed of capitalism. And because the working class is the political force where the changes must take place. The time has come where class responsibility is not just to your sisters and fellow workers but also a responsibility to the earth we dwell upon. Class responsibility is at stake in the Wobblies and its participation in the IWW movement.

Arthur J. Miller
Ship Builder’s IU 140: IWW, USA

The IWW understands that the working class and their organizations go far beyond borders of nations and that knowing that this is the responsibility of each and every worker. The IWW understands that the working class and their organizations go far beyond borders of nations and that knowing that this is the responsibility of each and every worker.
interests take many different forms. Though the purpose of the IFW is to create a revolutionary industrial organization, the Wobblies have actively supported other forms of resistance. In its early years the Wobblies were involved in the Black Sox Scandal, and fought the Fascists in Spain. Wobblies have been active in social movements as free speech, antiracist, civil rights, anti-war, and defense of the environment. Wobblies resisted segregation laws in the South. The seat of the Wobblies to service work in support of political prisoners from Money-Billings and Sacco-Vanzetti, from the old days to Leonard Peltier and Mumia Abette of yesterday. Wherever you find resistance you are sure to find some Wobblies. These were many Wobblies in the streets of Seattle during the 1999 protests against the WTO and many Wobblies working to save the redwood old-growth forests.

The history books seem to think the IFW was not a U.S. labor organization, this is not true. The Industrial Workers of the World, as its name suggests, is an organization of workers around the world. IFW organizations have existed on every continent on the face of the earth and have had major organizational and industrial action in such places as Chile, South Africa, Mexico, Canada, and Australia, to name a few countries. The IFW understands that the working class and their organizations go far beyond national borders to unite all workers. It is the responsibility of each and every worker to see that the IFW is strong and that the working class is united and strong.

In the world where the working class is organized internationally and the organization of the working class is strong, there is no longer a need for industrial and national borders to separate us. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally.

In this world where the working class is organized internationally and the organization of the working class is strong, there is no longer a need for industrial and national borders to separate us. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally.

In this world where the working class is organized internationally and the organization of the working class is strong, there is no longer a need for industrial and national borders to separate us. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally.

In this world where the working class is organized internationally and the organization of the working class is strong, there is no longer a need for industrial and national borders to separate us. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally.

In this world where the working class is organized internationally and the organization of the working class is strong, there is no longer a need for industrial and national borders to separate us. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally. The IFW is strong and the working class is organized internationally.
If you are not cowards, kill me!

Louise Michel

Mirage Editions
1990

January 9th marked the 100th anniversary of Louise Michel's death. Michel was simply the most popular revolution person. Known as "The Red Virgin", she played an important role in the creation of the Paris Commune by insinuating the people of Montmartre to stop the government and seize the guns of the National Guard. She fought on the barricades during the final days of revolt when not tending the wounded. Escaping the mass slaughter of 30,000 Parisians after the Commune was defeated, she was arrested, tried and exiled to New Caledonia along with thousands of other rebels. There, she supported the indigenous people in their revolt against French imperialism. Finally returning to France when the government pardoned the remaining Communards, she took an active part in the anarchist movement.

In 1903 she visited the block flag and had a protest against unemployment across Paris and to that flag, previously associated with French labour strikers, "The black flag is the flag of strike and the flag of those who are hungry," as she put it, became the classic anarchist symbol. A participant in many struggles, she was arrested numerous times and always remained defiant of the authorities she so clearly held in utter contempt. Anarchist and feminist, Michel fought for equality for all and for women's self-emancipation ("we women must take our place without begging for it"). She died at the age of 74, and by a fitting coincidence, she was buried a day before a crowd of 200,000 people the same day as the 1905 Russian Revolution started.

This book will introduce this magnificent rebel to a new generation. It contains a selection of writings by Michel, including her defiant speech when on trial after the Commune. "If you are not cowards, kill me!" Those are by far the best thing about the book. It also has a couple of good sections from Emma Goldman who was profoundly influenced by Michel. The first is from "Living My Life" and the second is a letter about claims that Michel was a lesbian. It is nice to know that Goldman was not a homophobe and her anarchists extended to those of different sexual orientations. There is a great account by Sheila Rowbotham of how the woman in the Commune were radicalised by their strugles and, as a consequence, how they also had to fight the sexism of their male comrades. Howard Zinn, the American radical historian, has a short piece on the "New Left" which is concrete and to the point (i.e. that history proved Bolshevik, not Marx right). A tribute poem ("Vive合わせ") by her friend Victor Hugo is also included, as are the words of the "Internationale" (written by anarchist Communist Eugene Potier).

