The Black Dwarf

Est 1817 Vol 13 Number 9 10th January 1969 Fortnightly 1s 6d



Women sex and the abolition of the family

Editorial

No problem is more complex and less clearly thought-out than the liberation of women in modern society. Women are subject to men on many levels – in industry, in the professions, in the family, in law and in personal relations. Their inequality is enforced at every stage, and the attempts that have been made so far to break this inequality have been partial and inadequate. The simplest issue is that of politics and employment. The first battle that women fought through the suffragette movement was for political rights, but although this was the focus of the conflict at that time it was only the very first stage of a campaign; women were then gradually able to advance into areas of employment that had previously been barred to them, but many restrictions still remain and the average pay for somen in industry is significantly less than for men. In medicine and teaching, for example, there is overt sex discrimination.

This area is still one in which a lot remains to be done; in many countries of the world including Switzerland women still have no right to vote; the light for equal pay for women is entering a more militant phase in this country. But these campaigns are only a part of the general campaign: the ability to participate in the charade of bourgeois elections and the right to equal exploitation by capitalist aployers do not mark the mains of the street overthrow capitalist society within which they are trying to achieve a measure of equality but more importantly because these areas of public inequality are merely one dimension of women's condition.

The greatest degree of exploitation of women comes within the family and sexual relations.

Women are brought up to play a particular role, that of house-teepers, mothers and faithful sives. But there is no biological reason why women should do bousework or look after children. Physical strength is rarely a relevant qualification for modern work. In theory, men could stay at home and look after the children while women earn the children while women earn the children while women earn and somen to go out and work; in this sense they represent a step forward, but they still leave antouched the whole area of extra relations, which is the core of the whole problem. If somen are to be equal to men, they must have equal sexual

The standard ideology of our occiety, and that of many others, a that women are supposed to be rigin before marriage and aithful afterwards; men are not expected to be either. This ideology divides women up into those that conform, while those that don't are penalised by a set of legal and social constraints.

Women are dependent economically on men in a society in which men work and women look after children; the divorce laws still penalise women insofar as they are financially weaker. The laws an legitimacy also discriminate in that the very concepts of legitimacy and 'illegitimacy' are a means of forcing women to have children within marriage, rather than allowing them to have them how and when they want.

But the law is only one level of this oppression. The attitudes of society are still oppressive and require considerable courage to struggle against for those without the financial strength to establish their own independence. Within the given nexus, women are expected to contain their sexuality within the family; alternatively marriage itself. There is no rationality in forcing people to formalise their relations by registering them in a church or a town hall. The very institution of a legalised, permanent relationship is one that must be criticised, as unnecessary and in many cases evil.

If people wish to live together they should be able to; if they are fed up with each other, they should be able to part without any constraint. If they have children, this will complicate matters and effective legal present the end of the ensure that chall and are not deserted and that both parents do what they can to finance their children's lives. Ia a society without legal marriage at all, the concepts of legitimacy and illegitimacy would disappear. If couples wanted to formalise their relations, they could still do so.

Pre-marital sexuality, the spread of knowledge about contraceptives and the gradual emergence of the unmarried family are signs of a gradual thaw in our society. But they are only a beginning, and aim of any revolutionary movement must be one of a qualitative change in the whole of society, not merely in the political institutions and the distribution of power. The oppression of workers is one dimension of the struggle; that of women a distinct though related one.

When Marx and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto, they stressed the relation between the status of women and the society in which this status was defined. For the bourgeoisie, the family was a means of preserving property through inheritance; and bourgeois education a means perpetuate their class politically and ideologically, as well as biologically. The public schools in our society still carry out this essential role. For the proletariat, the pressure of modern industry, driving women and children into the factories, served to disintegrate the family and personal relations altogether. In calling for the abolition of the family, they were not calling for the abolition of a stable relationship between parents and children, but for the end of the family as a tool of capitalist society, and a form of social relationship which capitalism, in order to preserve itself, tried to turn into a feature of society which was beyond all criticism.

Engels' (1884), The Origin of the Family, Private Property and The State, is an analysis of the role of the family in capitalist society: although some of the historical anthropology that he puts forward has been superceded by subsequent research, his central theses remain.

possibility of different minds of relation, since the material basis for the monogamous family will have been removed. Secondly the criterion for relations between the sexes should be mutual feeling and not constraint, economic pressure or legality.

In capitalist society, women are

exploited as instruments both of production and of reproduction. It

in the interests of the bourgeoisie to breed their wives as mindless, ornamental servants and to force the women of the proletariat into factories to work for wages considerably less than those pid to men. Although some cracks have appeared in this edifice, the structure of Marx's analysis remains unchanged. When Lenin confronted the question of the liberation of women, he was in the position to carry out important reforms on this basis of his analysis. In the years immediately following the revolution a series of laws were passed abolishing the Czarist legislation on women, sex and the family. Divorce was made free for men and women; abortion and contraception were made freely available; the distinction between legitimacy and illegitimacy was abolished, as was the ban on homosexuality. Lenin was quick to point out that in itself this was not enough, and he stressed the need for a change in the attitudes that men had to women, since this lay behind the whole structure of male domination and laws in themselves were not enough to overcome the culture of the repressive family. The sad fate of this tradition in Russia and Eastern Europe is merely one further example of the degeneration of the Russian revolution. The project of Marx and Engels, to abolish the traditional family once the material basis for it was ab was never implemented. Today all the most mystified forms of submissive feminism - special women's days, flower shows, adulation of the woman uniquely as a mother - are flourishing. The ideal of women as individuals freely choosing how to carry out their personal and sexual relations has been forgotten, to be replaced by the most bankrupt and shabby

In the Third World, different issues are involved. One of the most universal features of the imperialist impact on colonial countries is the brothellisation of the women of the colonial territories. Shanghai before 1949, Havana before 1959, and Saigon today are all proof of this. Any anti-imperialist movement is therefore forced to stress the importance of the family in contrast to mercenary sex and this has the danger of re-introducing or fortifying the traditional family structures. In China and Cuba women have been brought into political and economic life; the most obvious forms of traditional

In trying to work out what the aims of a revolutionary movement in his area of women and sex are to be, it is also essential to incorporate the findings of contemporary psychology. This is a dimension which was absent from Marx and Engels but on which in no way contradicts their work. The relation between Marxism and psychology is often phrased in terms of an inherent opposition between social and individual analysis, or social and individual solutions. Only this year, Anna Freud attacked the revolutionary student movements in the west for trying to change society rather than trying to solve their problem by adapting to it; and some trends in socialist thought, being excessively suspicious of the threat to political action, have failed to see the need for a psychological dimension to socialist theory.

Psychology is needed both to explain all the ways in which capitalist society reinforces its control, and to explore the ways in which man can be liberated through revolution.

The relation of psychology to the anaylsis of our society has been explored by Wilhelm Reich and Herbert Marcuse. There is no need to follow either of these thinkers all the way, but they have at least begun to develop the study of how capitalism forms the mind. Marcuse stated at the Dialectics of Liberation Congress last summer that capitalist society has 'invaded' the subconscious, and Reich in his work on The Sexual Revolution tried to describe what he called 'the sociology of the unconscious and of antisocial sexuality'. The key of the subconscious is the family. From the first months of a child's existence capitalist society fills it with the values, ideas and mystifications of its own reality, and this socialisation through the family is reinforced when the child goes to school. In addition, the average family represses sexuality in children and teaches them to accept a repressive or at least hypocritical sexual morality There cannot be many parents in this country, of whatever class, who would allow their children complete sexual freedom from the day they were born, or who would let them make love at home.

This constant repression of sexuality in the young, reinforced by the morality of the family, is in Reich's analysis the psychological basis for authoritarian society, whether fascist or Stalinist. By restoring the sexuality of the young, and by forcing them to submit their own feelings to an irrational and external parental authority, the young are taught to accept, and ultimately to need, an irrational external authority. The forms of

Seen in this light, the family is a political instrument in an authoritarian society. The analysis of this psychological dimension does not mean that capitalism rests on the existence of unconscious repression alone, but this psychological moulding through the repression of sexuality and through indoctrination within the family forms one means by which the unconscious is invaded and further base for manipulation and control is established.

The alternative to this now become clear. The answer is not to abolish the family but to abolish repression and mystification within the family, and to stress that the family is only one possible form of personal and sexual relationship, other multiple, communal and casual forms being equally viable. The point is not to condemn any particular form of social behaviour but to provide people with the choice and the realisation that no one form, sanctioned by our society for particular reasons, need be accepted as the ultimate criterion.

The liberation of women will only be achieved through a total overthrow of all the forms of their oppression – industrial, legal, sexual, psychological and cuotors; the precondition for such a total the precondition for such a total liberation is the overthrow of existing society, since only revolution can create the material basis for abolishing the repressive family. The first problem is to get women themselves to realise the nature of their own situation, since far too many have been so conditioned as to accept their multidimensional inferiority; the second step is to achieve a change in the attitudes of men, of left, right and centre. The loosening of traditional ties has far too
often replaced one form of sexual oppression by another, as the plight of the unmarried mother in our society shows. For them the abolition of the family has meant that they are left in the lurch by a society of male supremacists.

The way in which the sexual change is formulated in our society at the moment is all wrong. One has only to read the personal columns of the International Times to see that there are a lot of very lonely people around, and part of the cause of this terrifying solitude and misery is the phoney publicity given to sex by contemporary media. Instead of being freed from traditional constraint, sex has become an instrument of salesmanship, and for creating neurosis on a mass scale among the young. The sexuality of Playboy is as much a result of capitalist society as was that of the Victorian family: and the frenetic pursuit of quantity in sex is also a crude psychological response to the quantification and competitiveness of private enterprise. A mechanical 'free-love' is no more a solution than socialist puritanThe changes in sexual patterns among the young in modern industrial society are part of the crisis of our society, but they need to be seen in the social and revolutionary perspective — as a weakening of the repressive family structure, as fragmentary anticipations of conditions under socialism and not merely as the aberrations of a dissident youth. There is a need to think through the implications of these developments. For the left, the demand for the freedom and equality of women must be part of their campaign: the change in sexual behalur can all too easily be contained by bourgeois society which has already developed a vast mechanism of hypocrisy to accommodate deviations from the ideal of marriage.

It is important also to make clear the revolutionary possibilities of a liberated and responsible sexuality – an end to all legalisation, to all restrictions on sexual freedom and to the family as the tool of capitalist society. This programme may shock not only the conservative forces in our society but also the traditional left whose morbid condemnation of bourgeois decadence has often concealed a puritanical and repressed view of the world.

No doubt we will be accused of frivolity or degeneracy in raising these issues at all, but they lie at the heart of our critique of modern society and of our attempt to create an alternative society. Perhaps it will be argued that exaggerating the degree of exploitation to which they are subjected – but this objection is most likely to come from men. The question raised is what kind of revolution and what kind of socialism we want to see. The revolution towards which we are moving will not be merely political but will be social and qualitative, altering not only who have power in our society but the nature of power itself, and it is up to us to develop a critique of modern society that is total in its scope, criticising all its institutions and not confining ourselves to what is traditionally understood as 'politics'. The condition of women and the quality of sexuality is part of this critique.

The aim is not to condemn any forms of sexual and personal relations; indeed, in our society, given the social and psychological pressures that affect all but a few, it is very difficult not to get married in some form or other. It is not marriage or the family that must be criticised, but the setting up of these as ideals, and the pressure on individuals to get married or stay married when not they, but society, feel like it. Without the revolution in politics, there will be no solution to the social and individual problems

Agit-Prop

We are currently supporting the GLC tenants in their fight against rent increases. We are invited to their local tenants association meetings, where we perform a farcical sketch. This goes on at the beginning of the meeting and lasts about ten minutes. It is solid but digestable propaganda intended to whip up and refresh feelings of solidarity among the tenants present, to prepare them for the meat of the meeting ahead. In this respect we hope that it at times commits waverers; even that it attracts those who might not otherwise have attended the meeting into doing so.

We are small – a single group of six; the tenants cause is enormous. Their crucial confrontation with the GLC is close. We have a second play, a sequel to the first, which is in releases and which is in rehearsal and concerned with this confrontation. But we not large enough to

supoprt this struggle on the scale that we see as necessary. We want to expand. Four coordinated groups, synchronised with an intensive poster campaign, would far more than quadruple our

While the tenants struggle is important, it is clearly not the only issue with which we must become involved. But if we chose, for example, to support a particular strike, four coordinated groups operating in London would not be enough. We want our expansion to include the formation of groups outside London; and we want to operate not only in meetings, but in the streets.

For effectiveness, coordination of such groups to deal with the same issue at the same time, would be essential. But obviously the particular form that the common issue took within a common issue. issue took within each group

would be that groups concern. The minimum degree of co-operation, or centralisation, that we envisage would involve representatives from each group meeting or making contact at regular intervals, to plan the coordination of the particular campaign.

We are holding a meeting to which we invite every committed person who feels that he or she could contribute to or participate in helping us to realise this projected expansion.

It will be at 8 pm on 12 January, at 6 Southcote Road, London N19. For any further enquiries, or for those who would like to attend this meeting and are unable, please ring 01-636 9520, or write to us at 37 Gordon Mansions, Torrington Place, London WC1.

To the Adman Poet

'Profit is not a dirty word.' CALLAGHAN

Hireling baronet of confections emperor of toothpaste shah of soappowder prince of petroleum

you sell your mind to sell products for profit and not for the use they

language filched from the mouths of the people to bind them in half truths feelings stolen from the hearts of the poets to bind them in cash

profit is the thief of labour and the assassin of peace

impossible not to clench something

impossible not to clench something – fists, jaws, minds, whatever – when one reads of the bravery of the kids involved. But reading about it gives one a false sense, not of reality, but of the emotions and frustrations of being there. I

was, after all, in Chicago too, and, come to that, San Francisco when the pigs let fly. Reading about it one is in no doubt of what one would have done, what one was fighting for, whose side one would rally to. When you're in it — and whatever one says about the English police they haven?

whatever one says about the English police they haven't actually run *riot* like the American since 1819 – the dominant emotion is simply fear. The bravery is that of tested virility not that of somebody convinced their action is going to change things for the better. I think that everyone in a confrontation with police.

