Capitalism is losing its Barings.

By Pearse

To lose £75 million is slightly different. When Nick Leeson lost £1.3 billion on the Tokyo futures market in February, it should have raised more than eyebrows or smiles from anarchists. It would have raised questions.

Barings "misfortunes" have highlighted the issue of economic power and the fundamental changes in the nature of capitalism which we all have had the unpleasant pleasure of experiencing since the 1970's. These changes have important implications for our activities and our lives and so must be understood.

As should be obvious to any anarchist, capitalist companies and corporations, by their economic power, control political power, namely the state and its particular Parliaments and the executives (i.e. the governors). Politicians are often powerless in the face of opposition from economic power.

As Noam Chomsky notes:

"On capitalist democracies, interests that must be satisfied are those of capitalists; otherwise, there is no investment, no production, no work, no resources to be devoted, however marginally, to the needs of the general population" (Turning the Tide, Pluto, 1985 page 233).

Faced with a government aiming to implement "radical" policies (i.e. anything that will get up the noses of capital) and "decontrol" for the "needs of the working class people" capital would use its economic power to stop or undermine these reforms. How? Simply by moving production to more profitable countries. Its this economic power that the recent changes within capitalism have caused.

The tendency within capital is for it to become increasingly global in operation. Transnational Companies are, perhaps, the most well known representatives of this process. Globalisation becomes noticeable in the early 1970's, partly as a response to the post war and post war state intervention (i.e. the Cambridge economist put it, "challenging the post war "efficient" and "democratic" national interest" and "unenlightened" - and the infrastructure of speculation was rapidly expanded meaning that "opportunities for profit proliferated" by allowing capital formally invested in high labour cost industries in the U.S.A. to move to states with popular revolt, without doubt accelerated the evolution to globalisation (as it had the evolution to "national" capitalism, or the post war and post state intervention state)[21]. The major problem with the "full employment policy" was that it assumed a "globalisation of capital". This process which has benefited capitalism immensely, increased it's size, power and mobility.

The figures speak for themselves.

From 1986 to 1990, foreign exchange transactions rose from under $300 billion to $700 billion each day in London. This is expected to exceed $1.3 trillion in 1994. The World Bank estimates that the total sources of international financial institutions at about $14 trillion. (As an example, perspective on these figures, the Bank of England put it in 1992, equal to 13 times the Gross Domestic Product of the OECD group of countries on an annualised basis (Financial Times, 25/9/93). Closer to home, some $200- 300 billion a day flows through London's foreign exchange markets. This the equivalent of the UK's annual Gross National Product in two or three days.[4]

The tele-communications revolution aidsthis expansion, in which the globalisation of capital is immensely by increasing the mobility of capital. As an example, "the calls for workers control in that late 60's and early 70's, as workers power increases, profit rates decrease and capital moves, seeking more profitable pastures, causing unemployment. So the cycle continues.

Hence, after the extended period of boom caused by Keynesianism, working class struggle had invoked a capitalist crisis as the rate of profit fell, the Inflation as indicated above was first the response to this crisis as it "reduced the real wages of workers" which means "the workers will get the prices rise faster than wages, income that would have gone to workers goes to business, the necessary profit", (Financial Times, page 120). Working class revolt accelerated the process of globalisation and inflation pro-

duced the correct climate for the "deregulation" era of Thatcher and Reagan to be on the agenda.

This era was marked by a move away from the "command and control" (for the working class at least, not for the ruling class) to "free" markets as part of a "neoliberal revolution". This is the process not only represented a policy change away from the deficit so called democratic one, it also represented a strengthening of the power of the state and the globalisation of capitalism. A process which has benefited capitalism immensely, increased its size, power and mobility.

The free market is marked by the hypocrisy of those at the top and the sacrifices required from those at the bottom.

Struggle is bad for business.

This resulted in a extended period of capital accumulation, in which both productivity and wages could increase in hand, unfortunately for capital it is in periods of "boom" that the workers are strongest. This is the key to understanding the traditional "business cycle" of capitalism. If an industry or country experiences high unemployment workers will put up with longer hours, worse conditions and new technology in order to remain in work (see: "The New Slavery", Scotland on Sunday, 9/1/93), for example.

This allows capital to extract a higher level of profit from those workers, which, in turn signals other capital to invest in that area. As investment increases, unemployment falls so workers are in a better position and so resist capital's agenda, even going so far as to ACT against capital. For example, the calls for workers control in that late 60's and early 70's, as workers power increases, profit rates decrease and capital moves, seeking more profitable pastures, causing unemployment. So the cycle continues.

Hence, after the extended period of boom caused by Keynesianism, working class struggle had invoked a capitalist crisis as the rate of profit fell, the Inflation as indicated above was first the response to this crisis as it "reduced the real wages of workers" which means "the workers will get the prices rise faster than wages, income that would have gone to workers goes to business, the necessary profit", (Financial Times, page 120). Working class revolt accelerated the process of globalisation and inflation pro-

duced the correct climate for the "delegu-
lation" era of Thatcher and Reagan to be on the agenda.

No wonder this Financial Times special supplement on the IMF stated that: "Whole governments realise that the only intelligent response to the balance of payment crisis is for the globalisation to make its economies more acceptable". More acceptable to business, not the population.[5] This has seen, and will increasingly see, what could be called a free market in states, with capital moving between states which offer the best deals to investors and transnational companies, such as tax breaks, union busting, no pollution controls and so forth. The "globalisation" of capital aids this process immensely by increasing the mobility of capital and allowing it to play one work force against another.

For example, General Motors plans to close two dozen plants in the United States and Canada but it has become the largest emplo
er in Mexico. Why? Because an "eco-

omic miracle" as driven wages down, Labour's share of personal income in Mexico has "declined from 36 percent in the 1970's to as low as 9 percent by 1992" Else-where, General Motors opened a $600 mil-

lion assembly plant in the former East Ger-

many to "keep their noses to the grindstone". As wealth pours up the scale of wages and profits, capital is seeking new opportunities, such as it "reduced the real wages of workers...". The Free Market.

In the same vein, increasing mobility of production is fuelling globalisation. "The Rich need the poor", according to an economist in the Financial Times (23/9/94). He went on to say: "The poor should be the source of demand, not the source of supply. We must cut the poverty of the poor...". The poor are, of course, the source of demand, and so capital can get much cheaper labour, which does not seek [impediments such as] social protection, long holidays...

All of which, needless to say, will result in bigger and better profits for the few as we, the real "wealth creators" get a reduced slice of the value we create. As wealth pours up the scale of wages and profits, capital is seeking new opportunities, such as it "reduced the real wages of workers...". The Free Market.

In particular, the need to create "more efficient" regional markets. This regionalisation of markets requires increased political centralisation and further limitations in the power of ordi-

nary people. Taking the BC, for example, we find the "mechanism for decision-making between EC states leaves power in the hands of officials from (Interior ministers, police, customs and security services) through a myriad of frameworks...". Such officials... play a critical role in ensuring agreements between the different state of-
ficials. The EC Seizes control in the UK, including the 12 Prime Ministers, simply rubber-stamp the conclusions agreed by the Inte-

rior and Justice Ministers. It is then, in this inter-governmental process, that par-
liticians and people are informed (and if they don't like it... just say no).

