GENETIC MANIPULATION  CONTRACEPTIVE HAZARDS

RAF members' re-assessment
Italian feminists • Peugeot exposed
Red Therapy – can politics be fun?
WHERE WE STAND

Are you dissatisfied with your life in our society? Certainly important decisions about your life are out of your control and in the hands of managers and officials of one kind or another. It's quite likely that you don't know your neighbours or workmates very well - and feel anxious and lonely from time to time. Although we can consume a lot more than our grandparents ever did the process of getting the necessary cash remains a soul destroying struggle.

Of course, socialists and social reformers were offering answers to these problems long before any of us were born; yet despite bloody revolutions, struggles for trade union rights, and the election of reformers to government, there has been no fundamental change; the 'Communist' world is not communist and the 'Free' world is not free.

Genuine freedom involves the end of wage labour and all economic inequality; it involves the liberation of personal and social relations among men and women - a transformation of society which would be totally revolutionary in its scope.

But when we come to examine most radical and revolutionary movements we find that in practice they have little to do with freedom. Rigid hierarchical organisation and the worship of dead heroes go hand in hand with a willingness to manipulate and sacrifice ourselves and issues in order to 'build the revolutionary party'.

The real movement for freedom is not to be found in any formal organisation but rather in the responses of ordinary people who feel down trodden and ripped off. Whenever we recognise the needs of another person and that recognition is returned, a link in the chain snaps. Whenever we join hands in an open and equal fashion to shift the deadweight of bureaucracy even fractionally, a shudder passes through the whole structure.

SOLIDARITY is not the 'leadership' of this movement, but merely one small part within it. We attempt to broaden and deepen the growing criticism of modern society in theory and practice. We try to learn from the hidden history of ordinary people that lies beneath the history of our leaders and generals and attempt, within our means, to encourage autonomy, participation and equality in every struggle that we are involved in, whether in the workplace or in the wider community.

From 21st to 28th July this year 'Solidarity' retreated into the Galloway hills for a conference and a week's holiday (our first in 18 years). The venue was Lau- ricston Hall, a vast crumbling mansion run as an "alternative holiday camp" by a bunch of friendly hippies.

As agreed by the Orgbureau, we set aside the first weekend for a conference, though the feeling afterwards was that this wasn't the best start to a relaxing holiday. Saturday began with reports which showed we were alive and functioning quite well at ground level; if not so well co-ordinated as we'd like (though quite a few problems were ironed out during the week) followed by a rather confusing argument about the Elections.

Afternoon still hadn't brought us a speaker on "NEW TECHNOLOGY AND THE WORK ETHIC", so we improvised. Opinion was generally in favour of labour-saving tech-
The Italian women's movement remains the only social movement to have lost none of its strength, and the least of its initiatives is microscopically examined. It has been much criticised for refusing to condemn the Red Brigades and for its refusal to support the holy alliance between Communists and Christian Democrats 'in defence of democracy and the State'. Over the past twelve months the feminists have often been called on to declare their opposition to the violence of the 'terrorists'. Hence their suspicions and their silence, in public at least, and also their refusal to abandon a hard-won self-awareness in pursuit of aims which may not necessarily coincide with their own.

Many Italian feminists have decided to maintain their separatism as a guarantee, real or imagined, of their own existence. All the more so since everything that declares itself to be "different" runs the risk of being made to suffer the consequences by the holy alliance now in power. Giovanna, a member of one of the most radical collectives, explains: 'At the present time an attempt is being made to isolate and criminalise the autonomists and the extra-parliamentary left. The feminists are beginning to regard as a marginalised group and in the present situation it is no longer certain that we would be able to initiate action in the way we have done in the past. In Genoa, women who put up posters for the 8 March mobilisation were arrested and held in prison for a week. The 8 March demonstration was originally banned, yet that was before Moro was kidnapped.'

It's a time for asking questions and moving towards new answers; "What we want," one autonomist woman told us, "is to get to grips with reality and devise new methods of political activity which combine the achievements of feminism with those of the workers' movement. The danger with the feminist movement as far as we are concerned is that it is no more than a current of opinion, easily recuperable by the institutions. What we must do is find some global response to repression, that's the real problem'.

So Italian feminists do not intend to underwrite any series of emergency measures which would mean abandoning the identity and the political methods they have developed in recent years. They continue to make an impact by the force of their own arguments, quantitatively at least. The battles which the women's movement has had to fight to win elementary civil rights, divorce for example, explain its massive support. The fight for abortion is still to be won. The visible tip of the iceberg is important, despite its uncertainties and hesitations. But no one today knows how far below the surface the whole iceberg lies.

This article is a much shortened and edited version of Carnets romains, a series of interviews with Italian feminists by Martine Storti and Marie-Odile Delacour first published in Liberation, 10-12 April 1978.
At an open meeting of Manchester Men Against Sexism in June, two men who had been involved in the RED THERAPY group in London opened up a discussion on the work of their group and the value of "therapy" to radical political practice. The meeting complemented their publication of the same name.