American-, French-, Italian-, Spanish-, or German-style, knows

confrontation with police,

they're going to be physically

thing on a ritual plane: you know what will happen. It's

important to put your body on the line, and all that, but by so

doing you are tying yourself to games you know are loaded

against you.

beaten. And that puts the whole

with profit there is war between friends and friendship between enemies

with profit the wives of the assassins wear mink and the workers limp in old shoes with profit the work is done in fear and the owners despise the makers for profit with profit motorcars are constructed and the roads are paved with corpses (with profit the heart is hardened and sharpened into bayonets) with profit the love between man and woman is broken into suburbia

with too much water with profit the dentist spoils teeth and the doctor spurns the dying with profit habitations are built

that fall down and murder the and they are ridden to their graves

you know all this yet you break your her and stab truth for pour you sell your mind to a for profit and not for with profit our bread is baked

in the bunker's vanil

remains in the victim

profit leaves the moun

imagination corroded

encouraged to the

Booby traps

By our Science Corresponden

A scoop report by The Black Dwarf that a Wealdstone firm was manufacturing anti-personnel devices for African states brought rebuttals from the firm's managing director last week. Mr G. H. Garland, managing director of G. H.
Garland and Co Ltd, of 101
Nibthwaite Road, said that the
devices could not in themselves be used against people
as they were only as they were only detonating devices and had to be connected to an explosive

He also said that the devices could be used with charges for other tasks like blowing up against people. He said he didn't know exactly where the devices were used, but only that they were used in 'British Commonwealth states'.

Mr Garland said the devices, which he calls demolition switches, were made under licence to the Ministry of
Defence. This means that the
devices are the Ministry's
design and the Mnistry gives
the firm permission to manufacture them, with the firm paying a royalty.

The devices can only be sold through the Ministry of Defence, he says, and enquiries from individuals have to be referred to them. The firm has to get an export licence from the Board of Trade for the export of the devices he export of the devices, he

The firm makes three types of device, one chemical and three mechanical. The mechanical one looks like a pencil and is activated when part of the tubing is crushed.

The striker is held back by a The striker is held back by a piece of wire and a spring and when it operates activates an alkaline solution. The mechanical devices look like small metal cases and the operator simply pulls a catch which in turn pulls a spring and fires the striker. and fires the striker.

Each device costs about 15s. The firm has been manufacturing the devices for some 20 years and in the early days was producing a very large quantity. Now the output

varies. In some years none are produced, while in others there could be a few thousand of the different types manufactured.

Average amount made from the devices per year might be about £2,000. The highest total in a year has been about £30,000.

Mr Garland says that probably about 80% of the firm's export trade consists of these devices. The firm also makes TV components and engineering products, mostly under government contract. He says that the firm could survive without making the demolition switches although the rest of switches, although the rest of the business would have to be built up further.

One reason the firm made the devices, he says, was just as a business venture, as he liked making a business out of something.

Mr Garland said he had never seen one of the devices used in practice and had never seen the charges they were used for. He didn't know if they were used against people.

He was happy making them as He was happy making them as long as the government took the decisions on where they went, and his principles were largely in accord with the Government's. If he found that the devices were being used in a situation he disagreed with, then he would stand by his principles. his principles.

A Press Office spokesman at the Ministry of Defence said that the devices were used to detonate charges but in no special context. Some of these used against people, but he couldn't say in what situations.

He didn't know where they were used, except that they were used generally by the army wherever they were needed. He could not be more specific.

It was government policy that the export of arms to other countries could not be discussed. But he said the devices would not be sent to Rhodesia or South Africa. Of course, we believe that!!

Restrictive ritual

Every seven years the Pomos of California celebrate an expulsion california celebrate an expulsion of devils, who are represented by disguised men. 'Twenty or thirty men array themselves in harlequin rig and barbaric paint, and put vessels of pitch on their heads; they then secretly go into the they then secretly go into the they then secretly go into the surrounding mountains. These are to personify the devils. A herald goes up to the top of the assembly-house, and makes a speech to the multitude. At a signal agreed upon in the evening the masqueraders come in from the mountains, with the vessels of pitch flaming. the vessels of pitch flaming on their heads, and with all the frightful accessories of noise, motion, and costume which the savage mind can devise, in representation of demons. The representation of demons. The terrified women and children flee for life, the men huddle inside a circle, and, on the principle of fighting the devil with fire, they swing blazing firebrands in the air, yell, whose and make free in the sair, yell, whose and make free in the sair yell whose sair yel air, yell, whoop, and make frantic dashes at the marauding and blood-thirsty devils, so creating a terrific spectacle, and striking great fear into the hearts of the assembled hundreds of women, assembled hundreds of women, who are screaming and fainting and clinging to their valorous protectors. Finally, the devils succeed in getting into the assembly-house, and the bravest of the men enter and hold a parley with them. As a conclusion of the whole farce, the men summon courage, the devils are expelled from the assembly-house, and with a prodigious row and racket of sham fighting are chased away sham fighting are chased away in the mountains.'

In case you think the Pomos are a tribe or community like the Diggers, this quote comes from Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, first published in 1890. The point is that ritual encounters have by no means lost their force of late: indeed, with appropriate changes of name, Frazer's description could stand for any recent 'confrontation'. I am not knocking the brayers or singerity of ing the bravery or sincerity of the demonstrators on recent occasions, but I want to suggest that demonstrations that merely follow a ritual are as empty of effect as ceremonies to expel the devils were in California. After all, Ronnie Reagan is now their

Even the syntactical cement-blocks of Norman Mailer's prose in his pieces on the American Conventions in Miami and

Chicago cannot endow the confrontations with the effectiveness that was, and is, claimed for them. 'Yes, (says Mailer of the worst night in Chicago) it could only happen in a meeting of the Gods, that history for once should take place not on some back street, or some inaccessible grand room. Consider what a confrontation consists of. Usually formal permission is requested: even if it is refused and the demonstration it is refused and the demonstration nevertheless takes place, the forces of law and order have been well warned – they are always better prepared than the demonstrators. The leaders of the protest agree to stick by certain rules – or they don't, it doesn't matter since a ritual step outside those rules is going to take place. Many activities now feel that they have to be clobbered in order to show their fervour. The cops are very obliging in this respect. Then the victim has the satisfaction of reading about it the following day, or some inaccessible grand room, not in some laboratory indistinguishable from others, or in the sly undiscoverable hypocrisies of a committee of experts, but rather on the center of the stage, as if each side had said, "Here we will have our battle. Here we will win".' The battle. Here we will win . The horror of slaughter, of the indiscriminate use of overwhelming force on all-too-movable objects, of the lust for brutality that brings up something in the back of the throat that tastes like reading about it the following day, and those who also read about it cluck and pretend that in the victim's position they would have done exactly the same. back of the throat that tastes like licked metal – all this has been described, with and without passion, by observers of any recent confrontation. It is of course

But too often it's just a game. Not that great principles are not at stake. They are, otherwise, there'd be no demonstration. But to the primitive Pomos the casting-out of devils was pretty imoprtant too. And following a ritual that once had some sort of effect was too. And following a ritual that once had some sort of effect was very comforting: a crowd of brave people is greatly reassuring, and though during the action everyone's scared to death they know that afterwards there's going to be lots of the old 'and where were you then, when they charged were you then, when they charged down . . . ? '

The fact is that demonstrations — which everyone now says are useless, but we all go on them anyway, for if one sect refuses to join another's march it has one of its own — are based on the same kind of empty faith that sustained the Pomos. And it's not just the Pomos. And it's not just demonstrating I'm criticising, it's the whole gamut of protest action that follows rules which everyone, on both sides, knows and whose outcome is also drearily familiar. The idea of demonstrations, after all, is that you persuade public opinion, or the system, or yourselves, that your cause is just and demands remedy. They are also expressions of solidarity, often embarrassing to the system, and as such have a certain symbolic importance. But why try and elevate them to the status of effective actions? Anyone who thinks radicalisation does grow from the end of a policeman's truncheon should look at the results of an opinion poll taken not so long after Chicago: 78.7% thought the police were justified.

(Mind you, no one under polled – when the first 100 under 25 to pass some pollection what asked their cover 90% were on the den strators' side.)

I submit that demonstration essentially vicarious affairs with all protest action who outcome and programme is in advance. They allow participants to fee they are something, and they are something and they are something and they are something. something, and those who about it afterwards to feel they would have done som Because they once had an and remember it got to newspapers, not the policies people follow them mindle. The forms are observed, as indeed anyone who steps out them is accounted to the policies. indeed anyone who step to them is accused of not play the game. It is a sham, dan not because it enables some off steam, but because such constitute the whole of the protest activity. They know nothing else: like the Pomethey'd be shocked to discover were other things to do to ke the devils away.

The 'other things' must be surprising. If anyone on the 'law and order' side is totall prepared for what's going to happen, and on our side ever knows we're going to lose, the no point in going. Actions has to be prepared that rely not or ritual but on the strength, intellectual, political, and if necessary physical, of those tagant. We are not always in the same situation — if things could be changed there'd be no possure any sort of protest. We have a evaluate each action on its me evaluate each action on its me because we cannot rely on dop rituals, or authorities who were have us follow their path to a have us follow their path cul-de-sac where the cudge waiting. We have long ago pa the point when we can afford repeat the mistakes of past repeat the mistakes of past campaigns, when by repeating old slogans we can expect the walls to come tumbling down it there nothing in our inventivem our wits, our energy that can a us beyond ritual? Or will we continue to follow the old wars till the devils constrain. till the devils overtake us?

in Cuba and four other texts 5s Od. Just published, Send £1 for both books, post free, to

SATURDAY, 25 JAN: ROSA LUXEMBURG/KARL LIEBKNECHT: 50 YEARS AFTER. Speakers: Ernest

Poster Workshop Benefit Cast: Cartoon Archetypical Slogan Theatre Angry Arts Films Society

Reform vs Revolution Tribune vs Black Dwarf Michael Foot vs Tariq Ali

To the Black Dwarf 7 Carlisle Street WI

Letters

A very open letter to John Hoyland from John Lennon Dear John,

Your letter didn't sound patronising – it was. Who do you think you are? What do you think you know? I'm not only up against the establishment but you, too, it seems. I know what I'm up against – narrow minds – rich/poor. All your relationships may be poisoned – it depends how you look at it. What kind of system do you propose and who would run it?

I don't remember saying Revolution was revolutionary – fuck Mrs Dale. Listen to all three versions (Revolution 1, 2 and 9) then try again, dear John. You say 'In order to change the world we've got to understand what's wrong with the world. And then – destroy it. Ruthlessly.' You're obviously on a destruction kick. I'll tell you what's wrong with it – People – so do you want to destroy them? Ruthlessly? Until you/we change your/our heads – there's no chance. Tell me of one successful revolution. Who fucked up communism – christianity – capitalism – buddhism, etc? Sick Heads, and nothing else. Do you think all the enemy wear capitalist badges so that you can shoot them? It's a bit naive, John. You seem to think it's just a class war.

Apple was never intended to be as big as Marks and Spencers – our only reference to it was to get the kind of deal we used to get from this nasty capitalist shop when we were downtrodden working class students and bought a sweater or something which was reasonably cheap and lasted. We set up Apple with the money we as workers earned, so that we could control what we did productionwise, as much as we could. If it ever gets taken over by other workers, as far as I'm concerned, they can have it

When I say we con people – I mean we're selling dreams. Friends of mine like Dylan and Stones, etc who are doing *their* bit would understand what I said – ask them – then work it out.

The establishment never slotted us into a 'cheeky chappy' bag, dear John – WE DID – to get here to do what we're doing now. I was there, you weren't. So suddenly the papers told you we were taking acid – two years after the event! So you decided that our music was best then. You're probably right about why they didn't bust me before – they, like you, had me 'tagged'. I'll tell you something – I've been up against the same people all my life – I know they still hate me. There's no difference now – just the size of the game has changed. Then it was school masters, relatives, etc – now I'm arrested or ticked off by fascists or brothers in endless fucking prose.

Who's upset about the arrest? OK. I'll have a cup of tea. I don't worry about what you – the left – the middle – the right or any fucking boys' club think. I'm not that bourgeois.

Look man, I was/am not against you. Instead of splitting hairs about the Beatles and the Stones – think a little bigger – look at the world we're living in, John, and ask yourself: why? And then – come and join us.

Love,
John Lennon
PS—You smash it – and I'll build around it.

John Hoyland replies:

Dear John,
It must be nice for you not to be in any boys' clubs.

You're right, though. My letter was patronising, and maybe some of the things I raised in it were trivial. It's what you say about the more serious ones that I want to deal with. Above all, my point was that we've got to understand that the hang-ups emanate largely from the kind of society we live in. Unless you see this you end up blaming it all on nasty men. I think this is much more naive than blaming it on the class war. Yet this is what you do. You say what's wrong with the world is narrow minds, sick heads – people.

That's funny, because we're supposed to be the ones with 'minds that hate' who are 'on a destruction kick'. But we don't blame people, and we wouldn't want to shoot all the capitalists even if they did wear badges, because we think it's natural for them to behave the way they do. What we blame is the form of society which produces them - which by its nature is competitive, puts profit before principle, places power and privilege in the hands of the few at the expense of the may, etc. Given such a society a lot of people (rich/ poor) are necessarily selfish, narrow-minded, unscrupulous. They have to be. That's the way the system works. Build a better form of society - one based on co-operation and participation and sharing - and people will respond accordingly. And we know this will happen, because we see history moving inexorably towards this kind of society - both in the capitalist countries and in the communist

You talk a lot about sick heads. This also depends how you look at it. What do you think about a person who's content to sit around being beautiful while the rest of the world burns? What do think about a person who claims to be concerned about people and their values, but remains silent when confronted by the actual struggles and sufferings of most of

want to change institutions should free their minds 'instead'. Why instead? What makes you so sure that a lot of us haven't changed our heads in something like the way you recommend – and then found out it wasn't enough, because you simply cannot be completely turned on and happy when you know that kids are being roasted to death in Vietnam, when all around you you see people's individuality being stunted by the system. Why couldn't you have said 'as well' – which is what I would say?