According to Business Week (February 15, 1993), Europe must "hammer away at high wages and corporate taxes, shorten work-

ing hours, curtail benefits and change labour immobility and luxurious social programmes". This is exactly the sort of thing contained in any leftist pro-

gramme you can to mention (for example, see Issue 6 of "Liberation" and its "draft statement for a shorter working week")..

Nothing is more than capitalism does not require. Exactly the sort of thing that the generalisation of capital helps put an end to.

The globalisation of capitalism has already adversely affected whole populations, but the next stage of global free trade (as rep-

resented by GATT) will make things far worse. Global free trade, as the economist Sir James Goldsmith notes, will "shatter the way in which value-added is shared be-

tween the superblocks". ("value-added" being the "increase of value obtained when you convert raw materials into a manufactu-

ed product")

This has seen, and will increasingly see, what could be called a free market in states, with capital moving between states which offer the best deals to investors and transnational companies, such as tax breaks, union busting, no pollution controls and so forth. The "globalisation" of capital aids this process immensely by increasing the mobility of capital and allowing it to play one work force against another.

For example, General Motors plans to close two dozen plants in the United States and Canada but it has become the largest empl
The global solidarity of our class is the flower that grows from the soil of our local self-activity and direct action.

Capital Flight

Far fetched? No, not really. In January, 1974, the FT Index for the London Stock Exchange stood at 359.8. By the time the miner's went on strike, forcing Heath to hold (and lose) a general election. The miners were members of the government (which many left-wingers in its cabinet) talked about nationalizing the banks and much more. In August, Heath announced Plans to nationalise the ship building industry. By December, the FT index dropped to 101.5, like a flower that grows from the soil of our class movement. The miners' strike was not an isolated event. The drop in the index was not just about the miners. It was about the whole economy. The miners' strike was a powerful symbol of the power of the working class. It showed that the working class was not just a group of workers, but a powerful force in society. It showed that the working class had the power to organise and fight for their rights. It showed that the working class could win.

Why? What so bad about the U.K.? Simply, the working class were too militant, the trade unions were too strong, and the government was too weak. This is not just a one-off event. This is a trend in British history. The working class has been too strong, and the government has been too weak. This is why the miners' strike was so successful. The miners were able to organise and fight for their rights. They were able to win.

To meet the globalisation of capitalism, we need to forge international links between countries. Existing organisations, such as the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) are still not able to do this on their own. We need to create a real alternative so that we have our own alternatives, and so that we can create our own alternatives, and so that we can create our own possibilities.
The global solidarity of our class is the flower that grows from the soil of our local self-activity and direct action.

Why? What so bad about the U.K.? Simply, the working class were too militant, the trade unions were not "shackled by law and subduing" (as The Economist, February 27, 1993, recently put it) and the welfare state worked. There were no more flexible hours, seasonal contracts, job sharing and part-time work. In December, 1991, seven years after the ERT made its order for a parliament to "deliver" reforms that benefited working class people capital demanded change. The ERT has a two of two effects. Either capital would disinvest, so forcing the government to cut public spending or disrupt the state. Or, the ERT control, leaving the country and so would be isolated from new investment and its currency would become worthless. Either way, the economy would be severely damaged and the promised "reforms" would be dead letters. In addition, this economic failure would soon result in popular revolts in which turn would lead to a more authoritarian state as "democracy" was protected from the people.

Capital Flight
Far fetched? No, not really. In January, 1974, the FT Index for the London Stock Exchange stood at 500. Five years later, when the Miner’s went on strike, forcing Heath to hold (and lose) a general election, the FT Index had fallen to 400. It is a fall in the value of the pound (which many left-wingers in its cabinet) talked about nationalising the banks and much of the City. In August, 1975, the government announced Plans to nationalise the ship building industry. By December, the FT Index had fallen to 333. Treasury was spending $100 million a day buying back its own money to support the pound and the "inflexibility" in the labour market. "The further decline in the value of the pound has occurred despite the high level of interest rates... dealers said that selling pressure against the pound was not heavy or persistent, but there was an almost total lack of interest amongst buyers. The drop in the pound is extremely serious, particularly for the Government, who have to import food and other consumer goods. They are reduced to a state where they are dependent on how much money they can receive at the foreign exchange market. "The failure of the pound has resulted in a crisis for the government as well as for the economic system as a whole."

To meet the globalisation of capitalism, we need to forge international links between countries. Existing organisations, such as the European Parliament (EVP) and the World Trade Organization (WTO), are not effective. A new social movement that can challenge the World Bank and the IMF must be created. A new movement that has already been formed is the World Social Forum. This forum brings together people from all over the world to discuss and plan for a global alternative to economic globalization. By 2003, the World Social Forum had grown to include thousands of participants from across the globe who have come together to demand an end to the domination of the global economy by corporate interests.

Back to the Future?
As can be seen from the last Labour government, Bill Clinton, New Zealand or Angela Merkel, the neo-liberal agenda is still alive. They cannot challenge, never mind change, the fundamentals of the system (austerity, low wages, weakening public services, etc.). As long as the government continues to cut public spending and reduce the role of the state, we will be stuck in a low-growth, low-skill economy. The real question is not whether we should have a government, but how we can make a sustainable and just economy.

In other words, we have to build in the new world of the old. But beyond all this, we need a vision of the future and ideas on how to get there. We need political content to our activity in order to rise above the reality of capitalism and not sink into reformism. Political ideas which spring from, learn from and develop with working class struggle and self-activity. Therefore we need a strong and effective anarchistic organisation to help spread the idea we can change things by our own actions and that will encourage the spirit of revolution. That such an organisation must transcend national boundaries goes without saying, but like the society we want to build, it will be based on local autonomy and free federation. The Scottish Federation of Anarchists hope to be part of such a global federation.

It has never been the case that capitalism is becoming a more socialistic system by its growth. Its steady increase in size means that popular control of its institutions has become impossible. They have to be broken up, with power decentralized back to where it belongs, to local communities and workplaces united in a free confederation.

The inherent tendency towards centralisation and controlcapitalleavingthecountryandsothatbenefitedworkingclasspeoplecapital abroad and ended up having to receive a temporary "bailing out" (PenguinBooks, 1985, page 89). We all are aware of the social costs of these policies. And let not forget that they "can exist in spite of the current IMF were promised" (Donaldson, op cit).

Capital will not invest in a country which does not meet its approval. In 1977, the Bank of England failed to get the Labour government to join the EEC. As soon as the Tories abolished themselves and ended restrictions on capital movement, the Bank of England hastened to receive a temporary "bailing out" in the U.K. began going abroad. In the Guardian of 21 September, 1981, Victor Reeves reported last week by the Bank of England show that pension funds are now investing 25% of their assets abroad. The reason is nothing a few years ago and then their has been no investment at all (net) by unit trusts in the 1980s...controls were abolished" (Ramsay, page 3).


Edward Herman, Beyond Hypocrisy, South End Press, 1992.

Robin Ramsay, "Thatcher, North Sea Oil and the hegemony of the City", Lobster 27, pages 2 to 9.