The group first formed as a result of dissatisfaction amongst left-wing activists with the split they experienced between the political and the personal and the difficulty of trying to mend that split within the traditional left structures. Within the group as nucleus was formed from ex-members of East London BIG FLAME which at that time (1974) was still trying to formulate some kind of libertarian theory and practice. For about 2-3 years it seems most members of RED THERAPY withdrew from public political activity, which no doubt appeared to justify the accusations of their critics on the left. However was an understandably extreme reaction against the equally extreme abstract and guilt-ridden politics of the traditional left. It is interesting to speculate on whether the withdrawal of RED THERAPY and others of a like mind in BIG FLAME had any effect on the drift of that organisation back towards outmoded leninist modes of organisation and flirtation with the trotskyists. Anyway, since then many of the individuals concerned have re-entered public political activity in ventures which they see as both politically valuable and personally satisfying. Hopefully the influence of this group and others that have emerged within the women's movement will enable libertarian communists to avoid the divisions and extreme choices which these people were forced to make back in 1974.

The pamphlet itself covers the history of the group in relation to the changes that have been taking place in modern capitalism and in psychology, a debate on 'politics versus therapy', various personal views of time, the personal and the political and the value of "therapy" to radical political practice.

Mike Ballard.
Can politics be fun?
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um enthusing for the organisation what could I offer?

Many of the people in TOM I liked, the basic demands are right and there is a need for an anti-imperialist grouping in Britain, but there needs to be serious thought about the current definition of what is 'political'. We need to be aware of our motivations and our own needs and we need to be able to relate to people in a real way, not hiding behind slogans, leaflets, platforms and 'speakers', megaphones and banners. Once I got caught up in that merry-go-round it was very hard to try and get another form of political activity together.

Also the current accepted definition of who is worth talking to—who can wield influence and has power—is so awful: a few Lefties pursuing the same few shop stewards, councillors, MPs, trades council members, and the rest, the lumpen, considered unimportant, or even non-existent, if they aren't in a Union—those are the bosses' definitions of who is valuable (those who are in waged work).

...repressive, resentful, alienated, guilt-ridden....but I know there is another kind of effective political action which is fun, creative, warm—'cos we experienced it sometimes in the TV group, so it ain't just Utopian.

Can politics be fun?

Bird Watching

I first saw them in a square, at the foot of an escarpment of black rock. We had landed in Hammerfest half an hour earlier and the shrills of the kittiwakes were still ringing in my ears. Sighting conditions were perfect: little vegetation, target stationary and at ground level, sun well up in a cloudless sky, air utterly translucent. It was crisply cold.

Hammerfest is the world's northernmost township. It boasts wharves, warehouses and a big fleet of trawlers. Its several stores sell polar bear skins, reindeer antlers and knitted Norwegian headgear and sweaters for people going further north still, on mail ships called 'Northern Lights', 'North Pole' or 'Midnight Sun'.

There were two of them, of average size, one male and one female, about 30 feet apart. They looked watchful but harmless. Their eyes, like those of the seagulls, were pale grey, washed out, almost colourless. Their faces were strangely round. Both were flaxen-headed.

They were in their early twenties, in jeans, probably students. He was selling the paper, she dishing out the leaflets. I took one. No Norwegian was necessary to get the message. The vocabulary and style of revolutionary invective are universal, and—sad to relate— universally dull. The article was about Eritrea. Yes, Eritrea, where unlike what pertains in Northern Norway, there are not seven words for 'snow'. The text stated "the opportunistic and hegemonic behaviour of Russian social imperialism in the Horn of Africa." I rubbed my eyes. It seemed such an esoteric, such a contrived concern in this frozen context. Housewives, in the market, were asking if the ship had brought fresh fruit. Visitors were searching for a foreign paper—any foreign paper less than a week old. Seagulls, grown fat on discarded fish heads, squabbled noisily around. An eider escorted her ducklings amid the wooden piles of the jetty.

I remembered St. Olav who had sought—with scantsuccess—to proselytise the Esquimos. Then, by some compulsive association of ideas, my thought switched to parrots, and to the delightful round-faced puffins we had seen, skimming the water and diving, just before we'd entered port.

My companion prodded me in the ribs. I came down to earth with a bump and made a firm ornithological identification.

I'd just spotted my first brace of Maoistus polaris (the arctic maoist).

M.B.
Written by Horst Mahler and Jürgen Backer, published in BERLINER EXTRA-DIENST, 9-12-77

Known as the MAHLER DOCUMENT or BETRAYAL OF OUR IDEALS, the statement on terrorist methods takes on particular significance, the authors being "founder members" of the Red Army Fraction. As L.W., the translator, comments: "Whatever our disagreements with this text** and libertarians in particular may have misgivings on several points, such as the nature of the state and perspectives for future action - it is a serious attempt at a critique of terrorism, especially of its results in practice. It is significant that it should have come from a source close to the heart of the terrorist movement itself".

**For reasons of space the document has been extensively edited by the editorial collective of SOLIDARITY FOR SOCIAL REVOLUTION no. 8 (Scotland).

The Schleyer kidnapping marks a decisive turning-point in the political development of West Germany. Because we belonged to the original core of the "RAF", we think it is necessary to add our views to the discussion on the causes and results of terrorism. We have set them out in ten theses which do not purport to be the "final truth", but whose definitive formulation should rather stir up a controversial argument.

1 Anyone with any understanding knows that the most recent instance of terror are accelerating a development which is leading from the liquidation of the remaining civil liberties, through a degeneration of the state apparatus, to a fascist power machine. Those who belong to the armed commando units practising this terror also know this, therefore they want the racist state.

2 No one seriously considers that the terrorist groups in this country could ever take over political power or even the state apparatus. The Bavarian C.S.U.*** and sections of the C.D.U.**** are the main danger in the present crisis inside politics.