You say you sell dreams. So do Cliff Richard and Engelbert Humperdinck. It is just a question of whose dreams we like best? Or should we start to ask what role these dreams play in people's lives, what they make them do, whether they make them act or go to sleep, whether they're revolutionary dreams or go-to-sleep-and-forget-it-all dreams.

Let me tell you something back, I've been very involved in some of your music. The feeling I've go from songs like 'Strawberry Fields Forever' and 'A Day in the Life' is part of what has made me into the kind of socialist I am. But then you suddenly went and kicked all that in the face with 'Revolution'. That was why I wrote to you – to answer an attack you made on us, to criticise a position you took, to answer an attack you made on us, to criticise a position you took in relation to the revolutionary socialists movement – knowing that what yousaid would be listened to and respected by millions, whereas whatever reply we make here is read by only a few thousand.

Now you say you're not against us after all. Well that's nice, because I'm certainly not against you. I just wish you were a bit more on our side. (We could do with a few good songs.)

As for who I am – what kind of a question is that, for Christ's sake?

What do I know? I know it's possible for us to create a world which could one day become a loving paradise for every human-being. Is that

Decent British housewives

The day of the revolution has come and gone, and ordinary, decent, British housewives can now heave a sigh of relief, and put the kettle on for a nice cup of tea. The mindless militants, inspired by vivid recollections of Paris in April and May, and romantically dreaming of revolution and barricades in the streets of the West End, can now return to their factories and offices and universities to write more pamphlets on workers control and resume endless debates on the alienation of man in modern industrial society. Working class mothers can carry on going to bingo, and middle class fathers can roll their trousers up again at the local masonic hall in perfect safety. It was, after all, just another march, very significant in its way, but hardly a turning point in British politics. Just something else for historians and self-appointed experts to analyse and explain for the benefit of the mass produced conformists of the future.

Independent television almost openly advertised its programme for 27 October as follows: 3 pm to 4 pm 'Match of the Day'; 4 pm to 5 pm 'Demonstration of the Day But the record crowd was disappointed. Both policemen and demonstrators played a 10-man defence, neither had any imagination in front of goal, and everyone seemed content to hang on to a single point. When the final whilste blew, there were very few who were sorry. It was all rather boring.

British society has an inexhaustible capacity, for rendering ineffective by 'good-natured tolerance' any and every form of radical dissent. For once, it nearly didn't work. Our 'humane' 'liberal' dailies, a crucial link in the

chain of 'repressive tolerance', seemed to forget their historic role and were beginning to assume a different one altogether. As the hysteria mounted, and as each passing day brought fresh rumours of chaos in tube stations, occupation of key buildings, and 'fast-moving guerrilla arson squads', all kinds of shadowy right-wing forces began to emerge from dark corners, and, for one brief moment, respectable man seemed on the point of casting off his liberal, democratic clothes to reveal the fascist obscenity concealed beneath.

But it was not to be. As zero hour approached, everyone got cold feet. The striptease artists were too ashamed to reveal their nakedness, and those formerly consumed with lust lost their desire to look, for fear of what they might see. The day passed peacefully, and demonstrators sang 'Auld Lang Syne' IN GROSVENOR SQUARE with policemen. British 'good sense' prevailed. A revolution had died.

Only the obituary remained to be written, and this task fell appropriately to those champions of 'moderation', The New Statesman and The Guardian, who wagged their fingers reproachfully, and then assured us that we could now cheerfully forget all this nonsense about fundamental change, and get on with the really serious business of piecemeal reform at

Where do we go from here? Anybody know?

Yours sincerely, Richard Chessum, Pantyle House, 19 Station Road, Langford, Biggleswade, Beds.

English proletariat is not apathetic

Phyllis Deane, a statistical economic historian of some repute quoted: 'In the terse years between Waterloo in 1815 and the massacre of Peterloo in 1819 it has been said that England was nearer to social revolution than at any other time in her history.' This was no doubt due to the flood of labour onto the market after the war and the slump in demand of the industries that thrived on the war, notably ship-repairing, iron and woollen industries. Thus, inflation turned to deflation, real wages fell drastically and the real earnings of the average working class family were lower between 1815 and '19 than in the 1780s. Thus with a fall in real wages and a rise in unemployment, the standard of living of the working classes fell, causing, according to Deane and Asa Briggs, a near social revolution.

As our job today is to bring about conditions suitable for a working-class democracy, and not 'the development of ideological awareness and critique of bourgeois mystification 'as suggested by one Dwarf, it is helpful to be aware that the present government's measures

workers' and busmen's pay increase, is bringing about a fall in the workers' standard of living, after a period of a rising one. The English proletariat is not as apathetic as recent remarks would have one believe; it mobilised itself in the rise of Chartism, George Lansbury's opposition to the London council Marches of the early '30s. They may realise now that no Parliamentary party is seriously

concerning Poor Law rates and the Hunger interested in their position and since the present Government has more than two years to injure its position further, revolution can come in the foreseeable future, if a leader emerges similar to Cobbett, O'Connor or Lansbury. The policy of The Black Dwarf, and all the other organs of the Left, must be to bring home to the workers their position in the system, to continue the criticism of the bourgeois-inspired PIB and to associate the struggle of the British workers with the US Negroes, the Vietnamese peasant and the Mozambique guerrilla.



Logue poster

Che Guevara's **Bolivian**

Awareness of relative specificity

Your unsigned article on the RSSF (3 Dec) strives to maintain a 'non-sectarian' posture by denouncing all 'the sects' as equally dangerous to the student movement. This is surely a little disingenuous. For in the struggle for the programme and manifesto of the RSSF, the conclusion to which you support, International Socialism was the major force demanding a student programme - against the other 'sects' you mention, Maoists and RSL. Likewise in the debate on the Constitution, in which we fought for a structure preserving the political and tactical autonomy of local RSSF groups, and inhibiting control by any one sect ' over the movement. Far from adopting a purely sectarian outlook we allied ourselves with other revolutionary tendencies - notably New Left Review - who also had a serious student perspective.

As you will see from our pamphlet on ' Education, Capitalism and the Student Revolt '(4/6 post paid from IS, 36 Gilden Road, NW5), we have developed perhaps more carefully than any other group the 'awareness of the relative specificity of the student struggle within the general context of a socialist offensive', for which you call. We tried to fight for this at the conference.

It is difficult not to suspect that your call for 'an autonomous identity and an autonomous ideology' has its own sectarian motives. An identity and ideology cannot come from nowhere - does the Dwarf, or the IMG to which its editor belongs, aspire to fill the gap left by the inadequacies of IS, RSL, Maoists, etc? If so I feel that your exercise will prove wishful thinking. If a revolutionary student left is emerging in this country, the theories which 'the sects' (or some of them) have developed are playing a crucial role. IS in particular has given a lead in many institutions in forming a Socialist Society and in developing the struggle in the colleges. The RSL with its outworn attachment to the Labour Party, or the Maoists with their one-sided emphasis on the lairs of US Imperialism, may indeed be extraneous to the student movement. But you cannot brush off IS, because we have helped to create the few 'strong local bases' which exist at the

We are confident that our understands student situation and our general system perspective will win over more and me students. I am sure that here we have edge on the Dwarf. Your slogan " Don Demand, Occupy ' may have had a new relevance to LSE in late October (Free Halliday's reply to Roger Smith, 3 De in general it is not simply adventures: self-contradictory. We need demands, LSE, around which to mobilise people occupy. You are wholly out of touch wi students if you think that the majority, down the country, are ready to occupy that, on hearing a splendid revolutional rallying cry from Carlisle Street. The t revolutionary minority needs to connect the mass of students before anything car happen. This is the function of the dem which must be made (such as those we a to outline in our pamphlet).

Likewise with 'the theory of students as vanguard'. If all this says is that student 'detonate a proletarian explosion', who the 'theory' differ from a simple descri of the French events? But does this make students a 'vanguard'? Can they lead to workers' movement to revolution - or d still require the intervention of a conscio revolutionary minority of the working cl itself, organised in a 'party'? If the latt true then surely the notion of a 'student vanguard' is highly misleading. Student see the need to build a workers' party, no a student movement. Of course, we can that such a leadership is not built simply proclaiming it in Clapham High Street, anywhere else. But the necessity remains to rid ourselves of some of the illusions of student vanguardism' is a prerequisite f ensuring that students do play their prope in the building of a new revolutionary movement.

Fraternally, Martin Shaw, IS Group, Socialist Society (RSSF), LSE, Houghton Street, WC2

PS-Please don't make cuts, if you print letter, without asking me.

Fred Halliday replies:

As I wrote the Dwarf editorial on RSSF in the last number, there are a few points I'd like to make about Martin Shaw's letter.

The attack on the sects was because they concentrated on fighting each other - hence 'the accompanying low level of debate'. They were more committed to themselves than to RSSF, or the political discussion that others were trying to carry on. In this sense, the IS apart from a few Mao-bashing elements - are clearly exempt from these criticisms. Insofar as they were trying to raise the level of political discussion, and increase the intensity of theoretical contestation of bourgeois society they corresponded to the programme contained in the editorial.

As for the slogan, 'Don't Demand, Occupy', the attack on this ignores the theory of slogans in general. The agitational slogan is an intense summing up of a more complex position; depending on its status, it can represent either a guide to immediate action or can define a strategy over a long period of time. It was not intended only in first, but also in the second sense. The occupation is a component of the student, and proletarian, struggles to be carried out under specific conditions; in certain situations it can be a means of radicalising through mass struggles, and is not to be seen necessarily as the permanent seizure of a section of the capitalist infrastructure.

Nobody thinks that students are prepared occupy just like that ', but the role of the occupation can be critical, and the examp LSE, Hornsey, Birmingham, Bristol, Guil over the last six months show that the 'tim revolutionary minority ' can cease to be tir and become a significant vanguard - altho still a minority - through occupations. In addition, the occupation is not an alternati demands; it is a means of pressing for demands, and an experience of mass strugs that may radcalise great masses of students are not radicalised by sending requests to university administrations. That is the sens of the slogan.

The theory of the students as vanguard is merely a description of the French events. lays stress on aspects of revolutionary strat that traditional socialist strategy has not emphasised. The greatly increased importa of the university in capitalist society, the ne for a struggle on university issues - studen power and ideological contestation - and the possibility of students mobilising tactically the university by building red bases - these not negate the role of the proletarian party they do supplement it. Our editorial in issu no 5 should clarify the situation for those w feel either that there is no need to depart fr the traditional theory of revolution evaluate decades ago, and for those who think that changes in the superstructures of capitalist society have removed the need for the organisation of a proletarian party.

DWARF ACCEPTS TRIBUNE CHALLENGE By our political staff

The Editorial Board of The Black Dwarf has accepted a challenge from Tribus (the weekly organ of Labour's Left) to a public depate. The debate will take pla in Westminster Hall on 24 January at 7.30 pm. The subject: Parliament, the Labour Party and the struggle for Socialism. This is, in fact, the first time that left-wing MP's have debated revolutionary socialists in public. Tribune will be represented by Mr Michael Foot, MP, and Mr Eric Heffer, MP, while the Dw will have Comrade Bob Rowthorne and Comrade Tariq Ali. As the attendance likely to be fairly high we would ask all comrades who wish to attend to get their tickets from us as soon as possible (price: 2s 6d). The confrontation will not be confined to the aforementioned speakers but will include contributions from the

Vomen: the struggle for freedom...

Ok so you've heard it all before Ok so you're bored

But meanwhile

We still get less pay for the same work as you.
We are less likely to get jobs which are at all meaningful
In which we have any responsibility.

We are less likely to be educated less likely to be unionised. The present set up of the family puts great strains on us either we are struggling to combine badly paid work with bringing up a family or we are unable to do work for which

The area of taboo on our sexuality is much more extensive some women still never experience orgasm. and the double standard still pervasive.

we've been trained,

so what are we complaining about?

Ill this and something else besides.

consciousness with no shape – a muttered dissatisfaction – which uddenly shooots to the surface and EXPLODES. much less tangible something - a smouldering, bewildered onsciousness with no shape

We want to drive buses, play football, use beer mugs not glasses. We want men to take the pill. We do not want to be brought with bottles in invited as wives. We do not want to be wrapped up in cellophane

sent off to make the tea or shuffled into the social committee.

Sut these are only little things.
Revolutions are made about little things.
Little things which happen to you all the time, every day, wherever you go, all your life,

Here discontent focuses and here the experience is felt, expressed articulated, resisted – through the particular. The particular pummels you gently into passivity. Here the subordinated relates to dominator,

Divided in our real situations and in our understanding and We are perhaps the most divided of all oppressed groups. So we don't know how to find one another or ourselves.

We are in different classes.

consciousness of our condition.

Thus we devour and use one another.

Our 'emancipation' has been often merely the struggle of the privileged to improve and consolidate its superiority – The women of the working class remain the exploited of the exploited, oppressed as workers and oppressed as women.

We are with families and without them.

Hence we distrust one another.

The woman with a home and children is suspicious of the woman with no ties, seeing her as a potential threat to her territorial security.

The single woman feels the married woman is subtly critical because is not fulfilling her 'role' as homemaker, her 'function' as

She feels she is accused of being unable to be a woman

From small girls we are taught that failure means not being selected by men – the shame of being a wallflower. The sign of intelligence and subtletly is a contractual bargain as we As we grow up, especially from puberty, we are under intensive pressure to be 'acceptable' - not to put ourselves outside the safety net of marriage. THEY tell us what we should be.

hand over our virginity for a marriage document, a ring, and the obligation of financial support. Orgasm is a matter of merchandise. And remember THEY don't like us to be too clever. Well she might go to University but men want someone who can cook

The emphasis in our education tends to be much more on integration, double bind. We are assumed to have nothing to say, find it difficult to assert that we want to say something, are observed to say nothing, the encouragement of active criticism, of intellectual aggression is rare. The cautious virtues predominate. We are in an intellectual are assumed to have nothing to say.

rejected in a double sense. There is a 'moral' force behind this urge to conform. The girl who is critical of the stereotype presented to her can be condemned not simply like a boy as a rebel but as a stut as well. The latter is much more difficult to cope with. There it is still the whole dirty, frightened, patronising world behind slut, tart, old slag, nymphomaniac, dolly, bird, chick, bit of stuff, bit of crumpet, old bag, silly cow, blue stocking.