Notes
1. This fact is often ignored in the histories of the period, which are rewritten to imply that Labour Governments and workers fought against the loss of power and the changes indicated have decreased, an increase in consumer prices. Wage increases have been the result of workers' efforts to catch up after their income as it should have already been eroded by inflation.....The attempt to blame inflation on workers' wages is hardly more than a justification for those who want to increase profits by decreasing real wages. (Jeremy Brecher and Tim Costello, page 120).

2. The nationalisation of roughly 20% of economy (the most unprofitable sections of it as well) in 1945 was the direct result of ruling class fear. As Quintin Hogg, a Tory M.P. at the time, said, "If you don't give the people the social reforms they are going to give us as revolution". Memories of the near revolutions across Europe after the first war were obviously in many minds, and particularly in those who were particularly feared as "socialism". Anarchists at the time noted "the real opinion of workers' would be seen from Stock Exchange conditions and statements of industrialists that the Tory Front bench...[and from the workers] are that the owning classes had at displaced with the record and tendency of the Labour Party".

And let's not forget that they "can exist in spite of the current IMF were promised" (Donaldson, op cit).
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Direct Action: 14 ways to improve your Job

1. Workers run the world. Everything should stop without our labour. Withdrawing our labour is our weapon, and the right to run things is our demand.

2. At the same time, most work is a bore. As it is organized in our society, most labour kills the spirit and body of the worker, not to mention the mind. But to simply call for a four-hour day at eight hours pay is not enough. What will benefit from this automation that could realize such a demand? Who should control technology's introduction and integration into the economy? Potentially, we can.

3. Collective action is the source of our strength as workers. Many of the direct actions described below can be done by individuals, but they are far more effective when done collectively. This should not be mistaken for unionism. If collective action and union activity are simultaneous, fine. But collective action is not limited to unionism. Friendships and common grievances on the shop floor are enough to carry out most of the actions below.

4. Slow down. Your job is killing you anyway. When your boss tries to speed things up, drag your feet.

5. Work to rule. Follow every regulation and order down to the last detail, no matter how stupid they are. If you get absurd instructions, carry them out to the letter to demonstrate how absurd they are.

6. Ask questions. Pick apart your boss' instructions with questions about everything, even the most mundane details. Plead your ignorance and make your boss show him or her.

7. Strike through good work. If, as in a service-industry job, your strike would hurt other people more than your boss, strike by giving the public better or cheaper service, at your boss' expense naturally. Bus drivers can give cheap or free fares, restaurant workers can give heaping servings, hospital nurses and clerks can refuse to process bills or charge for services, etc.

8. Pass the buck. Ask your boss to make every decision and every judgement on the job so you can bury your boss under a load of petty decisions.

9. Don't forget the power of sit-down strikes and wildcat walk-outs. Well-timed collective action can win a demand, or grievance in minutes.

10. Practice deliberate inefficiency (aka " sabotage"). If working conditions are unsafe or brutal, a single loose bolt or misplaced part might bring things quickly to a halt.

11. Report on poor working conditions and fraudulent practice. Whistle-blowers, especially in consumer industries such as restaurants and hospitals, can be very effective. Call the fire brigade if there's a fire hazard. Call in the health and safety officers. Call the tax man on your boss' dodgy bookkeeping.

12. Everybody call in sick on the same day or days. The sick-in can cripple your workplace in a morning.

13. Take what is rightfully yours. If your boss refuses to give you breaks or longer lunches, get everybody on the job to take them anyway.

14. All of this is the day-to-day preparation for more dramatic forms of action, such as a strike in one industry, the general strike of all workers in the economy, and the creation of a network of powerful workers' self-organized assemblies or councils to run society. These forms of direct action, though far more organized, build from the simple direct actions described above.

D.N.A. - Do Not Accept

The new Criminal (In)Justice Act gives the police powers to take DNA samples. The outcome of this will be a U.K. wide DNA database.

The police will have powers to trawl through this database in a random search for suspects of crime. Michael Howard, at the Tory Party Conference last year, hailed the introduction of this DNA database saying that it would reduce crime and that anyone that had a DNA sample taken would "from that point on know that they were a marked man".

Don't be fooled by Tory lies or science. DNA will not be a solve all for crime.

Is Your DNA Sample Unique?

The biggest database of DNA to date is that of the FBI, in the USA. In this database there were three identical matches of DNA that could not be accounted for as errors or multiple entries from the same person. They were simply removed from the list. Research based on this new database was then published in influential science journals worldwide, stating that no multiple matches of DNA sample existed in the FBI data base and so DNA was unique to the individual. However as the FBI files were filled with, it is clear that two people can have identical DNA.

Further proof of this came when samples were taken from small numbers of people from two isolated groups of tribal peoples thousands of miles apart. In this small scale study, identical DNA samples were taken from people in these two separate groups. Random matches between individuals do happen. Your DNA is therefore not necessarily unique to you.

Testing of DNA

The inventor of the DNA test, Sir Alec Jeffrey, says that the result of DNA testing is "guaranteed foolproof from a good quality sample". DNA is therefore not guaranteed foolproof if the people conducting the tests are not working from a good quality sample.

The tests are being conducted and copyrighted by firms such as Cellmark Diagnostics, a subsidiary of I.C.I. In their promotional material they perpetuate the lie that their tests will "identify one human being with absolute certainty from all others". The reality was different when put into practice by the company.

In a blind testing to see how proficient Cellmark were, they made 7 errors from 30 samples. This gave false positives, i.e. a match between two samples where none actually existed. The people running the test met with Cellmark who were asked if they look again at these samples basically giving them an opportunity to rewrite their answers.

Can we trust the firms, nevermind the technology, when conducting real tests which could lead to real criminal convictions?

A Real Case

After a rape in Largs in 1987, Cellmark were employed to do DNA tests on a suspect. On the strength of the information from the DNA test conducted by them, Brian Kelly was convicted and sentenced to six years in Barlinnie. This was based on the mass of other evidence, such as a reliable alibi, to show he was actually innocent. The "foolproof", "scientific" evidence was accepted at face value. Brian Kelly was released in 1993 after serving all of his sentence on the basis of DNA "evidence".

Do Not Accept

We must campaign against DNA sampling. We must fight the lie that DNA is foolproof. Don't be blinded by science. Science does not equal truth.
Direct Action: 14 ways to improve your Job

1. Workers run the world. Everything would stop without our labour. Withdrawing our labour is our weapon, and the right to run things is our demand.

2. At the same time, most work is a bore. As it is organized in our society, most labour kills the spirit and body of the worker, not to mention the mind. But to simply call for a four-hour day at eight hours pay is not enough. Who will benefit from the automation that could realize such a demand? Who should control technology's introduction and integration into the economy? Potentially, we can.

3. Collective action is the source of our strength as workers. Many of the direct actions described below can be done by individuals, but they are far more effective when done collectively. This should not be mistaken for unionism. If collective action and union activity are simultaneous, fine. But collective action is not limited to unionism. Friendships and common grievances on the shop floor are enough to carry out most of the actions below.

4. Slow down. Your job is killing you any way, when your boss tries to speed things up, drag your feet.

5. Work to rule. Follow every regulation and order down to the last detail, no matter how stupid they are. If you get absurd instructions, carry them out to the letter to demonstrate how absurd they are.

6. Ask questions. Pick apart your boss' instructions with questions about everything, even about the most mundane details. Plead your ignorance and make your boss show his or her fingers.