3 The attempt of the S.P.D. and trade union leadership to take the wind out of the sails of the C.S.U.'s politics by stepping up reaction has completely foundered...themselves prisoners and parliamentary auxiliaries of the authoritarian "defenders of the Free World".

4 The overwhelming majority of the working population in our country identifies itself again, more strongly, with the state and its organs of power. That too is one of the terrorists' "successes".

5 There is at present in West Germany no social power which would be able and prepared to effect a liberating changeover. The rise of terrorism here is also an expression of the crisis of the "Left".

6 Anything is possible for us today - except the social revolution. Only when political liberty is won back will we be able to free ourselves from the ideological chains of a bankrupt theory of revolution, and find and test out ways of living which will give our ideal of freedom a positive content.

We maintain that the alternative assertion that the terrorists are not leftists at all but rather fascists, are wrong-headed. This line will only cloud our consciousness even more.

We will only be finished with individual terror and those who profit from it when we understand that trigger-happy hatred is not only a product of the decomposition of capitalist society, but at the same time an expression of the crisis of the socialist movement as a whole.

Ulrike Meinhof was without doubt a passionately convinced socialist up until her death, and ready for the highest personal sacrifice. Gudrun Ehlert was also driven by the same ideals, and the same can be assumed about most other terrorists. But when the people aggressively obstructed their messianic efforts they witnessed their total impotence in the most agonising form.

They are not only powerless against social reality, but also set at odds with their motives; for in them - to express it in Hegel's words - the "heart beating for the welfare of mankind" has long ago changed into "the rage of mad self-conceit". Their consciousness in isolation is to them the guage of all politics, of society and the individuals living in it - on that account they have individuals and society against them. Above all it is those dependent on wages, first and foremost the workers organised in trades unions, who identify with the state and its political order in the fight against terrorism and demand harsh measures, up to and including the reintroduction of the death penalty.

The hostility to the people thus
arrived at combines with their calculation that a sharpening of oppression leading to fascist terror will finally raise the people against the state and so bring forward and nourish revolutionary resistance. In this way they turn Mao's saying, "Where there is oppression there is resistance", inside out.

Because of this, neither their attitudes to the people, nor their motivation, nor even what they achieve, have the least to do with revolutionary politics. At the end of the sixties, indignation over the massacre of unarmed civilians perpetrated by the U.S. in Vietnam drove us to rise up against imperialism. With the same indignation, we reject all attempts to justify the murder of hostages — i.e. the killing of unarmed prisoners — and massacre of completely unarmed civilians as permissible and necessary.

Actions of that kind are crimes against the revolution.

History can provide other examples of revolutionary socialists turning up on the side of reaction.... We are not claiming that the terrorists of today, changed from social revolutionaries to fascists, as did Mussolini(1), Doriot(2), and the Strassers(3); but we think that their opposition to social reality has driven them into a cynical game with fascism and thereby they have clearly — and certainly not only objectively, but also subjectively — left the camp of progress and degenerated into auxiliaries of capital.

8

Neither Marxism nor Leninism, nor the social utopias of the anarchists were the source-ground for terrorism, but the unbearable reality of capital, its past and present outrages against humanity, the spiritual and mental degeneration it engenders.

9

By the internal laws of the capitalist mode of production, the capitalist power-state will go on changing into a powerful capital-state which directly regulates the social process of production and has the essential means of production at its disposal. We can avoid the ensuing dangers to the life and political freedom of the citizens of this state not by an abstract revolutionary propaganda, inaccessible to the people, which preaches the "smashing-up" of the bourgeois state. On the contrary: this nihilism will intensify the people's anxiety about social chaos and accelerate the flight to the "strong state".

Unemployment, illness, alcoholism, drug addiction, crime, terrorism and a whole procession of further social problems will steadily increase as the system's crisis comes to a head. Under the pressure of escalating suffering, people will go on appealing to the state as emergency helper and conceding it further-reaching rights of intervention, so long as they are not learning in struggle to regulate their affairs on their own responsibility. This social mechanism has certainly not, up to now, been correctly understood by Marxists.

Only the reality of freedom will overthrow the existence of the capitalist state. That the free society — at least in embryonic form — cannot already be developing in the capitalist state, is in our view one of the numerous defeatist false doctrines to which we have adhered for too long. It will arise in peoples' struggles to carry through their vital interests, to establish an environment favourable to life, against capital's apocalyptic pressure to consumption and growth. Only if people have a concrete idea, based on their own experiences, of the content and form of the new society, will they be ready and willing to strip off the enslaving form of their social existence and break their chains.

10

For us, the conclusion arising from that is that the struggle to maintain, regain and extend civil liberties is today our main task. Doesn't anyone who says that the capitalist state is too powerful and the struggle for civil liberties hopeless and just a "levelling" for revolutionising the "masses" weaken the progressive forces by leading them into ideological error, crippling and splitting them?

It all comes down to staying together and not letting ourselves be intimidated and unnerved by the howling reaction. If reaction today clamours for the liquidation of the remainder of the bourgeois constitutional state, we must as a priority stand up for its unconditional and unlimited realisation. If it is given up in some respects, it will disappear as a whole.

Only our momentary weakness gives reaction today the appearance of strength and invincibility.