These words have no male equivalents. To stray from the definition of what ' they' want is to risk being

across a great gulf, which grows wider, while she is pulled both ways. A most perilous and lonely condition, comparable to that of a black or working class militant. In the process of becoming interested in ideas she finds herself to some extent The girl who for some reason breaks away intellectually is in a peculiarly isolated position. She finds herself straddled as friends. They do more interesting things, discuss wider topics. She really defines herself as a boy. Other girls appear curious and rather boring, passive and accepting. She has little to say to most of them. The social contempt in which cut off from other girls and inclines naturally towards boys women are held confirms this. She is constantly being told

she is 'quite good for a girl'. Femininity becomes synonymous with frivolity, stupidity and narrowness. It seems obviously better to be a man. Doesn't she feel like n man, do their things, talk their talk. It is natural for her to define her situation in terms of a kind of sub-manness.

THEY tell us what we are.

towards women. One is simply not conscious of men writers or me The image is constantly reaffirmed. The books she reads and the films she sees are almost invariably by men. The women character created by them, however sympathetically and with whatever innufilm makers. They are just writers, just film makers. The reflected image for women they create will be taken straight by women understanding, must of necessity be the projection of their respon themselves. These characters ' are ' women,

Men will readily accept her as different, an exception, an interestion diversion. She lives in fact as a man. There might be a him of the 'emancipation' as being beyond question, not worth even stating discussing. The suffragettes happened a long time ago. over her virginity, a flicker of doubt, the discovery of a strange Throughout this process the educated girl probably takes her

duplicity lurking still in men. But no connection is obvious. She cannot see a condition of women It is not until she becomes older, grows less decorative, has babben that the rather deep cracks in the gloss of 'emancipation' appear She has the rest of her life to explore the limits and ambiguines of her 'freedom

And what a spurious freedom.

Most of us find the process too painful and not surprisingly settle for limited liberated areas. We give up struggling on every front an We walk and talk and think as living contradictions. ease into a niche of acceptance.



capable of defining her freedom. We shelter as well as retreat. We take refuge behind the privilege of class and education, using the protected dignity at the expense of the working class. rulers to secure respect and serious consideration, a and a protected liberation based on the underpaid labour of an au pair. manner and accent of the assurance that she is s for dignity and
it through ever more
e cooking recipes or
redecocation
suspicious and
e about women who upational variant sism doing a ried or women

Most of us live a particular combination of these or run the whole gamut knowing them for subterfuge – at certain moments struggling through and beyond them all. But it seems that capitalism condemns all people to live deceifully. How can we be expected to live otherwise? distorted) image of the oiding the issue in a od battle axe with at into lesbianism. corollary of this air style and a the board room on the male

as mature integra-are of course

responses are

omanness to a

They have nothing to say to you if you're carning £8 a week, or lif you're poor and working class and in a VD clinic. If you're economically exploited and socially despised you exist ourside the bounds of these emancipa Oppressed within a class system the bounds of these emancha-tions. They forget that we are

a profound

tion is doing

the male

Moreover they never go beyond confirmation or denial of what men say we are. We never tall them what we are. We never take hold of our definitions. We consequently admit our failure to be

it we are liberated

lat we have

e been part of else's belongings.

secause women

retreat is into

the power to

choice, our

But if the

constraint

ded beyond

But this has been twisted into a rather glib justification for inactivity and quietism. I Wait until the revolution Marxists have quite rightly always stressed that the subordination of aromen is part of the total mutual devouring process called capitalism. No one group can be liberated except through a transformation of the force and through its stricture subordinates the woman especially. But people won't give up their lamilies. They like them 2 Of course we know the bourgeois family exercises a conservative constraining we'll dole you out your equality then.
(Oh no you wont, power never concedes remember.)

and love with a

oman could

in to pay for

s, through the

essively pre-

After all

nstantly the

real subordina-uld be expressing

ut reacting, inder the comput-

d in a greater

al life the very

(What about a bit of praxis comrade to break down the sexual division of labour eration of women is a

the woman, for each time he tries to break through, he meets the hostility of other men or the conflicting demands of those women who prefer the traditional sex game. It is only women who can dissolve the assumptions. It is only women who can say what they feel because the experience is unique to them. releasing a whole lot of people to work for it. What about showing thousands of women the revolutior is something to do with them. True we won't get ar without really radical change. Inter there is the whole rigidity of job structure, unequal pay, leep cultural presuppositions—

I fact capitalism. Meanwhile, that's wrong with finding out cally what people resent, what's form with finding them with formative. which spring from an ng of their discontent. pitalist society, don't partonised as fluffy little about always baby Why is marriage a matter un of the write enough to ugh. ... Why those stag rituals, the ithin the family are osomatic illnesses, the their pay and being

ulities, which could be made spen under capitalism but I be more feasible under ulism and would help trate what it's about. For the campaign for equal and economic independence icial. As for the family, why ly nursery schools, why not less at the werkplace of both nother and father with time on work to play with the rett, who would get to know parents too. Or numerous t and flat co-operatives for ng affer children, for baby agand visiting the old. If seration for many women, would mean a

they do not speak, every time they assume no-one would listen. It is located in a structure in which both sexes are tragically trapped. The mans as much as which dwells in a whole complex of inarticulate attitudes, in contraception, abortion, orgasmand sexual equality, important It is an assumed secondariness which dwells in a whole comp

Only women can define themselves. To define yourself you have to explore yourself, you have to find yourself as a group before you can say how you. regard yourself as a group. It is only by understanding your situation as a group that you can relate it to the system through which you are dominated.

into the group and a realisation on the part of the elite of a common identity. This means that just as the white middle class. Cuban found he was a spick and the black PhD that he was nigger, the privileged woman has to extend beyond her elic consciousness to learn the extent of her common condition with the unprivileged woman. Only then can women really challenge the external definitions imposed on them, become sufficiently conscious to act and thus be recognised as being there.
The enemy is not identified as man. This is as futile as a black white student worker conflict.
The ally is not the woman who supports and benefits from capitalism. It is all people who are being crushed and twisted who want space and air and time to sit in the succession. This means a certain withdrawal

But the oppressed have to discover their own dignity, their own freedom, they have to make They have to decolonise themselves. Then they can liberate the colonisers.

whether you plan to marry 'in the near future', there are I two centres which deal exclusively with unmarried girls.

Brook Advisory in London, Birmingham, Edinburgh,
Bristol, and Liverpool, and the Marie Stopes Clinic in
London, None of these are on the Niational Health Service
and so all three charge — in the case of the FPA, both for
the contraceptives and for each appointment. Although the
girl's doctor has to be consulted for medical reasons if she
wants the pull, the parents do not. Female Dwarf readers who don't want an illegitimate baby force them to. Because of this, girls are often dependent on their own doctor, who may be completely unwilling to deal with them. Then there are private organisations such as the FPA, with over 800 clinics throughout the country. But these deal primarily with married couples, and individual Although it is often possible to go to the Family Planning arrange for contraceptive advice in their area, but does not or an illegal abortion take note: the only reasonably safe Family Planning Act (1967) allows local authorities to contraceptives are those used by the girl herself. The Organisation (where they are quite likely to ask you clinics decide whether or not to see unmarried girls.

But no method can be guaranteed: if you get pregnant, there are legal grounds - mainly psychiatric - for an

Pregnancy Advisory Service. If abortion is impossible, the National Council for the Unmarried Mother and her Child exists 'especially to ensure that the child of a single mother handicap. It provides no Mother and Baby homes hut sets standards for residential care. Although in many cases they advise adoption, if the mother wishes to keep the can grow up in our community without legal or social

child they do not urge the parents to marry for the child's sake; rather, their aim is to force legal and social reform so that the 'illegitimate' child is no longer an outcast in Family Planning Organisation: 27-35 Mortimer Street, London W1. Tel: 01-636 9155

Brook Advisory Centres: 55 Dawes Street, London SE17 01-703 9660.

Pregnancy Advisory Service: 40 Margaret Street, London Marie Stopes Clinic. 108 Whitheld Street, London W1. 01-387 4628.

National Council for the Unmarried Mother and her Child: 255 Kentish Town Road, London NW5 01-485 8383.

W1 01-629 9575

Some more advice

A Dwarf Reader

As far as I was concerned, being married or immatried when I had the child was faitly irrelevant. Far more important to me was whether I was sharing the experience with the man, whether there was someone else who felt as responsible for the child as I did. My case was pretty clear cut. I didn't know who the father was; it could have been one at two men, both of whom I had broken with by the time I knew I was pregnant (because the first doctor made a mistake this wasn't till I was two mouths). I liked both of them but not enough to follow either relationship through. I did in that on one level want the child very much. When I was told I was pregnant I felt a shock of both exhiberation and auxiety at this new invasion out my body. For me the choice was between having the child completely on my own or not having it at all. getting it aborted. I never considered adoption because I couldn't bear the idea of living with the child inside me for nine months and then groung it up to some altern set up inke an adoption society whose values I would completely disagree with. It seemed much more responsible nor to left it exist at all. As I say I wanted the child but didn't know it it made sense in terms of my life as a whole.

It was an existential decision in a sonse - having a child would mean radically changing my relationship to the world.

However exciting childbirth may be, a baby daes not, as the myths of the women's magazines and the fike suggest, equal happiness.

The mother and child can only work to a general framework which gives you go as far as it's possible at all in this society - some security and freedom.

The greatest danger seemed to me the struction wheels the mether and child are enclosed with each other. This danger still aperates whether the father is there or not. This is obvious from the hortdying plight of horedom and foneliness of millions of housewives. What seemed to me much more important than the single male female relationship was some sort of community, not necessarily a self consciously defined one of individuals thing in the same house, but some sort of network of people with whom the child can identify. The family unit is smaller now than it's ever been. The most common experience for a child is only two individuals with whom he has him and society and the fewer there are the fewer are his afternatives of attitudes and behaviour. Apart from the necessity to subvert all the shit imposed on the child from the outside and provide afternative ways of living. an important and consistent relationship. These are the middlemen between it makes life a hell of a lot easier on a practical level.

people expected me to feel. When I had to approach them the only way I could do it was to be as detailed as I could. In fact public stitudes have not much more liberal in the last five years or so, parily because unmarried mothers are getting mere and more common. I didn't come across any outright hostility, mostly the irritating assumption from the ILEA, when they gave me a supply teaching job, that I must be tertably unhappy. One of two of the hospital nurses treated me as not quite responsible for myself. The midwife, very discreet, always referring to me as Mrs, asked me who the father was as the head was appearing, with a dreadful pseudo concern.

The real horton is the social security people. When you go to see them you offsets to think out exactly what you're going to say. In dealing with NAB soffsets you have to be prepared for artything. Most of them are human run, what the tather to take any responsibility for the child do not name him. It's a man who stayed one right and you payent is set since. Once they have the fire guy to court. This is the way they prefer to set. However, if they done manage to they can take him to court themselves up tat. However, if they done manage to they can take him to court themselves up tat to 'case after the point. Be sure to know exactly show much the allowingues are because they will ity and fob you off with less. I was star months old because I done about it and few NAB officers will actually go so far as to reform you.

allowances are: Your rent paid: up to how much depends on area — approximately to in

E4 is (goes up 10s after two years).

Starts at E1.7s and increases by a few shillings very radually, If you have a man bring with you don't let them know he lives there, because he is then treated exactly the same way as a husband and is obligad to support you if he has means, and they often hassle him to support your child to.

erest away and peet at with their knickers down, no one to ou merchelm you, no etherealised cloudy being floating rawl wao from your competitive, ego strutting dienation. mopping up handker thief comfor ong to lose but your chains. You will no longer have

es or institutions only.

therefore the whole

Equal pay is not enough

Wast numbers of women go to work for about 70% of men's espiration on a grand sale and agual pay is clearly an elementary

But equal pay need not mean squality, and we must ask ourthat we want the same for carrieves? In a world where people are valued as economic units rather than as people, to be an equal economic unit must not be the height of our ambition. What we want is a revaluation of all people, men and women, in human terms not as adjuncts to

Going out to work is not new and not a sign of growing equality emancipation. In 1851, 25% of married women (and two out of three widows) had a job additional to housewife. For these working class women, work was an inevitable burden, in and out the home, as unskilled cheap

When you sell your labour-power you are selling part of your life, and if you sell it for a low price, in this society you are announcing that you are a low- live person. Equal pay is therefore a very necessary step towards equality, and will have repercussions on the value placed on women in general.

But the keeping down of women not just a capitalist phenomenon it is not just capitalists who be it. Other societies based on property have done it, and men of all classes take part in it.

The fact that women are the nothers makes them both power-land vulnerable, and men seek curb this power and utilise this unerability. Children make mothers guardians of the future with a direct and visible immortality, while a man can be dependent on the word of a soman even for his knowledge of fatherhood. This is power indeed. But mothers are vulnerable ostages, and by depriving mothers of the guardianship of their children men have made full use of superior physical strength to ensure their dominance.

Now we have an industrial society where physical strength matters less and less, where women have bad to be educated (though often

inadequately), and where some men see them as more of a danger ally themselves with the capitalist class on this particular issue, against their fellow women

These men are their own enemies, means under-valuing motherhood. If motherhood is under-valued so is family life. Bringing up children is regarded as just washing nappies and other unpleasant or monotonous tasks fit only for cabbages or servants, i.e. women. But surely dealing with the unfolding of new minds is a fascinating and creative thing, if properly shared with a willing partner and not a 24-hour a day

Reality has been so turned on its head that 'women's work' automatically means the most lowly, menial, unskilled, badlypaid work, instead of the most creative and humane.

In Victorian times, working class women were drudges and richer women were decorations. It cannot be regarded as more than a modest advance that working class women are now permitted to be both!