7. Strike through good work. If, as in a service-industry job, your strike would hurt other people more than you or your boss, striking by giving the public better or cheaper service, at your boss' expense naturally. But drivers can give cheap or free fares, restaurant workers can give heaping servings, hospital nurses and clerks can refuse to process bills or charge for services, etc.

8. Pass the buck. Ask your boss to make every decision and every judgment on the job, so you can keep your boss under a load of petty decisions.

9. Don't forget the power of sit-down strikes and wildcat walk-outs. Well-timed collective action can win a demand, or grievance, in minutes.

10. Practice deliberate inefficiency (aka "stupidage"). If working conditions are unsafe or brutal, a single loose bolt or lost part might bring things quickly to a halt.

11. Report on poor working conditions and fraudulent practice. Whistle-blowers, especially in consumer industries such as restaurants and hospitals, can be very effective. Call the fire brigade if there's a fire hazard. Call in the health and safety officers. Call the tax man on your boss' dodgy bookkeeping.

12. Everybody call in sick on the same day or days. The sick-in can cripple your workplace in a morning.

13. Take what is rightfully yours. If your boss refuses to give you breaks or longer lunches, get everybody on the job to take them anyway.

14. All of this is the day-to-day preparation for more dramatic forms of action, much as a strike in one industry, the general strike, etc. in the economy, and the creation of an organization of workers' self-empowerment (assemblies or councils) to run society. These forms of direct action, though far more organized, build from the simple direct actions described above.

D.N.A. - Do Not Accept

The new Criminal (In)Justice Act gives the police powers to take DNA samples. The outcome of this will be a U.K. wide DNA database.

The police will have powers to trawl through this database in a random search for suspects of crime. Michael Howard, at the Tory Party Conference last year, hailed the introduction of this DNA database saying that it would reduce crime and that anyone that had a DNA sample taken would "from that point on know that they were a marked man".

don't be fooled by Terry lies or science. DNA will not be a solve all for crime.

Is your DNA Sample Unique?

The biggest database of DNA to date is that of the F.B.I. in the USA. In this database there were three identical matches of DNA that could not be accounted for as errors or multiple entries from the same person. They were simply removed from the list. Research based on this new database was then published in an influential science journal worldwide, stating that no multiple matches of DNA sample existed in the F.B.I. data base and so DNA was unique to the individual. However as the F.B.I. files were filled with, it is clear that two people can have identical DNA. Further proof of this came when samples were taken from small numbers of people from two isolated groups of tribal peoples thousands of miles apart. In this small scale study, identical DNA samples were taken from people in these two separate groups. Random matches between individuals do happen. Your DNA is therefore not necessarily unique to you.

Testing of DNA

The inventor of the DNA test, Sir Alec Jeffrey, says that the result of DNA testing is "guaranteed foolproof from a good quality sample". DNA is therefore not guaranteed foolproof if the people conducting the tests are not working from a good quality sample.
Scottish Federation of Anarchists
As We See It

We encourage and assist resistance to all oppression. This includes economic and environmental exploitation and forms of state and social oppression, such as racism and sexism.

Mass direct action is the most effective and liberating form of struggle.

Our aim is for mass struggles to develop into a revolutionary transformation, in which people seize control of the world's resources and fundamentally re-organise society.

This can only be achieved by the self-organisation of the vast majority, the working class. We oppose all hierarchies and political parties.

We want a free, stateless world, with social wealth owned and controlled by society. Production will be to meet human need and all relationships based on equality and mutual respect.

As We See It
Capitalism

Under the present system we have no real say in the decisions that affect us, our communities or workplaces. Instead a minority know what is best to say in the decisions that affect us, our state that claims to estsbetweenthe ourmoney to snosi - and control us. In Scotland, 7% of the population own 84% of the wealth. It's the inter-est in this elite that must be Sfl[lsfl€dtWliilll1lise capitalist films and control us. A state which one country imposes its wishes and values upon another by economic or political means. Such domination can only be resisted by class struggle, not nationalism. Nationalism, like all cross-class movements, means only a change in rulers. There are no common interests between the classes. Our lives will be no better under Scottish bosses and politicians. We can only be free in a world without capitalism and states.

Resistance

Meaningful change can only happen when other people struggle together to resist power. In countries like Scotland, the vast majority who are excluded from power are the working class. This includes white and blue collar workers, workers in the service industry, the unemployed and other claimants and people doing domestic work at home.

These struggles take many forms, such as resistance to wage cuts, poverty, sexism, racism, ecological destruction, militarism and so forth. They are fought throughout society, in workplaces, in communities, in the health service, in benefit offices, in prisons.

We in the Scottish Federation of Anarchists are involved in such struggles and aim to encourage tendencies in this resistance towards:

- Self-organisation and equality, with people controlling their own struggles and organisations, rather than dependence on and control by leaders.
- Collective direct action, rather than ineffective lobbying or letter writing.
- Combining workplace and community struggles and organisation rather than their division into different "single issue" campaigns.
- The revolution of everyday life, not the poverty of consumerism or the boredom of left-wing politics.
- Changing the fundamental aspects of capitalism, rather than tinkering with minor changes.
- Revolution, not reformism, the working class and ruling class having nothing in common.

Revolution

This new world is not for the distant future. It exists now, in our hearts. By organising ourselves, using direct action and showing solidarity we create the ideas and structures of this new world within the present one. Only this will allow us to organise as a class and take over our workplaces and communities, to win the class war. Without this take-over we will struggle within the system, but never re-allocate.

A free society can only be created and run from below, by and for everyone. No political party acting or setting power on our behalf can do it for us. We reject the "would-be" rulers of left-wing parties and their politics. A free society can never come through Parliament or any other state. Par-

Anarchism is based on the free federation of autonomous groups, directly controlled from the bottom up by their members. An anarchist society, self-manage-
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As We See It

Capitalism

Under the present system we have no real say in the decisions that affect us, our communities or workplaces. Instead, a minority know what is best to say in the decisions that affect us. Instead, the state creates the illusion of choice, of democracy, other- wise there is no investment in our communities or workplaces. From the state, from fascists and from imperialism, where one country imposes its wishes and values upon another by economic or political means. Such domination can only be resisted by class struggle, not nationalism, for all cross class movements, means only a change in rulers. There are no other interests except between the classes. Our lives are only better under capitalism, not under socialism. Capitalism is the means by which we, the working class, are held in common ownership and control of social wealth and the means to create it. In Scotland, 7% of the population own 84% of the wealth. It’s the interests of this elite that must be satisfied within “democracy”, otherwise there is no investment, no production and no work. This is true for the whole of capitalist world as it is for the few remaining “Communist” Party regimes.

Economically, capitalism results in power and privilege for the few, sacrifices and alienation for the rest of us. Continually we see the world we live in being destroyed, standardised and packaged so that the elite can make a few more pounds. Capitalism has turned everyone feeling and desire we have into an object to be bought and sold. Human and community needs have been replaced by price tags and commercials.

Politically, we live in a highly centralised state, over which we have little meaningful control. Every five years we get the chance to vote for a politician, a puppet for faceless bureaucrats and big business. A cross on a bit of paper for a state which treats us like children, telling us what we can and cannot do. A state that claims to know what’s best for us regardless of what we actually think or want and which uses OUR money to subsidise capitalist firms and control us. A state that sends us to fight our wars for more power against its competing rivals. A state which increasingly grants itself more powerful powers in order to control dissent.