Unfortunately, rather than fill the book with as many first hand accounts of Michel's life and struggles as possible, we get subjected to accounts of the Paris Commune by the likes of Marx and Lenin. This is a fair assessment of the times and as representing the Russian anarchists much more brutally than the French socialist Paul Michel, he also provided over the daughter of the Kronsod Commune (ironically, nearly 50 years to the day that Michel faced the troops in Paris' Lenine's regime confirmed Michel's prediction interred when she along with other anarchists were expelled from the Marxist Second International, that the Marxist "will be worse than anyone he replaces in power" because the Marxists claim inflation and practice "wage slavery." It is significant that while the editor is happy to accept Michel's actions, her political analysis is never really engaged. This is to suggest that the series is meant to present both the rebels ideas along with their lives in a serious, informative and readable manner. In the present volume he did not even state the "adapting anarchistic politics" in exile. What anarchism actually stands for, however, goes misunderstood. This is surely a significant omission (although this may be a literal misprint). On the other hand, a few comments by Marxists generally about our ideas. For example, it is mentioned in the

"It's not every day that a squatted social space celebrates the one year anniversary of its occupation. With countless art exhibitions, film screenings, performances, workshops and projects, RampsParks in East London has managed to be a meeting place for people and groups all over the world. To mark the milestone, it was time to party like cowards said not even all the way out to find out how RampsParks survives. We invited all our friends to catch a bus RampsParks to RampsParks, Gertrude arriving with surgical precision, sitting a crowd composed of bands-nice anarchists, all activists in theصحفник-camping person wearing red symbol t-shirt and a collective "Super Bumper stickers. We were heading to a free event on the North London. In the evening we wanted to choose our chosen place and build some and then decide. Only one day before the evening we were ready to open our chosen building a friend came and told us about a building on RampsParks. We took a look and decided it was perfect. We opened the first house that night. Interestingly, the pub we were locked was "it was empty. But having a social space outside of profit motive or ongoing support from organisations for this long hasn't been easy. We and Selene are well aware of raising social funds as local projects. RampArts are immediately more exciting for people to put energy into many of the people and groups that use the space simply come for their event and contribute nothing beyond that. We often feel like verse makers. Anyone can come to one of RampArts' Monday meetings to discuss events or find out how they can help. Looking around the packed main hall, I knew these meetings are important. Tonight's event had all the excitement of a carnival with none of the bad attitude, as volunteers helped keep everyone fed and happy, collected donations at the door and even washed up on stage. Guest artist Lisa O'Dell says that there is no such thing as a "perfect" idea. So we think that the events we are involved in are about to happen, that the events we are involved in are about to happen.
If you are not cowards, kill me!

Louise Michel

Tar Massacre (Ed.)
Red Lines Series


January 9th marked the 100th anniversary of Louise Michel’s death. Michel was simply amazing, revolution personified. Known as ‘The Red Virgin,’ she played an important role in the creation of the Paris Commune by leading the people of Montmartre to stop the government setting the guns of the National Guard. She fought on the barricades during the final days of revolt when not tending the wounded. Escaping the mass slaughter of 30,000 Parisians after the Commune was defeated, she was arrested, tried and sentenced to New Caledonia along with thousands of other rebels. There, she supported the indigenous people in their revolt against French imperialism. Finally returning to France when the government pardoned the remaining Communards, she took an active part in the anarchist movement.

In 1869, she helped the black flag and had a protest against unemployment across Paris and so the flag, previously associated with French labour struggles (“The black flag is the flag of strikes and the flag of those who are hungry,” as she put it), became the classic anarchist symbol. A participant in many struggles, she was arrested numerous times and always remained defiant of the authorities she so clearly held in utter contempt. Anarchist and feminist, Michel fought for equality for all and for women’s self-emancipation (“we women must take our place without begging for it”). She died at the age of 74 and, by a fitting coincidence, she was buried after a crowd of 200,000 people the same day as the 1995 Russian Revolution started.

This book will introduce this magnificent rebel to a new audience. It contains a selection of writings by Michel (including her defiant speech when on trial after the Commune - “If you are not cowards, kill me!”). There are also two important letters from Emma Goldman who was profoundly influenced by Michel. The first is from “Living My Life” and the second is a letter about claims that Michel was a lesbian. It is nice to know that Goldman was a homophile and her anarchists extended to those of different orientations. There is also a good account by Sheila Rowbotham of how the women in the Commune were radicalised by their struggles and, as a consequence, how they also had to fight the sexism of their male comrades. Howard Zinn, the American radical historian, has a short piece on the “New Left” which is concise and to the point (i.e. that history proved Balzac, not Marx, right). A tribute poem (”Vive Major”) by her friend Victor Hugo is also included, as are the words of “the Internationale” (written by anarchist Communist Eugene Potrow).