If women are to achieve equal pay they must act as 'organised labour'. It is very easy to find working women in shops and factories. But they are much scarcer in Trade Union meetings, and they are rare jewels indeed in influential positions in the Unions. There are some signs that the worms are turning, at Fords and a few other places, but women in general are absent from the places general are absent from the places where the decisions are being made. Where are the women who should be on the AEF National Committee? Half the members of USDAW are women, yet only an eighth of the Executive. There are 88 Divisional Councillors in USDAW, but only three are women. This sort of statistic can be repeated throughout the be repeated throughout the Unions. Where are these missing women? They are at home cooking their husbands' meals.

As long as most women accept the burden of the 'double job' they will not have time or energy to take their places in the community, in political and trade union activities. As long as even many left-wing husbands expect their wives to stay at home with the babies while they go out to be in the vanguard of the struggle, there will be these missing women, absent from a struggle which concerns them at least as much as men. Last year's Workers' Control Conference was a splendid Conference – but it was very similar to the TUC and the Labour Party Conference in one way, in the proportion of women

The comment in a Union Journal that it would be a good thing for more women to be delegates to the Trades Union Congress because we are always short of dancing partners at the Mayor's Reception' is not an isolated example of male patronage within the working class movement itself.

Women will have to assert themselves pretty strenuously to beat down patronage, and to overcome all the aspects of discrimination still existing. Equal pay, equal training opportunities, equal guardianship of children (as a general right not just when there is a Court Order), and the removal of all the smaller humiliations.

There are hospitals which will not remove a womb without the husband's consent. There are the demand the husband's signature for compensation paid to a wife for her own accident at work. And

Even the very language is sex-biased. Perhaps it started with God the Father. I believe the pagans did have Goddesses! Do the Irish Civil Rights marchers really mean 'One man, one vote'? I hope not. Sex-bias lies very deep, after centuries of conditioning, and to make any further progress against it, including the achievement of equal pay for work of equal value, women will have to challenge the role assigned to them by men.

Domestic as well as financial responsibilities will have to be shared by men and women as partners, so that each lives fully both outside and inside the home and shares also the joys of parenthood. Neither will be superior to the other, and neither sex will abuse its particular powers. The achievement of this kind of equality for younger will research equality for women will raise the quality of the lives of men as well as women, and its achievement will be one measure of the success of the struggle against capitalism and other exploiting systems.

Lil Bilocca and Hull trawlers

or How our society puts profits before people - and victimises those who want to put people before profits.

In an isolated community like that of the Hull fishing industry, where 'women's place is in the home', people like Mrs Bilocca, who have come forward with demands and demonstrations, have to face considerable hostility and ridicule. Mrs Bilocca has received threatening letters, was shouted down when she addressed a meeting at Grimsby, and has been publicly rebuked by influential figures like Skipper Laurie Oliver, secretary of the Hull Trawler Officers' Guild. 'I have been asked', he said, 'by the wives of some of my members, to state that the action of Mrs Bilocca has not enhanced the image the public may have of fishermen's wives. Women who have lost men on the three ships have had the least to say about it, which is what we admire. The idea of forming a women's committee to fight battles for the men, is, to my mind, completely ludicrous.'

The short answer to Skipper Oliver is that one of the originators of the campaign lost her brother, the skipper of the Ross Cleveland, a few days later, that one of the leaders of the demonstration at the fish dock was the widow of a member of the crew of the St Romanus, and that of the two women who went with Mrs Bilocca in the delegation to London, one had lost her father at sea and the other was the wife of a Grimsby trawler officer.

Millions of people all over the country, and nearly everyone in Hull will remember the splendid fight that Mrs Lilian Bilocca put up last winter for safety and decent conditions on Hull's trawelers.

No doubt most people imagine that she is still famous, respected and a valued member of society, especially as the enquiry into the disasters held early last month in Hull vindicated her actions in many respects, (although as she herself says, they did only the bare minimum to satisfy public opinion). Men who had served on the trawlers on earlier voyages were not called to give evidence about the conditions of the trawlers, and none of them dared to come forward for fear of victimisation. But that just goes to show how well the real nature of our society is disguised from most people.

In fact, because of her actions, Lilian Bilocca has lost her job and cannot get another one - she has in fact 'got' other jobs - until they learnt her name . . . The hard-faced men who rule this country want disciplined servants from whom they can extract easy profits, not workers who care more for the conditions of people's lives than the boss's balance sheet. Our hypocritical society was forced to praise Lilian Bilocca to satisfy public opinion, but once the fuss had died down it quietly proceeded to punish her for helping to expose one of its many injustices.

The necessity for workers to stick together in the battle for a civilised, democratic, socialist society is once more demonstrated. Please send messages of support, etc. to: Mrs Lilian Bilocca, c/o Humberside Voice, 60 Southcoates Lane, Hull.

Dwarf profile: Barbara Castle

successful achievements has been the total destruction of Labour as rmist party. To this effect son has completely castrated Party, in the main, by buying it considerably by the Labour Left and especially by Barbara Castle be refers to affectionately as Castle was one of the leading bubts of the Labour left in every and the Labour left in every the was seen on CND marches; at the head of Anti-Apartheid demos against assum in South Africa', etc. In Orderd she was known for her fervent socialism. Inside the Labour Party she was a consistent acti-Gaitskellite and after the 1959 election she attacked the Gaitskellites in the Clause 4 controversy: 'No comrades', declared the 'fiery' redhead, 'it samply won't wash to say that hancoalisation is fusty and out of date.' Sne caused further struggle and saying: "our troops are being permitted to use unnecessarily tough measures."

In manufacturing indust ries where one-third of the employees are women, the average wage of women is just over 10s a week. For men £22 a week.

But with the advent of a Labour government in 1964 all this was to change. Barbara Castle and Anthony Greenwood were bought off to appease the Left in the PLP and make it feel as though it were represented in the corridors of power. To a certain extent it still does. Radical Barbara stayed in a government which supported American butchery in Vietnam; adopted racist policies at home and abroad and was determined to crush the limited opposition of the trade unions. Barbara's 'socialism' based on Methodism, not on Marx, but surely even a consistent social-reformist would have been sickened by the policies of the Wilson government. Not so our

Sunday Mirror:

'The cabinet's job is to take responsibility over the whole field.

You shouldn't go into a cabinet

It gradually became clear even to Labour activists that the only ' red' thing about Barbara Castle was her hair and even that was regularly dyed to keep her in good shape as Wilson's PR bit for the Left. Like some of the other erstwhile Bevanites, Barbara discovered that she liked power.

In the last week of August the TUC took a decision to back strikes aimed at achieving equal pay for women. We would have more faith in this if the TUC put this decision into practice by granting equal pay to the women employed at TUC headquarters in

She loved travelling in chauffer-driven cars; she loved posing for photographs. I once saw her at a Labour Party conference alighting from her car and waving to

is about power" and you have got to be in power to get things done.

If we want socialism in this country, we have got to have the power to bring it about.

Barbara Castle is paid £8,500 a year regardless of her sex.

But what does Barbara Castle mean by socialism. We are not told but you can bet that its got nothing to do with public owner-ship and workers control. In fact what Barbara Castle means is the rationalisation of British capitalism. She wants to make it more humane. But as the Labour government are discovering to their cost this is an impossible task. Reform is becoming more and more meaningless. The alternatives are socialism or barbarism and the trend of modern capitalism is towards barbarism.

In Banks for example: at 31, at top of incremental scale, women get £800 compared with £1,120

women in the refreshment room than the politician who knows he's talking crap and doesn't get 30s a week LESS than men.

Castle says that her job is to end the 'old, chaotic methods of free-market wage bargaining in favour of a rational process based on productivity'. What a load of crap. If you want to end the wage-bargaining procedures then why not deal with the problem at its root and END THE FREE-MARKET. Why has British capitalism to be bolstered at the expense of the British worker and in particular the British women workers whose demands for equal pay are always ignored. Why should Barbara Castle be paid the same wages as her fellow-ministers if other women in low-paid jobs continue to be treated as unequals and continue to suffer discrimination. At a Labour Party Conference in the old Bevanite days Mrs Castle declared: 'Young people are tired of being told about jam tomorrow. They want jam today.' The workers of this country would agree with that TODAY but we think Mrs Castle

In the House of Commons the makes them a trifle more alarming bother to hide it. The new breed of social-democrats combine reformist rhetoric with reactionary measures, but they will fail. They have deceived the workers of this country for too long and in the long run they will be the losers. Some workers will invariably move to the right. Others will look for a non-reformist, non-Stalinist alternative. The sooner this alternative begins to exist the better. In short, comrades, unity of the revolutionary left should become the watchword.

> Equal pay it is estimated would cost British capitalism up to £600 million a year which is why big business is so determined to prevent women from getting equal pay. The struggle for equal pay has already begun. Socialists should back this struggle quite unequivocally.



Nixon is king

by Douglas Gill

The majority of the Earl of Derby's cabinet had never held office, and the Duke of Wellington, on being informed of their names, imagined that he had misheard. 'Who?' Who?' he intoned, and the Who? Who? cabinet it came to be called. It was no more certain and clear what course Derby intended to steer. He had made no speeches at the recent elections, it not being his custom to descend to such things.

Mr Richard Nixon appeared before us every day for a year, and he announces his cabinet in a style which would have deafened the Duke. His policies, however, have not been revealed, and his ministers are unknown, inexperienced men.

The new cabinet gives little away. To search for colour in a colour-less list, to pronounce this one a hawk, that one a dove, to suggest that the White House staff will play more of a role than the ministers proper, are tasks bringing little reward; and Mr Nixon himself has been less than forthcoming. They are strong men, good men, and compassionate men, he declares, and this revelation has been solemnly spread; we may take it to mean, not that politics changes in 100 years, but that public relations have greatly improved.

Still, if he has not yet pronounced from the throne, the inhabitants of a world in which Nixon is king had made striking response. Of the villains who remain expelled from the court, the Chinese have chosen to stress his remark that in some areas the United States has become too deeply involved, that it should reduce its commitment and concentrate more on regions, like Europe, of greater importance. The phrase 'peaceful coexistence' has even been used,

to efface; they have resorted, even, to rewriting the past, to expunging the criticisms they made of Hal in his youth. In fact, they can be pleased with the change. Mr Wilson would welcome an end to the war – not because imperialism is criminal, disgraceful, or wrong, but because in Vietnam it has foundered, and a failure so great threatens the empire itself. On the one hand, Vietnam can be described as Johnson's mistake, and the whole thing wound up in a short space of time; on the other, wherever one looks, reaction is firmly in power, more strongly entrenched in Asia, Africa, South America than for many a year.

If the United States turns to Europe once more, this will accord with the plans of men such as Healey and Stewart, whose brand of reaction includes strengthening NATO, a larger share for Britain in what is termed Western defence. Western Europe, however, and particularly Bonn, is less open to the kind of domination from Washington which the British government is prepared to accept. The franc totters, the pound sinks, and the international monetary system is close to collapse, but the Germans hold firm and will not surrender their advantageous position. This act of defiance was a remarkable step, and presses their emergence as the principal partner in a Paris-Bonn axis which could fall out with Washington in a number of ways.

In the Middle East, too, there are indications of change. Israel is strong and secure, and the crusade which America launched in that country's favour offers no long-term results; too close an identification, indeed, allows Tsarist Russia to penetrate everywhere else. The Western naval monopoly in the Mediterranean is now being

These measures flow from Nixon's own views and from his empire's needs; they take no account of his ministers' and adviser's particular views. Rather conservative the latter turn out to be. The economists speak of an end to the deficit in the American budget, which will mean less bread for the poor but more circuses in the shape of Watts and Detroit. Some suggest a floating exchange rate for the dollar, which will contribute further to the chaos in international finance. On balance, full of unpleasant repercussions for Britain.

Squeezed by American economic retrenchment at home, by the instability of the pound and the franc, and by the unwillingness of the Germans to bail anyone out, Mr Wilson's talk of recovery is as misleading as ever. 'Arrest the speculators', cry the men of the left, forgetting that the king's dungeons are reserved, not for the jesters at court, but for those favourites who fall into disgrace.

avourites who fall into disgrace.

Tunisienne) which edits revue 'Tunisian Perspec

1969 catalogue available soon. Send for free copy Pamphlets from the works Our 'CHE' poster, 16" x 21". Only 3/- post free. 20% discount on 20 or

Support Tunisia!

(Perspectives Tunisiennes) have publicly shown up the

contradictions in the regime.

They have denounced the collusion between the national bourgeoisie – incapable of building an independent

Action by the militants has been aimed principally against Imperialism in an attempt to force the Tunisian regime to

economy - and imperialism.

show itself as it is: police

and servility to US imperialism.

After a demonstration

repression, pseudo-socialism, mystification of the workers

Forcibly Anonymous

One hundred and four intellectuals, students and workers in prison, a controlled press, a terrorised population dissatisfied with the various 'reforms' imposed from above, whose meaning to say the least is ambiguous: this is the Bourguibist regime, more and more a servile product of American imperialism; this is 'independence' according to official propaganda in Tunisia. The scandalous position taken by the Tunisian government over Vietnam is the most strking indication, though not the only one. The one and only party, whose social base shrinks more and more, has become simply a machine for repression.

The Tunisian militants, and in particuar The Tunisian Socialist Study and Action Group (Groupe d'Etudes et d'Action Socialiste Tunisienne) which edits the revue 'Tunisian Perspective'

denouncing US and British Imperialism directed against the embassies of the respective countries, Tunisian students saw their comrade MOHAMED BEN JENNET taken and sentenced to 20 years' hard labour (a sentence dictated by US imperialists who thereby struck at their most dangerous and efficient enemy—the students). In March, 1968 an important demonstration for solidarity with Ben Jennet took place, which—in spite of police provocation,

spite of police provocation, special forces, fascist students and party fanatics – rapidly transformed into a student strike with meetings and further demonstrations of considerable size.

In reaction to the unexpected proportions of the student movement, the regime proceeded to arrest students, professors, schoolchildren, workers, officials, agricultural engineers in large numbers. The repression soon became savage. Students who were arrested underwent harsh treatment in police centres in isolated villas belonging to the party, in vague improvised

The trial was held in this context. The main charge rea 'Conspiring against the internal security of the State.' Proofs? Tracks, revue a typewriter. Using all the finer points of Tunisian law, the court subdivided the charges so as to be able to ad up all the minor offences to give sentences of up to 14 years: five years for conspiracy; five years for belong ing to an illegal organisation one month for a provocative article; three years (months) for insulting Humphrey, Travan Do (Foreign Secretary o Saigon Government).