Not all working class people are oppressed in the same way. Black people are subjected to systematic racism from the state, from fascists and from individual racists. Women are oppressed by a system of attitudes, ways of living and institutions based on their domination by men. Lesbians and gay men suffer from bigotry and repressive laws. All such repressive roles repress all involved.

Discrimination and hierarchical and authoritarian relationships exist throughout society and must be resisted. These social oppressions are only useful to our rulers, as they divide us, getting us to blame other working class people for the problem we all face. They divert our anger away from the system and those who run it.

Every individual, group or people has the right to be itself and to self-determination. But capitalism results in the standardisation of cultures. Individuality, cultural diversity or popular self-determination cannot withstand market forces, the power of multi-national companies or the conformity created by state centralisation.

We are against all forms of imperialism, where one country imposes its wishes and values upon another by economic or political means. Such domination can only be resisted by class struggle, not nationalism. Nationalism, like all cross class movements, means only a change in rulers. There are no other interests except between the classes. Our lives will be no better under Scottish bosses and politicians. We can only be free in a free world, a world without capitalism and states.

Resistance

Meaningful change can only happen when ordinary people struggle together to resist power. In countries like Scotland, the vast majority who are excluded from power are the working class. This includes white and blue collar workers, workers in the service industry, the unemployed and other claimants and people doing domestic work at home.

These struggles take many forms, such as resistance to wage cuts, poverty, sexism, racism, ecological destruction, militarism and so forth. They are fought throughout society, in workplaces, in communities, in the health service, in benefit offices, in prisons.

We in the Scottish Federation of Anarchists are involved in such struggles and aim to encourage tendencies in this resistance towards:

- **Self-organisation and equality, with people controlling their own struggles and organisations, rather than dependence on and control by leaders.**

- **Combining workplace and community struggles and organisation rather than their division into different “single issue” campaigns.**

- **The revolution of everyday life, not the poverty of consumerism or the boredom of left-wing politics.**

- **Changing the fundamental aspects of capitalism, rather than tinkering with minor changes.**

- **Revolution, not reformism, the working class and ruling class have nothing in common.**

Struggles must be controlled by meetings of all those involved, with elected committees to carry out day to day tasks. Anyone elected to such a position of responsibility must carry out the wishes of the meetings or be answerable to those involved and subject to instant recall. Alternative forms of organisation must be created.

Resistance should be spread, with links created to workplaces and the community. Such links must be of a federal nature, with power resting firmly at the bottom in the hands of those involved. By organising in this manner we ensure that there is active participation in activity and decision making by all involved. Any organisation not based on these principles, such as the trade unions, are part of the problem.

We reject the dead end of electioneering. We must organise and fight where we have real power, in our communities and workplaces. From there we can impose by direct action that which politicians can never get in Parliament. Only this can create the spirit of revolt needed to resist oppression and get improvements in the here and now, as well as creating a new world.

Revolution

This new world is not for the distant future. It exists now, in our hearts. By organising ourselves, using direct action and showing solidarity we create the ideas and structures of this new world within the present one. Only this will allow us to organise as a class and take over our workplaces and communities, so winning the class war. Without this take-over we will struggle within the system, but never replace it.

A free society can only be created and run from below, by and for everyone. No political party acting or sitting power on our behalf can do it for us. We reject the “would-be” rulers of left-wing parties and their politics. A free society can never come through Parliament or any other state. Parliamant is organised to protect privilege and oppression, it cannot be reformed. States, by their structure and internal workings, create bureaucracy, with its own interests, power and privileges. They can never be used to abolish inequality and injustice.

The New Society

Society can be organised in a better way, one that meets the needs of all and the environment. This society is anarchism (or libertarian communism/socialism).

Anarchism comes from our needs and desires for freedom, equality and solidarity. It is the means by which we, the working class, can win the class war and create the sort of world we want and need.

Anarchism is based on the free federation of autonomous groups, directly controlled from the bottom up by their members. In an anarchist society, self-management replaces government and bosses. This decentralisation ensures that we take control of our own fates, without leaders and led.

Our goal is the creation of a global community where

- The world’s resources are held in common and shared.

- People manage their own lives, work and communities.

- All have an equal say in decision making through decentralised forms of organisation.

- Relationships in all areas of life are based on liberty, equality and mutual respect, regardless of gender, age, colour, sexual orientation, disability or culture.

- People live in harmony with nature.

- Work no longer consists of boring and repetitive tasks but instead becomes a mean of self-expression and fulfilment.
Spain and its Relevance Today

Part 2 by Iain MacSaorsa

Lessons from the Spanish Revolution

To organise a [libertarian] communist society on a large scale it would be necessary to transform the social revolution that occurred after Franco's military coup was defeated in the streets. We also said that this revolution had historical precedents. Consistently committees had represented plenums with fait accomplis and acted without mandates (sometimes in ways contrary to C.N.T. members). However, it must be pointed out that this was minimised by the nature of the C.N.T. although it did happen.

While anarchosyndicalism sees these dangers and tries to combat them, it is clear that it can only partially do so in practice. In addition, the idea that by controlling the economy automatically means destroying the state is false. This comes from French Revolutionary Syndicalism and not Anarchism. In effect, it means ignoring the state. And ignoring something does not make it go away. This idea can be seen from some aspects of the Spanish Revolution, i.e., the working class took over the economy but left the state intact. The C.N.T. leadership collaborated with the state (had they become so used to negotiating that they could not see beyond it?) and the rest is history.

However, without the C.N.T. the revolution would not have happened in the first place. The fact that the revolution occurred at all is a glowing testimony to the importance of class struggle and political organisation. An independence and militancy which the C.N.T. structure unlike Marxist unions encouraged and not crushed through centralisation.

The very structure and practice of the C.N.T. did produce a revolutionary working class, one of the likes of which the world has rarely seen. As Jose Peirats states, "above the level of direct action, the CNT was an eminently political organisation... a social and revolutionary organisation for agitation and insurrection" (Jose Peirats, Anarchists in the Spanish Revolution, page 239).

Lessons

The following positive points can be gathered from the C.N.T. and the Spanish anarchist movement:

1. They become bureaucratic/hierarchical, i.e., to generate "leaders" or union bosses separated from the rank and file. In order to get reforms, the union must negotiate and be prepared to compromise (which in practice means to get their members back to work). This results in the union committees, sooner or later, trying to control their own rank and file. This process of negotiation leads to a leaders/追随者
division.

2. To concentrate on short-term economic issues of the C.N.T. and the Spanish anarchist movement.

a. It encouraged the political, initiative and organisational skills of its members, the federal, decentralised body, based on direct discussion and decision making from the bottom up.

b. The CNT tradition was to discuss and examine everything, according to one militant. As Bakunin said "the International [the union movement] must be a people's movement, organised from the bottom up by the free spontaneous action of the masses. There must be no secret, no organisation, the masses must be in control of everything... All affairs of the International must be thoroughly and openly discussed without evasions and circumlocutions" (Bakunin on Anarchism, edited by Sam Dolgoff, page 408).