Translated by L.W. SOLIDARITY(LONDON)

NOTES IN THE TEXT:

(1) "Benito Mussolini had also been the leader of the revolutionary wing of the Italian Socialists and one of its martyrs".
(2) "Jacques Doriot, founder of a fascist party in France and organiser of a French SS division...a Communist labour leader and member of the Political Bureau of the French C.P. for ten years."
(3) "Gregor and Otto Strasser personify the tragic ensnaring of social revolutionaries in a reactionary movement", the Nazis.
With the large amount of publicity given recently in the popular press, as well as the specialist scientific journals, to genetic engineering it might be as well to draw the attention of socialists to consider both the impact and the political and social consequences this technology will have.

The main technique involved is called 'recombination'. It has been described as 'one of the most significant advances of twentieth century biology'.(1) "It could give humans power over nature in a more fundamental way than that of any other technology', said the 'distinguished' geneticist Cyril Dean Darlington, in an attempt to 'solve the problem' of disease, to other more 'fit' relations. Such disease-causing organisms would rip through a whole population.

The bureaucratic nature of the 'scientific community' has meant, by and large, that the research has been the sole assessors of the risks and levels of containment necessary. Many of the conferences held during the moratorium of 1974-75(U.S. researchers were urged to cut out the most potentially dangerous experiments where all the genetic material (DNA) of a rat or a frog and slot it into the "circular" DNA of a bacterium. The 'recombinant' bacterial cell then proliferates.

Porton Down, the ex-military research station, is one of the main places in Britain where these experiments go on. There are three points to make about its development.

First of all it has been marked by extremely close (almost unprecedented) liaison between academic researchers and industry. This has led to the patenting of techniques and organisms by academic researchers in Britain and the United States. That most further recombinant genetic research is likely to be under the direct control of capital is shown by the huge sums of money ($100m) about to be invested by ICI over the next decade. Shell, ICIleveer and G.D.Searle have similar plans.

In the U.S. seven genetic engineering companies have sprung up. Research is also going on in the USSR. Even China has plans, now that the Gang of Four (with their anti-scientism) are out of the way.

The second point is that the 'benefits' of genetic manipulation are being presented as the solutions to every problem from disease and famine to illnesses and deaths resulting from industrial hazards. Although it's true that, for instance, crop plants could be equipped with nitrogen-fixing genes which would obviate the need for nitrogen fertiliser, and specially engineered bacteria could be made to express inserted genes and produce insulin (needed by diabetics) or other useful hormones, it's important to realise the role these arguments play. Society is defined in purely technological terms. Political and social questions are reduced to technical problems waiting to be 'solved' by the technological imperative.

Thirdly the hazards have not been properly looked into because of the false urgency which has been generated. The bureaucratic nature of the 'scientific community' has meant, by and large, that the research has been the sole assessors of the risks and levels of containment necessary. Many of the conferences held during the moratorium of 1974-75(U.S. researchers were urged to cut out the most potentially dangerous experiments where all the genetic material (DNA) of a rat or a frog and slot it into the "circular" DNA of a bacterium. The 'recombinant' bacterial cell then proliferates.

It's just that the 'benefits' of genetic manipulation, should it be supported? Today's work with frogs and bacteria and the 'test-tube' baby will no doubt provide the tools for human genetic surgery tomorrow. But is it's important to look behind the talk of 'curing disease' to the contemporary social situation in which such speculation is made, in order to uncover the ideological content of it.

Only recently the 'distinguished' geneticist Cyril Dean Darlington made some very political proposals (Heavily spiced with almost mystical sentiments about us having "lost our respect for nature") for future genetic intervention, like what to do with 'criminals' and those who won't be bothered to limit themselves to reproduce without control'. Sterilisation, he said, was the obvious answer.(3)

It's conceivable that genetically-induced sterility might be used in an attempt to 'solve' unemployment.
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SCIENCE

The dominant way of looking at was in terms of use and abuse.

Criticism was levelled at the for particular ends - but not ! Although still common on 'the left' under attack.

Disenchantment with the production against the technology o land, have contributed to the' a way of liberating humanity'. It fuelled a growing anti-scientist. But the debate is far from dead.

In the following articles SOLID of technology and science and t be considered as both an ideological right.
science itself. This view has increasingly come of confidence in science as a political force in its own right, particularly in the past, when science itself was used in Northern Ireland, in America has not licensed it for use there. In Britain, though it is also used in some European countries and New Zealand. However the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in America has not licensed it for five months. The CSM here have not approved DP fully is because of its side effects. The active compound in DP is a substance called medroxyprogesterone acetate. In 1970 the FDA recommended the withdrawal of contraceptive pills containing this substance because it was found to increase the incidence of breast nodules in women, it is doubtful whether this trial was continued for long enough. In fact this clinic have now stopped giving routine cancer screening as they feel it is better to reach a wider number of people than "serving a few while discouraging many" with extensive physical examinations. (1). (Checks for breast lumps and cervical cancer should be carried out when any form of hormone contraceptive is used, and CSM withdrew these pills for the same reason. Although a study at the McCormick Christian Clinic in Chiang Mai, Thailand, has indicated that there is no significant increase in the incidence of breast nodules in women, it is doubtful whether this trial was continued for long enough. In fact this clinic have now stopped giving routine cancer screening as they feel it is better to reach a wider number of people than "serving a few while discouraging many" with extensive physical examinations. (1). (Checks for breast lumps and cervical cancer should be carried out when any form of hormone contraceptive is used, and
women need help and DP will help them to avoid another pregnancy, but why is DP seen as being the obvious answer? Why aren't the side effects explained to these women? Why are they usually not tested? Why aren't other safer contraceptive methods explained to them? If they already have several children why don't the family planning doctors suggest that the man could have a vasectomy? Dr. Wilson got away with using DP in Glasgow, and I then began to hear of it's use in Dundee. One woman I know of, a member of Dundee Women's Liberation Group, was given DP when she was in hospital having an abortion. She lives alone with two children and had recently been re-housed (on one of the worst housing estates in Dundee) after living for a while in the Women's Aid Refuge - so she was seen by the family planning doctors as being a "problem" woman. She says (3) "The nurse came with an injection - not thinking I didn't ask what it was - truthfully I was too frightened!"