The news which has reached us about those being held is particularly alarming: no family visitors, no letters. Some are chained in their cells. An International Committee to safeguard human rights in Tunisia has been set up in Paris.

COMRADES, SUPPORT THE TUNISIAN MILITANTS IN THEIR STRUGGLE: DEMAND THEIR RELEASE AND RIGHTS AS POLITICA PRISONERS! SUPPORT ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLES WHEREVER THEY MAY BE

SUPPORT TUNISIANS IN THEIR STRUGGLE

DWARF DESIGNER SEEKS GIRL:

Head girl typer

The Czech situation has focused attention upon Yugoslavia which is seen by some as the principal opponent of Soviet-style communism. Comment in both Communist and Western press centres upon the idea that Yugoslavia is returning to some form of capitalism. Evaluations, however, differ. Thus Fidel Castro characterises Yugoslavia as returning to a bourgeois liberal system, where communist aims for an end to economic exploitation, and a end to a society which works for personal gain, are lost. That she is the agent of imperialism is demonstrated, for Castro, by her refusal in 1959 to supply new revolutionary government with arms, having previously offered such services to Batista. Castro criticises the Yugoslav economic system for its reintroduction of the concept of profitability and the market economy, and accuses it of once again making man the slave of money.

Yugoslavia

bourgeois press, in particular The postavia. Various articles in journal have spoken of creeping capitalism' and of 'the ocreasing liberalisation of the

At first sight, then, this rather and right would seem to indicate that something is amiss in

The features of society which Castro, and more importantly, the Yugoslav student protesters of June this year, criticise, and which The Economist praises, are the growth in importance of the private sector of the economy and the trend towards autonomy of industrial enterprises. On the face of it Yugoslavia does seem to be retrogressing, but however important these trends are, they must be evaluated in the context of the development of Yugoslav communism and of the system of communism and of the system of workers' self-management (WSM). The success or failure of WSM will determine whether cialism is achieved or is blocked

Historical Development The origins of decentralisation must be traced to Yugoslav society before World War II.

Yugoslavia was formed as a nation after the First World War as an amalgamation of Balkan nation states, whose past history was one of extreme instability, of changes of boundaries and administration between the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish Empires.

During the late 19th century there had been numerous insurrections against imperialist oppression, and there arose, especially among the peasantry, a deep-seated distrust of central authority, which was reinforced by the fragmentary nature of the Balkans.

Nationalistic schisms continued after 1919, and in the rural areas the influence of a strong extended family system and village autonomy was slow to decline. These anti-centralist sentiments and traditions of resistance influenced the partisan struggle of World War II, for, although the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party had grown up in the industrial districts, the majority of the partisans were majority of the partisans were

The YCP itself had been influenced by anarcho-syndicalist ideas, especially during the Spanish Civil War, as well as Stalinist centralism, and this helped it to adapt to guerrilla

Thus the situation leading up to the 1948 split from the Cominform must be seen as having its roots in pre-Communist Yugoslavia and in the struggles during the revolution. during the revolution.

The uniqueness of Yugoslav society can be understood partially in terms of the uniqueness of the Communist takeover in that country. Unlike much of Eastern Europe, where Communism was imposed by the liberating Soviet forces, the Yugoslav revolution was carried out largely without the aid of Russia.

The instrument of revolution was Tito's partisan movement which waged guerrilla campaigns against the Nazi invaders and two rightwaged guerrifa campaigns against the Nazi invaders and two rightwing Yugoslav groups, the Croat Ustashi and the Serbian Chetnicks under Mihailovic. The Partisans were materially aided by both the Western allies and later by Russia, but remained independent of outside control, largely because of the nature of the fighting. Tito emerged during the fighting as the 'natural' leader of the future Yugoslavia. His enemy Heinrich Himmler said of his military talents: 'I wish we had a dozen Tito's in Germany, men who were leaders and had such resolution and good nerves that, even though they were forever encircled, they would never give in.' It is important however not to copy the fault of many Western journalists feat. fault of many Western journalists (e.g. Sunday Times, 3 Nov, 1968) who write the history of Yugoslav communism as the history of Tito, as if the social background and specific experiences of the YCP were irrelevant.

It was natural that Tito and the other political leaders, who had received their initial training in Russia, should look in that direction for a model of the incipient communist Yugoslavia, but the seeds of decentralisation had been sown and were soon to bear fruit. From the start Yugoslavia was never completely dependent upon Russia, indeed she continued to receive Marshall Aid from the US.

Stalinism and the Yugoslav Communists was irreparable and Cominform. Two years later she

embarked upon a programme of economic and administrative reform, based upon decentralisa tion and the institution of WSM.

Market Socialism' Since 1950 there has been a change of emphasis from a planned to a market economy, from state control towards increasing autonomy for the

The anti-centralist forces were based upon a recognition of the evils and inefficiencies of rigid bureaucratic control, and the reforms of 1950 to 1965 were an attempt at the democratisation of the economy. In this process the role of planning has been role of planning has been restricted largely to within the enterprise, and the economy has become one of 'market socialism'.

It is socialist because of direct democratic control of socially owned property, but its market features, e.g. the reliance upon price and profit mechanisms and the competition between enterprises, may restrict these socialist features.

In the official Chinese view WSM merely involves a change from a party bureaucracy to a managerial bureaucracy, but this is to ignore the very real power of the Workers' Councils, and the real gains of socialist democracy.

However, it is also claimed that the system is efficient as well as just. Weight was given to this claim by the high level of industrial production which increased on average by 15% per annum between 1950 and 1961, but the heavy capital investment helped this increase. By the beginning of the 1960's the time was judged ripe for further measures of decentralisation. The reforms of 1961 and 1963 virtually abolished state planning. By 1964 however, the economy was in crisis.

The oligopolistic and monopolistic behaviour of the now autonomous enterprises led to problems of inflation and of excess capacity in industry (54% as measured by energy consumption).

State intervention to raise prices state intervention to raise prices arbitrarily was necessary, with the result that during 1964 the cost of living increased by 24% while wages rose only by 10%. Unemployment rose and continues to rise, e.g. in 1967 there was 6% unemployment and 3% partial unemployment.

This period also saw the encouragement of the private sector of the economy, principally in transport, small-scale building, catering and the tourist industry. This was justified by the argument that competition would prove a spur to the public sector, but in reality private enterprise serves a different market. different market.

The student protests during June 1968 were directed largely against these features, i.e. the effects of the decline of planning and the reappearance of exploitation by private enterprise. The students were protesting against the growth of material inequalities; inequalities between workers and management, between and management, between workers and private entre-preneurs, between workers in 'advantaged' and 'dis-advantaged' sectors of

industry; and between the developed and under-developed areas of the country.

Their argument was that decentralisation of economic phas gone too far and that cent co-ordination is still necessary prevent inefficiency and inequa This, however, is not an attack upon the system of WSM, whi must remain as the basic instrument of instrument of democratisation Nor are they demands for a bureaucratic form of central planning.

What is needed is the democratisation of the planning process itself, that is a system whereby the plan stems from below, but once agreed upon is executed from above.

The mechanisms for such a system already exist. At the commune, republic and federal levels of government there is a system of one chamber elected direct suffrage, and another representing producers, elected through the Workers' Councils. Thus a return to planning would Thus a return to planning woul not require the establishment onew centres of power, but the enlargement of the existing ones

The signs from Yugoslavia on this subject are encouraging if not dramatic. The students' demands were met by an increas in the minimum legal wage, by a tightening up of regulations concerning private enterprise and by promises to investigate other

Perhaps 1969 will see a trend back to socialist planning.

The logic of occupation

A little news item, buried amongst the pages of the Israeli daily Haaretz reads:

New information policy for Israeli radio and army. News items concerning small border incidents no longer to be published. From our military correspondent.

Israel Galili, Minister for Information, has directed the Voice of Israel to suppress news broadcasts concerning activities of sabotage reganisations, as well as those concerning minor border incidents not involving casualties, following a complaint of the Israeli army authorities conerning 'exagerated' reporting of such incidents by the broadcasting service.

Following these directives the 'Voice of Israel' has curtailed its reporting of border incidents and subotage activity. Only reports of Army spokesmen are broadcast, all other reports require advanced

These directives conform to the new information st doubts were raised about the value of official publication of every minor and not involving casualties. Such news created the impression that the sabotage organisations are successful, and more than once received exaggerated solution the radio and in some of the papers. According to the new policy there is no restriction the press to publish news on minor border acidents, or sabotage activity that failed, but the A spokesman does not issue official communiques

Hazretz, 11 November, 1968.)

Another news item buried in a chronicle of the evening paper Yediot Aharonot reads: The military governor said yesterday to the ababitants of one of the villages (in the occupied West Bank, N.I) that if they fail to come to the help of the authorities in keeping order "there will not remain, within a few years, a single house standing in the village Vediot Aharonot, 26 November, 1968)

The quotation marks around the military governor's words appeared in the original news item.

settlement MEHOLA on the West Bank as a

You have done yourselves an honour by reinheriting

After reminding his listeners that Gideon's cavalry once thundered in that valley he added 'After 3,200 years Gideon's great grandchildren have again performed wonder of war on the same spot. The wheel of history has turned full circle but now under the banner of: "Sickle and sword to God and Gideon

(Yediot Aharonot, 21 November, 1968)

These news items highlight the new developments in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Palestinian guerrilla fighters perform daily acts of sabotage, mining, ambushing, attacking military, economic, installations in the occupied territories and inside Israel. However, their major success is in a different sphere: they have won the support, and recognition fo the majority of the Palestinians including those living under Israeli rule - as the embodiment of the Palestinians' aspirations. This was not the situation prevailing from June, 1967 say, June, 1968. During that period most Palestinians were numbed by the impact of contact with the modern, Westernised, Israeli society. The Israeli occupation was much more lenient than the Jordanian and the Egyptian one, it was, unlike its predecessors, free from corruption. Moreover, most Palestinians believed and hoped that Nasser, Hussein, Jarring, or Brezhnev, will sooner or later, dislodge the Israelis from the occupied territories. When these hopes failed to be realised, and the occupation proved to be harsh, houses of suspects (or relatives of suspects) of acts of sabotage, being blown up without trial or inquiry, the attitude towards the guerrilla movements turned from indifference into sympathy.

The Israeli authorities are fully aware of the fact (having undergone a similar experience 20 years ago) that they cannot defeat the combination of militant, active, guerrilla groups and a parent population of 1.5 million people which sympathises and passively, or actively, supports them. The recognition of the fact that such a state of affairs is actually emerging is driving the Israeli authorities and public opinion to despair. There are mounting pressures in the Israeli public to reinstate capital punishment for sabouteurs. The issue was debated in the Israeli parliament. Other pressures demand the construction of hard labour camps in the Sinai

corespondent reports on visits to prison camps for Palestinians under the heading: 'Recreation camps for sabouteurs?' the text is tailored to produce the conclusion that the Israeli POW camps are, in fact, recreation camps for sabouteurs.

The recognition of the fact that no Israeli politician or policy have a political solution to the conflict drives many Israelis to fatalism or religion. Dayan articulated the fatalists in the concluding sentence of his speech to joint forces in the Staff

'The Arabs do not agree to our venture. If we want to continue our work in Eretz Israel against their desires there is no alternative but that lives should be lost. It is our destiny to be in a state of continual warfare with the Arabs. This situation may well be undesirable, but such is reality.' (Jerusalem Post, 30 September, 1968)

As for becoming religious, this is quite the fashion among high ranking Israeli army officers. Suffice it to note that Maj-Gen Zeevi, quoted earlier, has, like many of his colleagues become religious as a result of experiences during, and after, the June, 1967 war. Maj-Gen Zeevi, shot, with his own hands, in mid-September of this year, five Palestinian guerrilla fighters, after they had surrendered their arms and were taken prisoner by a junior officer who refused to obey the order to shoot them. A secret army inquiry was held to investigate the case, but typically, the army and civilian authorities took a decision not to do anything about it, and to hush the matter up.

The self-manufactured Israeli illusion of the Palestinians living happily as a discriminated population under the enlightened Israeli rule in Greater Israel were shattered by the logic of occupation within less than 18 months. The ad which 10 Israelis published in Haaretz three months after the June 1967 war now reads like a prophecy. It said:

Our right to defend ourselves does not grant us the right to oppress others.

Occupation mean foreign rule, Foreign rule breeds resistance, Resistance breeds oppression,

Oppression breeds Terror, and counter-Terror. The victims of Terror are nearly always innocent

Holding on to the occupied territories will transform

Terror

Ever since the CIA overthrew the nationalist regime of Mohammad Mosadeq in 1953, Iran has been in the grip of a terrorist anti-communist regime, headed by the Shah. In spite of the fact that this regime has come in recent years to take a more independent stand vis-a-vis its US promoters, and in spite of the military and economic aid accorded it by the Russians, a white terror still reigns in the

In January, 1968 hundreds of students were arrested in the several universities of the country following an upsurge in political resistance. The immediate cause of this upsurge was the death, in mysterious circumstances, of the Olympic wrestling champion, Holamreza Takhti, who had taken up a position of public opposition to the shah, and was a leader of Mosadeq's old organisation, the National Front. According to the left, Takhti was murdered by the SAVAK, the Shah's secret police, and his funeral and subsequent mourning ceremonies were an occasion for public demonstrations. Thirty eople have been shot in Iranian kurdistan this summer.

The arrested students were tortured and kept without trial; their families did not know for several months what had happened to them. It was only when the SAVAK released some of the detainees that they knew that the students were still alive

The standard torture practiced in prison is known as dast-i-bande ghapani - the prisoners hands are tied behind his back and he is forced to pull his shoulders further and further back thus straining his chest and shoulder blades. More standard processes such as enforced sleeplessness are also common. One student detainee, Jazani, was kept awake for

Those detainees who have been released after the January terror have been forced into the army. Seventeen others are now coming up for trial, eight of them on capital charges. A protest movement in their favour is sweeping the west: on November 30 a demonstration by 300 British and Persian militants marched to the Iranian Embassy and demanded that there be a fair trial. In 1965 a similar protest movement saved the lives of seven Iranian graduates of British universities who had been framed with attempting to shoot the shah.