Unfortunately, rather than fill the bank with as many first hand accounts of Michel’s life and struggles as possible, we get subjected to accounts of the Paris Commune by the likes of Marx and Lenin. This is disappointing, given that the focus of the series is to present both the rebels and their ideas along with their lives in a serious but approachable style. As such, the series is unfortunately redeemed by the fact that the ’chord’ of radicals running through the series is maintained. In particular, it is interesting to see how Michel’s “emotional ties were with the anarchist movement” but that she is hardly surviving as four pages previously it is admitted that she “adopted anarchist politics” in exile. What anarchists actually stands for in the movement is as yet unexplored and Margaret Morris generally are about our ideas.” For example, it is mentioned in the

It’s not every day that a squatted social space celebrates the one year anniversary of its occupation. With countless art exhibitions, film screenings, performances, workshops and protests, Ramparts in North East London has come to mean a lot to people and groups all over the world. To mark the milestone, it was time to party like cowards so I went along to find out how Ramparts survives.

I arrived in time to catch former Big Red Grrrl tourronse, Girtronde drifting with surgical precision, stirring a crowd composed of fistic- face anarchists, tattooed punks and an occasional ‘bored looking’ passers by. With only minutes before the scheduled- looking- people party everyone, every conceivable group was being represented. The usually spacious main hall was now a mass of sweating and charming, kicking and writhing, Girtronde lead singer Zoe Garden explained the how to an also- laughing eclectic collecti. Girtronde’s thrashing, the undulating energy of the crowd is powered by real skill on all instruments and they’re not afraid to ask for serious, political issues, just like the centre itself.

But and Selene are the duo that first saw potential in the vacaon house on Ramparts Street. They recall that evening one year ago. "We stumbled into a load of empty pallets which naturally come with public event space place and private accommodation. On the evening we were there, we changed to a design we’d been working on. We opened the door and decided it was perfect. We opened the first house that night. Interestingly, the pub we were looking at it was £20,000. But it’s a social space without profit motive or ongoing support from organisations for this long it’s been empty. Ben and Selene warn about using social centres like Ramparts for granted. ‘Of course we never imagined we’d be here for a year and being around that long generates its own problems. We had have a drop off in involvement as new projects are immediately more exciting for people to put energy into, many of the people and groups that use the space simply come for their event and contribute nothing back to us on any of the -which we feel like we learn more.

Anyone can come to one of Ramparts’ Monday meetings to discuss events or find out how they can help. Looking around the packed main hall, I knew these meetings are debates by comparison Tonight’s event had all the excitement of a concert with none of the bad attitude, as volunteers helped keep everyone fed and happy, collected donations at the door and even rode on stage.

Gard’o’s sword-wielding side came at an end after a few minutes. Just as she was about to turn the steady stream of DnB Nassley, I asked the Ramparts about the upcoming turnout. "Attendance of events doesn’t usually translate into support -our spring clean was a classic example. Sadly, we find we get most hands-on support and volunteers from overseas investors who we accommodate during their stay. The hands-on support is for nothing and we do it purely to support them and we perform it to ensure they are happy. We had to put together another campaign is putting on a benefit. I guess the space also has the benefit of a reputation now as we get bands bands contact us asking to play!" But RampArt is about much more than raising for good causes. I climbed up to the building’s roof garden to take a break from the crowd and think about social spaces and Ramparts. No one has ever asked Ben and Selene to acknowledge the social costs of their work, huge social and exhibition space, screening room, backyards, and even a radio station, not to mention various ongoing projects. RampArts offers any individual or group limitless opportunities to get involved, even if its sometimes to swing a broom. No social space can survive without community support and encouragement, and a good number of people agree to join in at Ramparts. Check out ramparts.co.uk for find what’s going on and go out there. With few places like it, let’s keep Ramparts alive for many years to come.

Alex Shapiro
introduction that Miché had supported the statement by arrested anarchists made in 1883 and that she reproduced it in full in her memoirs. The edition of the book was published for the first time in 1988. Surely such a concise summary of what Miché believed in would warrant inclusion in any book about her life and work. And given that Miché became an anarchist after the event, it would make sense to reproduce, in her own words, the material that formed the basis of her own political thought.

 Sadly, we are not to be spared. Many of Miché's ideas were developed in her own work and in her work in the broader anarchist movement. Her ideas were developed in her own work and in the broader anarchist movement.

 For the record, there wasn't even if it had been then the Communist would have worked. Miché explored the idea of revolution as a way of transforming the world into a utopia for all. But she may have been useful to mention this. The fact that this is not entirely possible to change the world into a utopia for all. It's a little bit too soon to say.