After it was over I was told that would do me for three months - it was the new form of birth control. I felt so angry but to crown it all the family planning lady came to my home with another when my three months were up. By this time I had found out about it all so I told her "No way." You would have thought I had committed a murder and after a heated talk I was told "Don't come crying to us if you get pregnant." This is not the only case I know of in Dundee - I also know a seventeen year old unmarried mother (again a 'problem' woman) who has been offered it. Interestingly whenever anyone who was well-informed asked about DP on their visit to the family planning clinic they were told it was hardly ever used. Recently articles have appeared in the Leveller(4) and Spare Rib(5) from women in the East London Health Group who have discovered that DP is being used extensively amongst working class women in the East End. As in Glasgow it seems to mainly be used on women who have several children or who have had abortions. In fact it looks like the use of DP is widespread; Maggie Jones (Research Editor, Family Planning Association(FPA) herself says (2) "There is scarcely a domiciliary service in the country which does not make use of it and it is also given to women at some hospitals following childbirth or termination." This is without it being licensed for use in this country!!

The use of DP in this way amongst working class women in this country is bad enough but when coupled to its use in under-developed countries one really begins to wonder what the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) and the FPA are up to.

Nina Woodcock.

Genetic Manipulation contd.

The McCormick Clinic in Thailand gives 10,000 injections per month (1,000 being new acceptors). The clinic has 1,000 women who have been on DP for seven years or more. There are hundreds of thousands of women in other countries from Argentina to Tanzania to Vietnam who receive a shot of DP every three months, and don't forget every shot means more money for Upjohn Ltd.. One of the main reasons given for the use of DP in this way is that uneducated women are not capable of taking the pill properly, yet in China DP is not used - instead they rely heavily on the pill. DP is also not used in Russia or Eastern Europe.

The use of contraception by, or sterilisation of, Third World women protects American business interests. A recent report from the US State Department says: "If the population explosion proceeds unchecked, said Dr. Raven-holt (director of the US Office of Population), it will cause such terrible economic conditions abroad that revolutions will ensue. And revolutions, he suggested, are scarcely ever beneficial to the interests of the United States." (6)

There is nothing wrong with the idea of injectable contraceptives if the drug used is safe; injectables are convenient for both the doctor and the patient. But DP is not safe. The use of DP is increasing not because women like it but because doctors do. Women must have the right to control their own bodies and this means the full choice of all available contraceptives - no explanation of how each works and its side effects. If we can't have full control over our bodies we have no hope of being able to control our own lives.

Guy Taylor.

References

(1), (2) Science 190, p.1175
(3) Sunday Times 27th August 1978

See also issue No. 39 of Science for People: "The Politics of Genetic Engineering" pp1-4.
The impending takeover of Chrysler's U.K. operations by the French Peugeot-Citroen combine will mean a different kind of management altogether for Chrysler's workers: one which regularly uses an internal spy system, "persuades" workers to join a pro-management trade union and uses hired thugs to "keep the workers in line".

The history and structure of Peugeot are described in the latest SOLIDARITY MOTOR BULLETIN, just out. With the regime described above in force, it is not surprising that productivity is 50% greater again than at U.K. Chrysler (12.0 vehicles per worker annually as against 8.2). This is reflected in the profit figures — Peugeot, £169m in 1976 and still increasing; U.K. Chrysler, a £52,000 loss in six months this year. However, the Bulletin does not concentrate on what is usually called "economics", but on the way the Peugeot management ensures minimum disruption to production on the line.

Since 1968, the year of revolt, Peugeot have been hypersensitive to the tendency of workers in advanced technological production to resort to all means of controlling the speed of the line and others ways of contesting the powers of the "order-givers".

In 1968, despite a strong legacy of paternalism and the fact that the company supplies housing and social facilities in one giant industrial prison — 42,000 people are employed in the area of Sochaux in eastern France — Peugeot was occupied.

In this case the French riot police (CRS) won a "victory". They attacked the occupation at three in the morning and the ensuing battle left three workers dead.

Another important strike in 1969 by a group of workers in a strategic position (spray-painters) forced a total shutdown and won concessions on sickness benefits.

Determined that this was not going to be the pattern of future "industrial relations", the Peugeot firm have installed a system of employing a force of mercenaries (mostly from past Algerian campaigns) whose function is to inform on people not submitting to the dictates of productivity. In exceptional circumstances they are used to physically intimidate and break up strikes.

This has not worked totally, however, and small-scale strikes still erupt. Also important, these thugs are also partially a law unto themselves and indulge in criminal activities in the wider community. There have been instances where they have disrupted production themselves, in order to fabricate dissent.