Pakistan: the crisis and its origins

Recent events in Pakistan have been reported in some detail by the bourgeois press in the West, but even now their interest seems to have been sparked off essentially by the attempted assassination of Pakistan's dictator, Ayub Khan. This sudden interest in Pakistani politics would tend to give the impression that this is the first serious opposition to the Ayub regime. The impression is a false one. Opposition to the regime has existed virtually from the start of this decade of tyranny. A tyranny which has oppressed the masses of Pakistan since the coup d'etat October 1958. They have had the effrontery to call it the October Revolution

After ten years of dictatorship, opposition to the regime is widespread and embraces almost every sector of public life. Liberal-conservatives, Conservative-liberals, social-democrats, Stalinists, socialists are all in opposition to the regime. All, that is except the extreme rightwing Jamaat-i-Islam (Pakistan's version of the Muslim Brotherhood) and a large section of those who call themselves Maoists, but of this last category more later.

The main purpose of the military takeover of Pakistan in 1958 by General Ayub was to circumvent the country's first General Election which was scheduled for April 1959 and at which it was obvious that the political parties in favour of withdrawing from SEATO and CENTO would be elected to power. Ayub's own brother, Sardar Bahadur, talked at one stage of his 'unshakeable conviction' that the CIA were involved in the coup. It seemed that even bourgeois democracy was not meant for Pakistanis. President Ayub told the nation, 'We must understand that democracy cannot work in a hot climate. To have democracy we must have a cold climate like Britain.

With this as its motto the new regime banned all political parties, imposed a vigorous censorship on the press and warned that any participation in politics by the masses would be dealt with severely. It would take an entire volume to give a detailed survey of the early iniquities of the Ayub regime. Certain facts, however, bear repetition. A well-known communist militant from Karachi, Hassan Nasir, was arrested and taken to Lahore where he was held in the infamous Lahore Fort - a torture palace dating back to the 15th century. After weeks of torture Hasan was murdered and his body disappeared. From the village of Kooli, near Quetta (in Baluchistan), 400 Baluchis were taken to a concentration camp. In this camp half-naked persons were hung by their feet and subjected to vile tortures. Seven Baluchis were hanged in Hyderbad prison. Their only crime was the demand for provincial autonomy. While these reports are still denied by the Ayub regime there is no reason to doubt their authenticity and the time is not far off when they will be stated in public by the oppositionists.

In this atmosphere of repression the oppo sition remained silent. When it emerged it did so via the student community who by virtue of their place in society were the only organised force in Pakistan. Organised not in any political sense but organised because they could assemble in large numbers at their schools and universities. The first demonstrations in Pakistan were not civil rights demonstrations. They were organised to protest against the assassination of Patrice Lumumba in 1961. The demonstrators chanted anti-US, anti-UN slogans. A few shouted slogans against the Ayub regime. The important point, howwas that students had defied a martial law regulation which forbade all political demonstrations

The main force of the opposition was in East Pakistan (separated from the West by 1,000 miles of Indian territory) where the student community played a vital role in energising the masses who have a tradition of militancy dating back to struggles against British imperialism. In 1963 after Ayub had promulgated a new Constitution with sufficient checks and balances to safeguard his position semipermanently, there were protest demonstrations in East Pakistan. A Cabinet Minister defending government policies was man-handled at Dacca University for insulting the mass of militant students. Hundreds of students were arrested. The insidious University Ordinances were brought into force made it a crime for students to in politics and banned free elections in Universities. In West Pakistan the government also made it a crime (maximum penalty two years rigorous imprisonment) for male and female students to talk to each other on university campuses. Theatrical performances with mixed casts were banned! Political and sexual repression reigned supreme.

Pakistan'. Hence she had to be treated with some 'respect' by the dictatorship. Miss Jinnah succeeded in uniting the opposition parties behind her and if there had been direct elections on the basis of adult franchise she would have won. However the indirect method whereby 80,000 'basic democrats' elect the President worked in Ayub's favour. The 'political parties' which supported Ayub, the army and the civil service, saw to it that the Boss won, but even in these circumstances 40% of the 'basic democrats' preferred to vote for Miss Jinnah.

The present struggle should, therefore, be viewed both as a continuation of the struggle against the regime and as an advance. It has brought some of Ayub's erstwhile supporters into direct opposition against the dictatorship and it is necessary to put their 'opposition into its correct perspective. One should add that the decision of some of the leading members of the Ayub faction to oppose the Boss has had a traumatic effect on the masses. It is as if Khruschev and other members of the Stalinist faction had come out in open opposition to Stalin just after World War II!

Sino-Pakistan Relations

It became clear in 1964 even to the most reactionary element in the Ayub coterie that the United States was more interested in India than in Pakistan. This was true both militarily and geographically. Politically, of course, India was the 'free world's' model against China. (How ludicrous that seems now.) It was also clear that the aim of the United States was to unite India and Pakistan militarily as a 'base against Red China'. And certainly Ayub played his part to perfection. He appealed to Nehru for 'joint defence'! 'Joint defence against whom?' retorted the Indian Prime Minister. The United States had at that stage not convinced the Indian government of the need for a confrontation with China. Apart from that fact the social-democrat in Nehru viewed the reactionary, Sandhurst-trained Ayub with ill-concealed distaste. After the Sino-Indian confrontation Ayub was still prepared in the early stages to 'talk business' but was rebuffed. The Pakistan government then decided to cultivate 'friendly relations' with the Chinese government. This was originally intended to 'blackmail' the United States. The latter, however, knew full well that if it ever came to the crunch Ayub would back those who fed him. 'Friendship' with China was allowed to progress. Chou-en-Lai visited Pakistan; Ayub visited China. Marshal Chen Yi on one of his visits to Lahore declared 'Basic Democracy is very similar to our People's Communes.' This embarrassed even the Pakistani Maoists. Basic democracy is the name Ayub has given to the system now prevailing in Pakistan! One of the architects of 'friendship' with China was the Pakistan Foreign Minister, Zulfiqur Bhutto. His antiimperialist rhetoric was useful to the Ayub regime while they were playing the antiimperialist card. During the Indo-Pakistan war the Chinese were the only major power to give total support to the Pakistan position on Kashmir. It seems clear, as Bhutto has consistently maintained, that it was the threat of Chinese military intervention which prevented the Indian government from taking over East Pakistan. (And incidentally also frightened the Soviet Union and the US into ending the war.) However what is also clear is that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union were prepared for any alteration in the status quo in the Indo-Pak sub-continent. For them the rights of the people of Kashmir or of India

Chinese popularity in Pakistan increased after the war. Newsreels showing either Mao or Chou-en-Lai were greeted with massive applause in cinemas throughout the country. But the attitude of the government towards China began to cool considerably. Bhutto was forced to resign as the American government refused to resume aid while he was in the cabinet. Bhutto's resignation resulted in the latter becoming a leading spearhead of the opposition against the dictatorship. Forgotten were the seven years he had faithfully served the dictatorship. He himself remarked, in reply to Ayub's allegations, that his biggest crime was accepting office under the dictatorship. The removal of Bhutto from the cabinet coincided with the removal of various like-minded officers from the armed services. Some of whom had visited Peking!

1966 Railway Strike

The economic situation deteriorated rapidly after the war. The price of flour and sugar rose phenomenally. A strict rationing was imposed and workers and peasants had to wait for hours in queues before they could be served. As a result some of them had to forego working days in order to collect their rations

forced to seek redress through the governmental conciliation machinery and industrial courts. The railway workers union was/is a stooge union completely subservient to national interests '. The 'unofficial' union was controlled by the Maoist wing of the National Awami Party. The latter were opposed to any strike action because of the 'anti-imperialist nature of the Ayub regime'. Any national strike would harm the regime and only serve imperialism! (Incidentally this line was laid down by none other than Chou-en-Lai himself when he went to see Maulana Bhashani, leader of the Maoist wing of NAP, who was being treated at a hospital in Peking in 1964!) The result was that completely spontaneously, independent workers' committees were set up and the call for a strike went out by word of mouth and a few scruffy, badly-distributed leaflets. The strike action was a complete success. Train services throughout W. Pakistan came to a complete halt. Veteran observers claimed that it was the first SUCCESSFUL rail strike in the history of the Indo-Pak sub-continent. For two whole days not a single carriage moved on the tracks throughout West Pakistan. The 'Maoist leader Mirza Ibrahim was summoned by the government and asked to call the strike off. He agreed on condition that his union was recognised as the official union. The government said that if he succeeded in calling the strike off, this particular demand would be granted. Mirza Ibrahim called a mass meeting of railway workers in Lahore and asked them to go back to work. The strike he claimed was 'financed' by the CIA. When this was simply laughed off he became more theoretical: 'The strike', he now argued, 'was preventing grain from reaching the peasants'. Angry railway workers spat on him and told him in no uncertain terms to go home. But, alas, this was not to be. The Ayub regime suspected that Mirza Ibrahim and colleagues hadn't tried hard enough to end the strike and imprisoned them! There was no mention either of the strike or of the imprisonment of the Maoists (despite themselves) by either Peking Review or China Reconstructs. An oversight, one presumes! Meanwhile the government used every form of intimidation to end the strike and finally it succeeded. There were mass dismissals and arrests without trial. In Hyderabad when striking workers lay on the tracks to prevent blacklegs from driving trains the result was trains being driven over their bodies. Some workers died. Others were seriously wounded. The amazing thing about the strike was the level of organisation and spirit of solidarity displayed by the workers. The leadership of the strike was localised and restricted in the main to young workers. The coffee-house intellectuals hadn't even heard their names before and certainly have not since. The unions, both official and 'unofficial' and their structures were completely bypassed!

The present crisis

The present crisis was sparked off by a government decision to ban all opposition public meetings and in particular those being addressed by Mr Bhutto. The student community refused to accept this particular directive and the meetings went ahead as scheduled. When the police intervened riots took place and in some instances the students emerged as victors. However if the 'trouble' had only been sparked off by students the regime would have been able to deal with it. The students acted as a detonator and many workers came out on to the streets. This in its turn gave the 'leaderships' of the various political parties a longawaited opportunity to emerge in public at the head of demonstrations. The assassination attempt on Ayub is merely a symptom of the prevailing politico-economic unrest in the country. The arrest of Zulfigar Bhutto is another. Mr Bhutto is a petit-bourgeois nationalist politician with no political base in the country except the students. Seasoned political observers here argue that he is simply not interested in building a serious political base. Certainly the manifesto of his Pakistan People's Party is extremely confused. While talking about nationalising the key sectors of industry it can still talk in terms of:

The private sector will play its own useful role in the kind of mixed economy envisaged, but will not be able to create monopolistic preserves. It must flourish under conditions proper to private enterprise, namely those of competition. .

Of the other opposition parties there is the National Awami Party which is split into pro-Peking and pro-Russian sections. We have explained the orientation of the first section. The second consists of liberals and former Stalinists, the same tradition as members of any Latin American CP. Their vision seems to be restricted to Parliament! The Muslim League is the party of the more 'progressive' landlords and sections of the rising bourgeoisie

to opt out of political opposition to the A regime. At a recent demonstration in Laboratory over 21 miles long, the Maoists stayed as What they fail to realise is that in a rightdictatorship even the demand for bours democracy' has revolutionary underto There must be a limited freedom to edu and influence the masses before a revolution party can make any headway.

Conclusions

No one can deny that the Ayub regime is state of severe crisis. The students are state of virtual rebellion. For the first t young schoolboys have demonstrated university students and have displayed exe lary heroism in the face of police bruta Teachers are threatened with immediate missal if they take part in politics are sent by the Ministry of Education to principals of colleges and schools read that in regard to Educational institute. receiving financial assistance from the ment, a condition of grant should be that institution concerned will frame rules regulations on their (sic) own initiative ensure that the employees whether serving whole-time or part-time basis will not themselves as candidates in any election.

In a country with a population of 100,000, where there is a literacy of below 20% al 3% are women and owing to the exist circumstances they count for little. Of remaining 17% about 7% are disqualified for politics because they are government emp ees and that includes teachers and journal (in government service). The teachers of prise the largest single body of literature. people in the country. They are banned for politics. It seems almost as though sa Marxist had infiltrated the Ayub regime was deliberately giving wrong advice increase the political consciousness of people. The position of the workers peasants is even worse. Despite the praise the Financial Times for Pakistan's econo miracle the actual wages of the worker gone down. The increases in per capita incr recorded by the regime's apologists is a reof the massive increase of income recorded the 1% (if not less) of the 20% literates run the country. Pakistan is ruled by 20 families amongst whom the leading fam is Field-Marshal Ayub's. His sons Gohar A and Tahir Ayub even talk in terms of succession '

It is possible that with the emergence of Marshal Asghar Khan, an honest version Ayub, as an Oppositionist the Armed For will not interfere if Ayub is overthro Whether that is true or not the Opposi parties should unite and fight for civil liber That is the most pressing need of the h Socialists should demand the release of political prisoners, freedom of speech press and ONE MAN, ONE VOTE. And Maoists must join his opposition; they sho stop acting as the frontier guards of Chir state policy and come out in a princip opposition to the dictatorship. Why, should ask themselves have the Chinese p ignored the struggle for political liberties Pakistan. Why does Mao receive a mili delegation from Pakistan headed by Yahya, the C-in-C of the Army, the same as students are shot down in cold blood. 1 should demand of the Chinese comrades a l more display of internationalism in pract and a little less slogan-mongering. At the of writing I have just heard that a section the left-wing NAP in East Pakistan has par demonstration against the dicta ship. The demonstration took place in D on 7 December and troops were called ou aid the police. According to a governs press release two demonstrators have killed and 20 wounded but the actual fig are bound to be considerably higher. occasion for this particular demonstration Ayub's visit to East Pakistan. His regime consistently treated East Pakistan as a co and it is hardly surprising that the wor and students of Dacca treat him as they we the representative of any occupying po This display of solidarity by East Pakist with the struggle in West Pakistan is of mense significance. The realisation that parts of the country face the same prod could go a long way towards creating a un

Today the acid-test is the struggle for liberties. Those who call themselves Mars and Leninists must participate in this strug If they choose to ignore this struggle themselves will be ignored in time to o Meanwhile all Pakistanis living abread she set up action committees. They can material and moral support to the moving inside the country. They can write and tribute pamphlets explaining the situation

The other Thompson Dwarf diary

Black majority rule in Rhodesia is not just as matter of political theory. What we are confronted with is a country, whose hod carriers are black, being eventually so transformed that the hand which holds the hod takes over the drawing board.