The C.N.T. rejected full-time officials. Instead union officials were part-timers who did union work either after work hours or, if they had to miss work, they were paid their normal wage. Hence they were in touch with the union members and shared their experiences and needs as they continued to be workers. This reduced the tendency for bureaucratic and top officials to become an unofficial governing caste within the organisations.

Without the C.N.T., the revolution would not have happened in the first place.

Their experiences and needs as they continued to be workers. This reduced the tendency for bureaucratic and top officials to become an unofficial governing caste within the organisations.
Spain and its Relevance Today

Part 2 by Iain MacSaorsa

Lessons from the Spanish Revolution

To organise a [libertarian] communist society on a large scale it would be necessary to transfer an economic life radically, such as methods of production, of exchange and consumption; and all this could not be achieved other than gradually, as the objective circumstances permitted and to the extent that the masses understood what advantages could be gained and were able to act for themselves" (Enrico Malatesta, Life and Ideas, page 36).

In part one, we indicated the social revolution that occurred after Franco’s military coup was defeated in the streets. We also said that this revolution was undermined by the state and could not develop fully and that this was caused (in part) by the actions of the C.N.T. and F.A.I. committees. The issue now is what lessons for our struggles and times can be learned from the anarchist movement in Spain and the 1936 revolution?

We should not rush to condemn the C.N.T. out of hand. We should search for an explanation of what happened. The fact that anarchists joined a government should prompt the question, was the defeat in Spain a defeat of anarchist theory and tactics OR a failure of anarchists to apply their theory and tactics?

It is clear from the actions of, for example, the Makhnovists in the Ukraine during the Russian Revolution that anarchism is a valid approach to social struggle and revolution. So what made Spain "special"?

Firstly, as discussed in part one, the question of nationalist unity. The C.N.T. lead ers were totally blinded by this, leading them to support a "democratic" state against a "fascist" one. While the bases of a new world was being created, inspiring the fight against fascism, the C.N.T. leaders collaborated with the system that spawns fascism. As the Friends of Durruti make clear, "Democracy defeated the Spanish people, not Fascism" (Class War on the Home Front, page 30).

The false dilemma of "anarchist dictatorship" or "collaboration" was a fundamentally wrong. It was never a case of banning parties, etc, under an anarchist system, far from it. Full rights of free speech, organisation and so on should have existed "distorted everything right from the start" (Collectives in the Spanish Revolution, page 227) and did not allow the collectives to develop beyond a self-managed social condition into full socialism.[1]

Anarchosyndicalism

The centralisation which occurred within the C.N.T. after 19th July did not "just happen". There are institutional reasons why it occurred. These come from anarchosyndicalist practice.

The fusion of anarchism and the union movement ("syndicalism") is the basic idea of anarchosyndicalism. The unions are enough in themselves and, through the daily struggle for reforms, can lead to socialism. In practice, this does not quite work (unfortunately).

Anarchosyndicalist unions must operate within the same basic situation as capitalistic unions, therefore they come under the same pressures and influences. These pressures of working within the capitalist system (in a unionist manner) produce the following tendencies:

1. They become bureaucratic/hierarchical, to generate "leaders" or union bosses separated from the rank and file. In order to get reforms, the union must negotiate and be prepared to compromise (which in practice means to get their members back to work). This results in the union committees, sooner or later, trying to control their own rank and file. This process of negotiation leads to a leader defence.

2. To concentrate on short term economic issues. This is due to the connection and keep a large union membership.

It is clear from its history that the C.N.T. was not immune to these tendencies. For example, the F.A.I. was formed explicitly to combat reformism within the C.N.T. (see Peirats, page 238-9, and Juan Gomez Casas, page 100, for example). The actions of the C.N.T. during the revolution had historical precedents. Consistently committees had represented plenums with fait accomplis and acted without mandates (sometimes in ways contrary to C.N.T. members). However, it must be pointed out that this was minimised by the nature of the C.N.T. although it did happen.

While anarchosyndicalism sees these dangers and tries to combat them, it is clear that it can only partially do so in practice.

In addition, the idea that by controlling the economy automatically means destroying the state is false. This comes from French Revolutionary Syndicalism and not Anarchism. In effect, it means ignoring the state. And ignoring something does not make it go away. This idea can be seen from some aspects of the Spanish Revolution, ie the working class took over the economy but left the state intact. The C.N.T. leadership collaborated with the state (had they become so used to negotiating that they could not see beyond it?) and the rest is history.

However, without the C.N.T. the revolution would not have happened in the first place. The fact that the revolution occurred at all is a glowing testimony to the independence and militancy of ordinary C.N.T. members. An independence and militancy which the C.N.T. structure unlike Marxist unions encouraged and not crushed through centralism.

The very structure and practice of the C.N.T. did produce a revolutionary work. This is the only method by which society could be organised. A method which was based on the ability of ordinary people to direct society themselves and which showed in practice that special ruling authorities are unnecessary and undesirable. It also proves that anarchist organisation is more revolutionary than "socialist" (i.e. Marxist) forms (which are, at best, more "democratic" forms of capitalist/statist structures).

This created a viable and practical example of an alternative method by which society could be organised. A method which was based on the ability of ordinary people to direct society themselves and which showed in practice that special ruling authorities are unnecessary and undesirable. It also proves that anarchist organisation is more revolutionary than "socialist" (i.e. Marxist) forms (which are, at best, more "democratic" forms of capitalist/statist structures).

The C.N.T. rejected full-time officials. Instead union officials were part-timers who did union work either after work hours or, if they had to miss work, they were paid their normal wage. Hence they were in touch with the union members and shared their experiences and needs as they continued to be workers. This reduced the tendency for union bureaucracies to develop or for officials to become an officials governing caste within the organisations.

Without the C.N.T. the revolution would not have happened in the first place.

The C.N.T. was organised, primarily, on a local basis. The industrial union federations (ie union federations for one industry) were weak. The real base of the C.N.T. was the regional/local federation of all industrial unions in an area. Hence class wide issues could be fought, industrial divisions overcome and solidarity action spread across industry.

The C.N.T., because of this, fought in and out of the factory for social issues, helping to reduce the tendency towards concentrating only on economics as "the demands of the CNT went much further than those of any socialist organisation, with its emphasis on true equality, autogestion [self-management] and working class dignity, anarchosyndicalism made demands on the capitalist system could only be granted to the workers" (J. Romero Maur, The Spanish case, page 79, from Anarchism Today, edited by James Joll et al. This short essay is a good overview of the ideas and practice of the C.N.T. up to 1936 (although I feel that it gets certain aspects of Bakunin’s ideas on “syndicalism” wrong).

This is not to ignore the importance of industry wide federations of unions; of course, it just indicates that such forms of industrial unionism can, and do, concentrate on partial aspects of the class struggle and do not generate the same class and social awareness as regionally based organisations.

3. Direct action was used in every case. This raised the consciousness and militancy of the working class better than any election campaign. The benefits of "Doing it Yourself" was seen in practice. This, combined with anarchist consciousness, resulted in a movement in which people could transform their assumptions about what was possible, necessary and desirable.