In all this the trade unions are less of a force than is the case in Britain. It could be argued that it is the failure of the unions to occupy a strategic position vis-a-vis bargaining with the employers that necessitates a more overt way of control by management.

This article first appeared in GLASGOW PEOPLE'S PRESS, to whom thanks.

**SOLIDARITY MOTOR BULLETIN no.8**
"Chrysler Workers Beware: Peugeot destroys all known activists".
from SOLIDARITY (LONDON)
c/o 123 Lathom Road, E.6.
(Price 10p + post).
Dear comrades,

In general I like the direction the 'Solidarity' movement is heading away from the intolerance and rigidity of thought in the 'state capitalist left, from which I have heard that London 'Solidarity' broke away from at the beginning of the '60s.

However, I fail to see the point of publishing such mindless crap as the letter from Sophie Laws in 'S for SR' no. 4. I am firmly of the belief that men are also victims of patriarchial culture-relationships, though not to the same extent as women. I contrast Misha Wolf's article on sexuality as something which provokes thought. The experiences and feelings he describes have often resembled my own experiences - but it is a pity that he should respond to the whole phenomena which includes 'Men speaking in a macho manner about any matter related to feelings, sexuality and personal relationships.'

Advertising using semi nude women and/or men to sell products and songs with lyrics full of sexual games by becoming celibate. Certainly there is far more to warn human relationships than just sexual intercourse/fucking (delete as appropriate) but to me it seems like retreating from a problem by seeking false solutions, not really grasping the nettle.

Though I said I liked the direction that the 'Solidarity' movement is heading, I have noticed a lack of accounts of struggles at workplaces since the merger with 'Social Revolution'. I hope that 'Solidarity' writers are not turning their backs on workplace struggles.

DB (Bristol)

Like Misha Wolf (Solidarity 4) I feel a need for human warmth and for close physical contact with other human beings and when I'm in a situation where I'm with a partner of whom I'm enamoured and who is enamoured of me, such contact leads to sexual arousal which demands sexual satisfaction. If such satisfaction is not forthcoming, I experience feelings of frustration, anger and being hurt. Such negative emotions only serve to reinforce the authoritarian character structure which is the product of the repressive conditioning which often includes support for violent, totalitarian ideologies. Seeing sex, or men, or women as the enemy, advocating withdrawal into the loveless, unsatisfied wilderness of separation and celibacy will not solve this problem, rather it will serve to worsen it by implying if not actually stating that genital sexuality is 'counter revolutionary'.

What will solve the problem is the creation of the material conditions which will enable people to lead full, free, happy lives (including sex lives). This is what libertarian revolution should be all about it.

I enjoy eating, drinking, smoking (tobacco and dope) and fucking and I'll fight anyone no matter what they call themselves who seek to prohibit my right to do so. If this is chauvinism or counter revolutionary (too bad) because for me revolution means more freedom not less.

Finally, I'm surprised there has been no discussion of the ideas of Reich which I think are very relevant to this topic. Strange considering 'Solidarity' was one of the few groups which didn't ignore Reich or write him out of history but recognised his pertinence to today's fight for freedom.

TL (London)

Dear 'Solidarity',

The Grunwick strike is now officially over. Looking back at it, and at the discussion of it by 'revolutionary groups cannot affect the defeat, but it can give us guidance for future struggles.

Why was this fight lost? It was not primarily because of the activities of the NAPF, or that universal excuse, 'betrayal by the leadership'. It was because the workers most directly involved did not support it. There are those who will try to evade this fact by various statistical sophistries, but these only emphasise the basic fact. When the strike started, most of the workers at Grunwick stayed at work.

The division between APEX & UPW is not seriously faced. My information is that there was strong opposition from some of the membership of both unions to support for Grunwicks, as well as equally strong support from others.
I am not saying we should not support minorities. I am saying, firstly, that majority support is a very useful sector. Secondly, that where it does not exist we should say so. And thirdly, that from a social point of view, purely trade-unionist, viewpoint, it is essential. I do not believe that a socialist society can be brought about without conscious majority support.

In order to build this support, as well as to advance individual struggles, we must seek in each situation to maximize support. The first step in this process is to discover what the situation really is. If we find not many workers supporting a struggle we should be clear about this, and then seek to find out why. This means treating them as real human beings with their own fears and hopes, not as some alien monsters called 'scabs'.

For instance, in Grunwick was the workforce split along ethnic or caste lines? Was there intimidation of workers, and how could one counteract it? Were plumbers and waiters at the Randolph pissed off workers supporting a struggle we mean treating them as real human beings with their own fears and hopes, not as some alien monsters called 'scabs'.

This way there is some hope that we can build a wider and stronger movement. Current tactics seem to offer more glorious defeats.

Dear Solidarity,

First, Russia. Despite Mat Finish’s statement of all the pro-Russian propaganda up in London, all we get down here in Somerset is anti-Russian propaganda, day in, day out, from the BBC and the press.

Just as so-called communism keeps going thanks to the capitalist bogey, so do-called capitalism staggers on by the war psychosis whipped up by the communist bogeys. To an extent, too, to concentrate on Russia for ideological history lessons plays into the hands of authoritarians of both left, right, and centre, for it enables the left to say ‘It would of been socialism except they went wrong by...’, it enables the right to say ‘It was socialism’, and it enables the centre, our rulers, to conveniently divert our attention from the most salient point of all: namely, they, our middle-of-the-road liberal mandarins are our historical bolesheviks, and their hands are covered with just as much blood as Stalins.