It is a natural ambition – although one not necessarily entertained by all the present hod-carriers. But will it be feasible to attain this in a span of 15 years without the risk of a lot of jerry-building?

Lives will be disrupted in the process and, if the experiment fails, the sufferers will be black as well as white.

Hasten slowly 'is ancient advice. So, too, is 'more haste less speed'. Both should be applied by Parliament when it considers the pace of black advance in Rhodesia.

There is more to this than conforming to the theories of political idealists whose eyes are so set on the horizon that they fail to see the tragic results of over-haste elsewhere in Africa.

This was the leading editorial of the 'Evening Telegraph' of Wednesday, 16 October, 1968. It is a typical example. The rag is printed in Dundee.

Who runs the Un-Free Press in Scotland? The famous firm of D. C. Thomson – the creators of Beano and Dandy, Desperate Dan and Lord Snooty's Little Pals. Not a bad name for D. C.

Thomson, a firm which loves Sir

Alec Douglas Home as much as it

loves Ian Smith. D. C. Thomson

& Co. is Scotland's biggest

publishing company. And Britain's

most reactionary newspaper group. most reactionary newspaper group.

Their main publications are The anday Post, circulation 300,000 a week, The Weekly circulation 1,200,000 a ces, the Dundee Courier & Atteriser, and the Dundee

Evening Telegraph, both of which

the required reading on the East

Coast of Scotland. In addition

they publish a huge number of comes for children and a series of adult magazines — the most prestigious is the Scots Magazine. It's estimated that out of 30,000,000 copies of children's comics published in Britain each week, Thomson's issue 20,000,000.

The organisation is strictly non-conditionally this dates from the 1926 strike. (In Thomson's this is called the 'Hold-up'). New executives are given a pamphlet, published by the firm, which tells of the attempts of the printing mions to maintain an organisation

promised that anyone who didn't so out on strike would have a job for life. Many unskilled men

In 1952 another attempt was Print unions declared a nation-ade blacking of the firm and its products. This time the law mervened and the strikers had to e satisfied with a declaration that souldn't automatically get a

Now the firm's rules state: 'The firm doesn't recognise trade

Despite this, many departments are fairly well organised. In one of the major offices the Pressroom 98%, the Stereotypers are about while the Caseroom is about to rganised. This has unusual the caseroom is while the pressroom is trained they get plenty of overtime and a good rate. But the curroom which doesn't have any threat to hold over the management's head only gets the

The most interesting feature of the Thomson Press is the political anitudes held. To call them

The attitude probably stems from the beilefs of the founder of the group, David Coupar Thomson.

is, retelling of the trivial so as to make even the dullest of readers think he'd a story in him. This apotheosis of the trivial can still be seen by a glance at the middle page of the Sunday Post. The following headings weren't

They include, 'Mr Thompson brings a dog back from the dead', 'We've found the boy Mr Robertson was looking for', 'Glory be! The bull's head was stuck in the window.' stuck in the window

By way of contrast the main article strikes a 'serious' note –
'The next few weeks will be
critical for us all' – it's an attack
on the AEU for daring to ask for
a pay increase.

Of course every newspaper contains light relief. It's important that people should be told how Mrs Bargh swallowed her goldfish while giving it the 'kiss of life'

But the Sunday Post and the other Thomson papers give nothing else – except for political comment, of the most vicious and

'Why should my taxes go to pay for the big families of these immigrants', for example.

Essentially they hate anyone who disturbs the even tenor of life in the suburbs; anyone who introduces a new idea into the limited talk of the bus into town; anyone who thinks there is a world outside the cosy well-lit houses of the lumpen-middle-class

Yet it is the most successful paper in Scotland. Every household in the country gets it.

Basically they promote an attitude of 'Christian' toughmindedness, Belt-tightening and self-denial is what every working man and woman should be doing 'during this period of crisis'. It's estimated that the profits of the Sunday Post are £30,000 a week.

We all like to feel we're up against it - even Social-democrats. Especially if the root cause of our 'being up against it' is not ourselves but some outside agency.

Thomson's deny being colour prejudiced. They may head up a piece in their opinion column, 'It makes you think'. But it's surely not actionable to mention that 'One worker in six in the Royal Mint is coloured'.

Ian Smith has no truer supporter in Britain than the Thomson Press. Any piece warning of African terrorists is sure to get a page. The Duke of Montrose, Rhodesia's top Scot, is a very satisfied reader. Another Thomson favourite is Enoch Powell. The latter's crude racialism finds a responsive chord in the Sunday Post.

No one has yet discovered how much profit the Thomson empire

Thomson group is complicated. Those interested can find it in Camrose's book, British
Newspapers and Their

On the editorial side of the business, there is no comparison with any other newspaper. On the Sunday Post, for example, the editor, Johnny Martin's idea is for the paper to look as if it has been written by one present written by one person.

Apparently there's a sub in Dundee who re-writes all the material to ensure that this is achieved. Example – Homosexual Law Reform Bill was called, 'The law to legalise misbehaviour between men'.

The language used in the paper is in couthy Doric, loaded with 'Jings', 'Holy Smoke', 'Gosh' No one in Scotland speaks this language – but by now everyone

Woring conditions for journalists are incredible. According to reporters in their Glasgow office it's only a few years since editorial staff were required to put in an hour's linotyping practice on a Saturday morning.

When a staff man in a country branch office crashed the office car, he was sent a Raleigh 3-speed gear bike – on which he had to pay carriage at the station.

A surprising thing is that so many of the journalists employed on the paper are Labour supporters of some kind or another. Not that They still have to write what they're told. And the line is decided ultimately by 'Mr Harold'

Every Friday he lumbers into the Dundee office of the Sunday Post and confers with the Editor. Most of the time he ponders upon the best headlines for the middle page stories. Occasionaly he sends forth an edict. Mostly it's on politics. But a few months age it was about a non-existent plague of weeds affecting Scotland. A story was

Some time ago he walked into the People's Journal office in Dundee and flourished a number of blank sheets of paper.

'The Journal circulates to farmers,' he said, 'But how many of you know how to spell the most important word in the farmer's

At this he gave a violent twitch and uttered an explosive cry. The staff politely looked the other way. He did it again.

'Now write it down', he said in a normal voice and passed the sheets round the reporters. They looked blank. Harold noticed and performed the motion and uttered

Finally the idea got through to them. He meant 'Tehk', the sound a farmer makes to his horse. They wrote their versions of how it should be spelt.

Harold examined their efforts rather disapprovingly. Then he

Most of our difficulties now seem to be over and we assure you that from now onwards you will receive the Dwarf regularly at fortnightly intervals. We have been forced to reduce our size because of printer difficulties. Yet another 50 printers in the London area have refused to print us mainly for political reasons. So the struggle continues. Those who have been spreading rumours to the effect that the Dwarf was about to fold up will be disappointed Friends and enemies please note: The Black Dwarf is here to stay. We apologise for our irregularity to our subscribers who now number 1,000 and are growing every day. They have been exceptionally patient and understanding. We would like to emphasise again that the Dwarf is your newspaper and help of any sort is always welcome, particularly in the sphere of circulation. If you can help distribute the paper or know of any shop which is prepared to sell it please get in touch with us immediately.

We hope that the new year will see the struggle against capitalism and imperialism continue on a world-wide scale. As far as Britain is concerned the Dwarf will do all that it can to support those who are struggling against capitalism regardless of what political group they belong to. It is our aim that the Dwarf continue as a paper of and for the revolutionary Left in this country. That it not be allied to any particular tendency. This is crucial if we are to maintain its non-sectarian nature. It is a pity that some selfproclaimed Maoist bookshops in the Camden Road refuse to stock the Black Dwarf because 'you've got Trotskyists on your Editorial Board '. True. We also have Maoists, Guevarists, etc. For a left-wing bookshop to discriminate against us on vulgar, Stalinist grounds is a disgrace. No one is surprised when W. H. Smith and John Menzies refuse to stock us, but we are surprised when those who call themselves Maoists behave in the same way. Surely, comrades, in a society such as ours we should let even half a dozen flowers bloom.

A Get Gorton Ad Hoc Committee has been formed to organise demonstrations against the Australian Prime Minister, Mr John Gorton, during his visit to London for the Prime Ministers' Conference (7 to 15 January).

Set up under the aegis of Australians and New Zealanders Against the Vietnam War (ANZAVW), the committee will co-ordinate plans to picket Australia House during the week of anti-Gorton protests. The political motives behind the protests are clearcut. Australia has troops in Vietnam, opposed the bombing halt and now opposes the Paris peace talks. This emphasises one of the essential points about Australia's involvement in the war: Australia is not simply a running dog of the US imperialists. It has struck a more hawkish posture in Asia than any other country except Formosa. Throughout the war whenever Amercian resolve has wavered, Australia has been the 'ally' which has blackmailed the Americans into escalating.

Racialism is implicit in Australia's Vietnam policy. 'Fight the yellow bastards in Asia before they get down here,' is the grotesque logic of Gorton's foreign policy.
Gorton is maintaining the country's immoral White Australia and allows British pastoral interests to shamelessly exploit the Aboriginals. Whenever pressure is brought to bear to improve the conditions of the Aboriginals, Gorton finds it convenient to call the agitators 'Communists' or 'fellow travellers'. He has allowed secret police agents to operate on the campus and defended in the House of Representatives the action of Australian troops in Vietnam who tortured a 17 year old Vietnamese girl. When demonstrations erupted earlier this year over the Vietnam policy he described the participants as 'nuits' and added: 'I will only tolerate dissent in this country as long as it remains ineffective.' Get Gorton during the Prime Ministers'

The following report was sent in by Dwarfs in Worcestershire:

James Dance is our MP. He's old, a Tory and Chairman of the Mary Whitehouse Mob. He and other MP's made a big mistake when they visited South Vietnam at the request of the Saigon Government because their visit served only to boost the morale of Thieu and Co.

We dislike James - we dislike what he says about the Vietnamese on his return home. We hear he is holding a 'surgery' at the Conservative Club - so we

9.45 am, Saturday, 16 November.
It's cold and early but 16 turn up
—we are anarchists and anarchistic
Trotskyites—some are VSC
members—we all support VSC.
At 10.15 am it is decided to
move—heading for the Tory
Club, NLF flags are planted in
Church Yard and on Corporation
Lamp-posts. The town looks
colourful! Everyone arrives outside
The Club as the press look on

Monday, 6 Jan: Anti-apartheid picket outside Marlborough House, St James Street, SW1: eve of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. 7.30 pm-10 am Tuesday, 7.

6 Jan: VSC meeting to discuss 9 March action. Conway Hall,

7 Jan: Commonwealth P.M.'s Conference, Should be picketed throughout, Representatives of fascist states (Malowi, Kenya, Pakistan, Ghana, Australia and New Zealand) will be there! Marlborough House.

Saturday, 11 Jan: ANZAW Confrontation outside Australia House, onwards to the Savoy, where Gorton will be staying. 11 am.

we wait/joke/plot and answer the questions of journalists and Miss Large, the Tory Party secretary.

At last Friendly Jimmie appears but can spare 'literally only 5 minutes'. Comrade Richard reads our declaration offering a Reward 'for information leading to the apprehension of James Dance' – 'Wanted: for collaborating with the Pentagon and their Saigon Stooges' in their efforts to suppress our Vietnamese Comrades (who failed to apprehend him while he was in their country).

Our James says he knows a great deal about the situation in Vietnam — he says our NLF flags are those of 'The North Vietnamese Communist Aggressors' and 'It is ugly'. So is the Union Jack is our reply. 'Pm proud of it' mutters Dance standing to attention.

The arguments continue but we're

The Politics of Communication: Conference at the Africa Centre, 38 King Street, WC2. 11 and 12 January. Speakers include Raymond Williams, Perry Anderson, Terry Eagleton, Tom Nairn, and Free Communications Group. 30/–two days, students 10/–. Enquiries and cheque/PO's to: Communications to: Communications
Conference, May Day
Manifesto, 11 Fitzroy Square,
London W1.

Sunday, 12 Jan: Ad-Hoc Committee on Rhodesia, in association with Black People's Alliance. 2 pm. Speakers' Corner to the Round House.

Saturday, 18 Jan: IS meeting: Rosa Luxemburg Commemora-tion. Africa Centre, King Street, WC2, 3.30 pm. Followed

and cliches made in the past.
Suddenly he decides to leave - so
we rush out of the club with him.
A few minutes later his car pulls up the drive and we sit down -he's not going to keep his other appointment!

Tory Councillors swear, 'I fought for you in the war you long haired bastards', says one while throwing a flag at one of us. We disrespect them. Someone blasphemes, 'forget the last war women and children are being burned in Vietnam NOW'.

James Dance gets out of Big Humber and shakes and turns purple – he shouts desperately 'If you want to stop the war shave your hair, get into a uniform and go fight for the Americans': we feel sick – but it's turny

Police arrive - but we're winning so it's time to stop. The demo ends on a good note; 'we've Democracy to be the farce we know it to be'.

by rave, with CAST etc, at New Merlin's Cave, Margery Street, WC1, 8.30 pm.

Saturday, 18 Jan: VSC National Council meeting, Leeds Trade Hall.

Friday, 24 Jan: Tribute vs Black Dwarf. Debate on Labour Party, Parliament and The Struggle for Socialism. 7.15 pm at Central Hall, Westminster. Tickets 2s 6d available from Dwarf and Tribune.

Saturday, 25 Jan: ROSA LUXEMBURG/KARL LIEBKNECHT: 50 YEARS AFTER. Speakers: Ernest Mandel, Peter Brandt, Tariq Ali. Sponsored by Inter-national Marxist Group, 7.30