4. The role of anarchists, as anarchists. Without the actions and ideas of anarchists, the C.N.T. would have soon become the same as any other union. The anarchists raised the "moral tone" of the unions and ensured they did not degenerate into reformism. This had been pointed out by many people before hand, for example Malatesta wrote: "Trade Unions are by their very nature reformists and never revolutionaries. The revolutionary spirit must be introduced by the constant actions of revolutionaries who work within their ranks as well as outside, in order to transform the normal definition of the union function. On the contrary" (Enrico Malatesta, Life and Ideas, page 117). [2]

The actions of our comrades did make the C.N.T. a revolutionary organisation, did make it operate in an anarchist manner. However, the tactics they used over time...
Anarchism must be relevant to working class people. We must advocate anarchist tactics and organisation in all struggles. It is clear that to organise anarchists is not enough. We must encourage the organisation of the working class, otherwise "revolutionary" ideas are only the domain of professional revolutionaries. People, under these circumstances, cannot formulate and apply their own agenda and so remain passive tools in the hands of leaders. By permanent libertarian socialist organisation, people can control their own struggles and so, eventually, their own lives. It accuses people, through practice, to self-management and so anarchism. The experience of the C.N.T. shows this.

This was the great strength of the Spanish Anarchist movement. It was a movement "that, in addition to possessing a revolutionary ideology [sic], was also capable of mobilising action around objectives firmly rooted in the life and conditions of the working class... It was this ability periodicity to identify and express widely felt needs and feelings, that, together with its presence at community level, formed the basis of the strength of radical anarchism, and enabled it to build a mass base of support" (Nick Rider, The practice of direct action: the F.A.I., pages 79-105).

As Malatesta made clear, "to encourage popular organisations of all kinds is the logical continuation of a basic revolutionary tactic" and should therefore be an integral part of our programme... anarchists do not want to...

destroying the freedom to make mistakes.

Impetus for a libertarian social revolution come from elsewhere than "below"?

In no coincidence that collectivism was more socialist in rural collectives as the state was effectively destroyed (by the CNT in Aragon) by federations of collectives. As one militant describes the process of collectivisation, it had to be based on free federation. "From the bottom up" :-


Anarchists in the union committees unless at ground level. In these committees, in the case of conflict with the boss, the militant forced to compromise to arrive at an agreement. The contacts and activities which come from being in this position, push the militant towards bureaucracy. Conscious of this, we do not wish to run it. Our role is to analyse from the bottom the dangers which beset an union organisation like ours. No militant should prolong his (sic) job in committees, beyond the time allotted to him (sic). No permanent and indispensable people" (Durruti, The People Armed, page 216 [3]).

However, the dangers of bureaucracy could not be defeated by the tactics of the F.A.I. in the 30's nor by those anarchists who considered themselves as syndicalists first.

5. As noted earlier, for anarchism to succeed the state must not be ignored but smashed and "replaced" by a libertarian structure(s) to coordinate activity. In his history of the F.A.I., Juan Gomez Casas (an active Faista in 1936) makes this clear:

"How else could libertarian communism be brought about? It would always signify the dissolution of the old parties dedicated to the idea of power, or at least make it impossible for them to pursue their politics aimed at seizure of power. There will always be pockets of opposition to new experiences and therefore resistance to joining 'the spontaneity of the unanimous masses'... In addition, the masses would have confidence in the government of expression in the unions as well as... their political organisations in the districts and communities" (Anarchist Organisation: the History of the F.A.I., page 186).

As the Friends of Durruti said "A revolution requires the absolute domination of the workers organisations". (The Friends of Durruti accuse, from Class War on the Home Front, page 34).

As Malatesta made clear, "to encourage popular organisations of all kinds is the logical continuation of a basic revolutionary tactic" and should therefore be an integral part of our programme... anarchists do not want to... produce free individuals who think for themselves. We'd ask, "Did you think it was fair when the cacique [local] said to the working class, 'You will not work?' and they said, 'Of course not'. They were, of course, those who didn't want to. We would try to speak to them in terms they understood. We'd ask, 'You want to be free? Your world is built on servitude. You want to be socialist. 'There were, of course, those who didn't want to. We would try to speak to them in terms they understood. We'd ask, 'You want to be free? Your world is built on servitude. You want to be socialist."

While our immediate focus is Scotland, we are committed internationalists who wish to develop links and joint activity with revolutionaries world-wide.

The Scottish Federation of Anarchists

The Scottish Federation of Anarchists is a federation of autonomous groups and individuals, co-operating without any central governing body. We reject centralisation, hierarchy and bureaucracy. We believe in organising ourselves so that we reflect the kind of society we want to see.

For Anarchism, pages 79-105).

The lesson from every revolution is that the mistakes made in the process of liberation by people themselves are always minor compared to the consequences of creating authorities which eliminate such "ideological errors" by destroying the freedom to make mistakes.

The Scottish Federation of Anarchists is a federation of autonomous groups and individuals, co-operating without any central governing body. We reject centralisation, hierarchy and bureaucracy. We believe in organising ourselves so that we reflect the kind of society we want to see.

While our immediate focus is Scotland, we are committed internationalists who wish to develop links and joint activity with revolutionaries world-wide.

The S.F.A. welcomes the involvement of all people in these new social structures, regardless of whether they describe themselves as anarchists, autonomists, libertarian socialists/communists or whatever.
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Anarchists started to fight reformism by being elected to every union post they could. In the short term it worked, but in the longer term it meant that "if the FAI influenced the CNT, the opposite was also true... anarchy lost much of its special character when anarchists tried to lead the anarcho-syndicalist federation. In fact, the anarchists were run by the union..." and "blinkered by participation in union committees, the FAI became incapable of a 'social vision'" (Anarchists in the Spanish Revolution, Jose Peirats, page 239).

This proved to be the undoing of the anarchist movement as the reality of being a union official resulted in militants becoming syndicalists first, anarchists second. As the rank and file militants left for the front, the "moral tone" of the organisation fell. The rank and file were too busy constructing collectives and fighting to effectively control the committees. In this situation, the actions of the committees could not be effectively stopped by the normal C.N.T. procedures (plenums, etc) and by the time anything could be done to stop the consequences of the initial betrayal of the 20th of July, it was too late.

This problem of "officialanism" was seen by many anarchists. Durruti noted that "anarchists in the union committees unless at ground level. In these committees, in the case of conflict with the militant, the militant was forced to compromise to arrive at an agreement. The contacts and activities which come from being in this position, push the militant towards bureaucrats. Conscious of this risk, we do not wish to run it. Our role is to analyse from the bottom the dangers which beset an union organisation like ours. No militant should prolong his (sic) job in committees, beyond the time allotted to him (sic). No permanent and indispensable people" (Durruti - The People Armed, page 216 [3]).

However, the dangers of bureaucracy could not be defeated by the tactics of the F.A.I. in the 30's nor by those anarchists who considered themselves as syndicalists first.

5. As noted earlier, for anarchist to succeed the state must not be ignored but smashed and "replaced" by a libertarian structure(s) to coordinate activity. In the history of the F.A.I., Juan Gomez Casas (an active Faista in 1936) makes this clear:

"How else could libertarian communism be brought about? It would always signify the dissolution of the old parties dedicated to the idea of power, or at least make it impossible for them to pursue their politics aimed at seizure of power. There will always be pockets of opposition to new experiences and therefore resistance to joining 'the spontaneity of the anarcho masses'. In addition, the masses would have come into the political arena of expression in the unions as well as... their political organisations in the district and communities" (Anarchist Organisation: the History of the F.A.I., page 186).