So why is ‘Solidarity’ so obsessed with Russia – apart from it being a stick to beat the trad, authoritarian left with. Russia today would seem to be a society displaying all the complacent prosperity of mid-Victorian England, with a flattened, robotic workforce, and McCarthy-ite campaigns against the dissidents among intellectuals in line Multinational companies and banks certainly agree. Surely, if we’re interested in a new form of society, England is a more interesting phenomenon to study. We had our terror anything up to two hundred years ago, and the work discipline it imposed on the English is palpably breaking down here more than anywhere else in the world.

Which gets me on to my second point. The old ‘Solidarity’ publications relied very heavily on detailed factual reporting on what people were doing to control their own lives, and left the readers to draw their own conclusions. The first two new Solidarities seemed very weak on concrete example, and much given to rather empty preaching, a vice of most other left papers.

The No 4 was much better. Just as in the 60’s ‘Solidarity’ seemed fixated on the industry of the decade – the car industry – perhaps in the eighties it should start concentrating on electronics. JMQ’s article ‘Miniaturisation of the Proletariat’ was a start, but I thought a misplaced one. It relied far too much on the traditional scare stories which have appeared in many other places, and failed to dwell on the really genuine opportunities which silicon microprocessors offer mankind for the evolution of a more libertarian society.

Far from having one big computer boss, IBM is now having – because of customer demand – to design computer systems which rely on lots of localized, decentralized inputs and stores of knowledge, and only exchange information in a limited and controlled manner. As the article points out, modern computing systems in many ways are coming to reflect old-fashioned Anarcho-Syndicalist social systems. Micro-electronics – the industry of the future!

With Bread, Rosie, and Cider, J.P., (Somerset).
MsPrint is a new Scottish feminist journal which women write, but men are allowed to read. The opening issue is remarkably free from vicious anti-male polemics. In particular, articles on the thorny subjects of rape and violence against women succeed in developing their political dimensions in a way which is accessible to the uncommitted reader. For example, the rape article points out the conflict in calling for a change in the Scots law on corroboration — this would lead to more convictions in rape cases, but at the price of adversely affecting the rights of suspects in general. MsPrint should not be dismissed as merely "reformist". Certain changes in the law are worth campaigning for now, but we should not fail to understand the need for fundamental changes in the underlying political structure.

If anything is likely to prevent MsPrint from being widely read by ordinary women (and men) in Scotland it is an unfortunate opening article by a 'Marxist' Feminist which provides an object lesson in how to mystify people with "dialectic". Libertarians should be interested in the interview with a woman welder, particularly for its illustration of direct action among female workers.

John Cowan.

SUBSCRIPTIONS to MsPrint (£1.50) from Nina Woodcock, 74 Arklay St., Dundee.

MUTINIES: 1917-1920 by Dave Lamb
Solidarity pamphlet. 35p

The Monocled Mutineer

by William Allison & John Fairley
(Quartet, 1976) £4.95.

The Monocled Mutineer tells the story of an extraordinary character, Private Percy Topliss, and of his role in the Etaples mutiny of 1917 to his death in a police ambush in 1920. It is a stirring yarn, packed with hitherto unpublished material about the Etaples mutiny — the bulk of which will remain classified until the year 2017.

In 1917, fifty-four divisions of the French army mutinied, leaving the brunt of the war of attrition to be borne by British troops. The authors tell now of the French mutiny filtered through informal contacts between French and British troops, and of the significant role played by a small, but growing, international army of deserters. Eventually British troops staged a mass mutiny against the hellish conditions at Etaples camp, near the British front line. Though the mutiny was concealed from the wartime Cabinet it lasted for six days, involving over one hundred thousand men — a curious combination of disciplined Scots and anarchic Anzacs.

Whilst the story is primarily about Topliss, the book is packed with eye-witness accounts of the barbaric excesses of authority and of resistance to official brutality. It is always encouraging to read about authorities getting their "come-uppance" — like the night when one hundred mutineers crashed into an officers' meeting, ordered them into the guardhouse and built a bonfire around the hut, giving them an ultimatum to improve conditions or be burned alive. Needless to say, a decision was reached within ten minutes.

During the six days of mutiny, officers were thrown into rivers, some had their throats cut, whilst others were paraded around the camp in wooden cages. Civilian support grew, with local brothers — previously exclusive to officers — reducing their rates for mutineers.

Altogether a stirring tale of adventure, defiance of authority, official brutality and cover-up and an unsolved mystery. Why was Private Topliss — a ringleader in the mutiny — gunned down by the police without being offered the opportunity to surrender? What embarrassment could Topliss have caused the authorities had he lived?

The authors offer no political analysis of the events covered in the book. Perhaps this is just as well. The merit of the book lies in a wealth of factual material which speaks for itself.

Dave Lamb.
happy with AWSI, but it was agreed to await further debate before surgery: watch out for a discussion bulletin.

The last session (praising Soly 4 and abusing Soly 3) was overshadowed by one participants statement that he'd found a "denial of emotion" during the conference intolerable. The event was significant: up to now, in our debate on personal politics, over-intellectualism in 'Solidarity' has come under fire. Laurieston introduced a tendency who seemed to err on the side of "over-emotionalism".

Thus at the week's start, we discussed tasks (like the creche, and helping the residents with cooking and clearing up) and random job allocation was suggested so everyone had a share. This was met with objections to having a rota at all, on the grounds that it "wasn't libertarian" and that everyone should do what they feel like.