 And just to state the obvious, it was not, as the editor states, "Miché's communist international". Miché neither owned (although she acted like she did most times) nor did she espouse her theories. When Marx finally succeeded in imposing his ideas into it, to combat the rising influence of the anarchists around Bakunin, he only succeeded in killing. Perhaps it was a subject and a central role. They probably do really think of it as "Miché's influence". It's a little bit too soon to say.

 I should stress that I am not suggesting that these comments by the editor are the reason for marxism to exist. I am sure that the editor is a little bit too soon to say.

 I should stress that I am not suggesting that these comments by the editor are the reason for marxism to exist. I am sure that the editor is a little bit too soon to say.

 Additionally, I should stress that I am not suggesting that these comments by the editor are the reason for marxism to exist. I am sure that the editor is a little bit too soon to say.

 Anarchists are often accused of being utopian and their ideas of revolution as a way of transforming the world into a utopia for all. But they probably do really think of it as "Miché's influence". It's a little bit too soon to say.

 Rokosj also reinterprets his cut to a discussion of the role of workers' councils in the establishment of a libertarian state. As an alternative to a nation-state, Rokosj uses the example of Levick to show the impossibility of using centralised state power to achieve social justice. As he continuously stresses, only the direct participation of the working classes in constructing socialism can make it work. Rokosj takes the experiences in working-class groups of people in different localities, has his ideas of self-organised groups and networks.

 To conclude, Rokosj presents anarchistic thought as a clear, coherent, and consistent tradition of social revolution and inspiration and should be considered essential reading for anyone seeking an alternative to capitalist society. It is based on liberty, equality and solidarity.

 "The Marxist biases and their corresponding historical revisionism are amazing, but should not detract the reader from finding out about the life of this amazing woman."

 more modest claim that Marx "helped find" the organization. It is clear that Marx was present at the founding meeting of the International but he was not involved in organizing the meeting or the process that led to its creation. The British and especially French trade unionists, both of which Marx spent a lot of time fighting and he was a member of the General Council.

 The editor goes out of his way to present a Marxian spin to the Communards. He notes that "members of Marx's first International were elected to the Communist's Central Committee". The idea of a Central Committee for the first time in 1838 is not a secret. If the editor had bothered to include, say, the Communist's declaration to the French people it would become pretty clear that the ideas that inspired much of the Communard movement were derived from Prophete's thought.

 "The Marxist biases and their corresponding historical revisionism are amazing, but should not detract the reader from finding out about the life of this amazing woman."

 "A propos of the "Marxist biases and their corresponding historical revisionism are amazing, but should not detract the reader from finding out about the life of this amazing woman."

 The book is not perfect, of course. Some may find it dated. Most evidently, there is no discussion of ecology, sexism or racism. His concentration on the labour movement could have been extended to encompass the new sociology that was the man, if not only, pre-occupation of anarchism. Similarly, while he notes that the various self-organized workers organisations will be the building block of a libertarian socialist economy, he fails to stress that the nature and structure of how work and values will be transformed after a revolution. Perhaps he simply took for granted that workers would inevitably and magically transform the world in the same way as capitalists used to and that those who served to police the system of a free and rational society would come to better, better, worse under workers' self-management. Either way, it is an omission that should not be made today.

 Sadly, Rokosj fails to discuss the necessity of community organisations to complement the working class. There is no attempt to address the tendency of syndicalist unions to adjust themselves to the system they are fighting and become reformist.

 Given that numerous revolutionary unions have done this (most famously, the French CGT), Rokosj fails to discuss it. Any account of anarchism necessarily needs to address this issue if it is to convince other revolutionaries and intellectuals that the current trade unions bear little resemblance to the syndicalist unions he outlines which suggest that the latter are not only inherently and therefore so that there is no need for libertarians to organise as libertarians to influence it.

 Similarly, while he rightly points out the revolutionaries' accomplishment of theCNT andPASduringtheSpanishCivilWar, he fails to account for their disastrous role in collaborating with the Fascist Republic until Franco was able to consolidate his power, while perhaps understanding the limitations of communes in crystallising the constructive and disturbing features of the present system.

 Saying all that should not detract from the importance of Rokosj's work and his valuable role in preserving the memory of the ideas and the practices of the anarchists who have been forgotten by history. Rokosj advocates and tactics Rokosj advocates and are still fresh and valid today - and not only in the labour movement. Direct action has, for example, been successfully used by various anti-racist groups in many different localities, as has the idea of self-organised groups and networks.

 To conclude, Rokosj presents anarchistic thought as a clear, coherent, and consistent tradition of social revolution and inspiration and should be considered essential reading for anyone seeking an alternative to capitalist society. It is based on liberty, equality and solidarity.
The Marxisms bai's and their corresponding historical revisionism are amusing, but should not distract the reader from finding out about the life of this amazing woman.
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