After the conference, therapy groups were rather more prominent than political discussions, and some definitely seemed to get a surplus of warmth and togetherness. There's room for different viewpoints, of course, but there was much worry about our political purposes being lost in therapeutic euphoria.

Generally, however, the atmosphere was sufficiently relaxed that people weren't too worried what others were doing: and there was a lot to be done together. Though parents were initially worried about being lumbered with child-care, the voluntary creche rota was well supported, and the older kids were entertained with games, shows and trips to the seaside. The income-sharing scheme, where everyone contributed a week's income for the food etc., was a success: indeed there was a surplus to play around with. When it wasn't raining there were the lochs, hills, forests, to explore and in the evening the pub or the fireside with a smores up later for the energetic.

Our discussions were tinged with a rare optimism: sure we had differences, but they're inevitable in a living organisation, and controversy keeps us on our toes. In short, it was a success and looks like being the first in a long line of holidays. Keep a week free in the summer '79.......

Niall M.

Some of our readers may occasionally read the left communist journal 'World Revolution'. If they do they may also have seen articles attacking 'Solidarity'. The last such article appeared in WR No 19. We have not previously entered into written debates with WR since previous experience has taught us that this group has no desire for a genuine dialogue. Furthermore, letters of criticism published by them invariably have replies ten times as long tagged on the end. However, there is one point in the last article which cannot pass without comment.

According to WR, the merger of 'Social Revolution' and 'Solidarity' was on the basis of a few homilies" being added to 'As We Don't See It' about "genuine freedom" after the revolution and the purging of sexist language". Since we know WR are not too concerned about sexism we'll let that pass for the moment. WR's main criticism of 'Solidarity' has been that it promotes "self-managed capitalism" rather than communism. Yet they ignore changes in point 6 of 'As We See It' and 'As We Don't See It' which specifically repudiate this accusation, advocating instead the elimination of "wage labour and production for the purposes of sale or exchange on the market", of "The national front-ers of armed states" and proposes their replacement by a "democratic community on a world scale". Together with the other views expressed in 'As We See It' this firmly commits 'Solidarity' to the development of a Libertarian Communist society.

Some of the other criticisms made by WR of particular articles in our paper on the 'Mather Platts' strike and the 'Anti Nazi League' I would personally agree with. The difference is that our paper is more in the nature of a discussion journal, whereas theirs seeks to promote a monolithic approach to world problems.

Mike Ballard
HITLER'S CHILDREN
by Jillian Becker.
(Joseph £6.50; also in Panther)

Jillian Becker was born in South Africa and studied there. She does not speak German. Her decision to write a book on the German R.A.F. (Red Army Fraction, misleadingly called Red Army Faction) with all relevant material, including that available only in German, was therefore a somewhat bold one. It could not have been carried out if she had not found a character whom she describes as "indispensable, tireless, and superbly efficient... translator and research assistant-extraordinary Bernhard Adamczewski."

I was "visited by the couple who then lived in Hemmingford Road, off Caledonian Road. They both seemed less than confidence-inspiring. However; what facts I had I put at their disposal - telling them that facts were public property and that they could have them even if they were from the German or U.S. secret service. Nor did the couple seem more trustworthy when, a few days later, they visited my Hamburg lawyer, Kurt Groenewold, who had defended some of the R.A.F. prisoners. (They claimed to be well-acquainted with me so as to extract information about his clients). In due course Groenewold's name as well as mine and those of many prominent German intellectuals appeared in the "acknowledgements" as having given help. Concerning Kurt Groenewold, myself and those with whom I had the opportunity to discuss the book, there is not one of us who was not aghast at how the facts (not to mention our interpretation of them) had been mis-handled. HITLER'S CHILDREN must be one of the most misleading books recently written.

Evidently, Ms Becker's experience as a writer of three not very distinguished novels encouraged her to supply fiction where her ability to deal with facts left her in the lurch. When, for instance, at Ulrike Meinhof's funeral the preacher, Prof. Dr. Gollwitzer (a close friend of President Heinemann, whose funeral oration was his next one) is said to have called her "the greatest woman in German politics since Rosa Luxemburg", this is pure fiction. He did not say a word of it. Ms Becker also slanders Kurt Groenewold by accusing him of crimes of which not even the most malicious German authorities have ever accused him - and these authorities seem to be conducting an annihilation campaign against "leftwing-extremist" lawyers.

Ms Becker, whose politics are close to, or identical with, those furthered by the National Association for Freedom, has produced a politically naive book, sensationalist yet rather tedious. This is all the more to be regretted since there is a great need for a book that would really explain how distinguished people like Frau Meinhof or Horst Mahler (who meanwhile has decisively rejected terrorism) came to regard terrorism as a way out and lost all sense of political reality, thus doing a great deal of harm not only to themselves and their few victims but to the entire German Left.

HITLER'S CHILDREN - the title is nowhere explained - was published in Britain, the U.S. and Germany. The publication must have been something of a public relations exercise. Review copies of the English edition were distributed throughout Germany with quite unusual generosity. Some intelligent and well-informed British reviewers tore the book to shreds. I would only quote Melanie Phillips (NEW SOCIETY, August 11, 1977) who writes as follows about Ms. Becker's attitude to the notorious Stammheim trial of the R.A.F.: "She doesn't mention that German law was broken time and again by the trial itself; she skims over the exclusion of the defence law-