As the Friends of Durruti said "A revolution requires the absolute domination of the workers organisations". (The Friends of Durruti accuse, from Class War on the Home Front, page 34).

As Malatesta made clear, "to encourage popular organisations of all kinds is the only real basis for communism; and should therefore be an integral part of our programme... anarchists do not want to organise the people; we want the people to organise themselves... we want the new life of way to emerge from the body of the people and correspond to the state of things at the point at which it advances (Life and Ideas, page 90). This can only occur via popular self-organisation. Bearing this in mind, we must also be aware of the dangers in the undoing of the largest anarchist movement in the world.

Notes -
1. As Bakunin wrote 60 years earlier "In a free community, collectivism can only come about through the pressure of circumstances, not by imposition from above but by a free spontaneous movement from below" (Bakunin on Anarchism, page 202). For where else could the

The lesson from every revolution is that the mistakes made in the process of liberation by people themselves are always minor compared to the dangers of creating authorities which eliminate such "ideological errors" by destroying the freedom to make mistakes.

Anarchists

2. Such ideas would, now, only be appropriate to rank and file organisations created in and by struggle in opposition to the Trade Unions. The STUC cannot be reformed, so why reform the last 70 years have contained enough proof of this.

3. As an aside, Durruti is echoing Bakunin who said "The purpose of the Alliance [i.e anarcho federation] is to promote the Revolution... it will suffer all ambition to dominate the revolutionary movement of the people, either by cliques or individuals. The Alliance will promote the Revolution only through the NATURAL BUT NEVER OFFICIAL INFLUENCE of all members of the Alliance" (Bakunin on Anarchism, edited by Sam Dolgoff, page 387).

As We See it (Continued from 23)

- Education is integrated with daily life to produce free individuals who think for themselves.
- Goods and services are produced directly for human needs in the widest sense.
- The market, exchange and money no longer exist and goods and services are provided free.

The Scottish Federation of Anarchists

The Scottish Federation of Anarchists is a federation of autonomous groups and individuals, co-operating without any central governing body. We reject centralisation, hierarchy and bureaucracy. We believe in organising ourselves so that we reflect the kind of society we want to see.

While our immediate focus is Scotland, we are committed internationalists and wish to develop links and joint activity with revolutionary organisations worldwide.

The S.F.A. welcomes the involvement of all groups in the movement, in all its aspects, regardless of whether they describe themselves as anarchists, autonomists, libertarian socialists/communists or whatever.
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Anarchism in Glasgow

Part 2

Charlie Baird Snr, Mollie Baird, John Taylor, Baldwin, Babs Raeside, Jimmy Raeside, 14/8/87

In August 1987 the Raesides, who had been living in Australia for many years, returned to Glasgow for a visit. This provided a rare opportunity to bring together some surviving members of anarchist groups in Glasgow during the 1940s for a public discussion on the history of the movement and the lesson which can be learned.

JTC: What did you think of Eddie Shaw as a speaker?

CB: Well, I didn’t agree with his type of propaganda. He could draw a crowd; he could hold a meeting, but you always got the feeling that Eddie was speaking for Eddie and his distinctive propaganda was different from Jimmy’s. Jimmy was a very capable speaker. The difference was that Shaw’s type of propaganda and perspective was that Shaw pandered to an audience, he communicated in their midst and they all the rest of it. You could see blokes bring their wives up to hear him. Raeside sent them away thinking – but you know, they were sitting in waiting for me. The man’s head was that size!

JTC: He was a forerunner of Billy Connolly.

MB: Eddie was in America for a few years – he was a tender-hander. He wouldn’t work, for a boss, he would only do for the different garages which would employ him. His first job, I think, was in the Pierhead Hotel. This was when he was standing watching the suckers (and he said “suckers” from the platform) putting in the hours. Now you know you’ve got to do something to get money but...

CB: That was the debit side of Eddie Shaw, but there’s another side of him. He was an asset of the movement, I recognised that. I didn’t agree completely with the type of propaganda he was – he was comical, funny, entertaining, a carefree type of person. There was a place in the movement for him, he was an asset. Mollie gave you another side of him, but then you could live with that, it wasn’t doing the movement any harm. Except that he counted on certain anarchists who broke up and disappeared. We have to ask ourselves the question: why? what happened? we don’t learn from them, it’s worse. I’d suggest to young anarchists today to-day to consider these aspects of the problem. I’d say the responsibility to prevent these splits is to be vigilant about person- alities and see that no-one constructs power from the group; once that happens that’s the beginning of the end for the group. We have mentioned certain comrades, but you have to understand I still liked Shaw, in spite of all the things we’ve said about him. Leech I couldn’t like - some people excused him by saying he was naive - he was naive but he was dangerous. He contributed most to the split within the group by his activities.

During the war

Q: What may many people siting here today say that this was all happening in the

middle of the Second World War, which was meant to be mass united patriots united everyone against the common foe. Here we’re getting a picture that in Glasgow it was a bit different. Maybe we haven’t talked about the industrial front, as well, the opposition to the CP collaborating with the bosses.

MB: Yes, that certainly did happen.

CB: I understand that at that time when the CP in New York were discussing it, one spoke went to the toilet and when he came back the position of the group had changed!

JTC: One can tell you intimately about that was Harry McShane was due to go down to Brunswik St to speak on a Sunday morning. He got his orders to change completely and call the war a people’s war, a patriotic war, against fascism, and he didn’t know where he was - he had to read it. He only spoke about 20 minutes, so that he could report back to the party that he had held the meeting as directed. They did such a somersault. But then he (CB) was going into more theoretical stuff. The difficulty is that in the anarchist movement you have 3 anarchists together and they’ll give you 30 definitions of what anarchism is, because by its very nature it’s indefinable because it’s without authority. Therefore you have different kinds of anarchism. Talking of personalities and clashes within the movement: Bakunin and Marx destroyed the 1st Internationale, but between them and Proudhon was dead, his influence was so great that Marx moved the centre of the International movement from France to Ger- many, in which it became connected with Kautsky and took on Social Democratic character, which was later reflected in the ILP and the Labour Party.

That’s two different types of anarchism. Bakunin had a slightly different one...

Egoism and Mutual Aid

Q: Can we explore the situation in the 1940s with these three different movements: Guy Aldred’s USM, the Anarchist Group, Willie MacDougal’s group. Did people get on? There was mutual aid in relation to the anti-war movement, etc?

JTC: No, there wasn’t mutual aid.

CB: There was indeed, there was a great deal of mutual aid. JTC: Well, we both look from different aspects.

CR: As a matter of fact, in the Glasgow group, it was split too. This didn’t contrib- ute to the ultimate split, but the group was split over the question of mutual aid and the ego. Eddie Shaw was an egoist; he was a Max Stirner man, and it was a bible with him, he carried it in his pocket every day and crusaded with it. On the other hand there was Jimmy and the other people like Kropotkin man. It became so tedious that we had a debate on it. So Shaw and Jimmy Dick and Eddie Shaw were still split. In fact from my own point of view and others too, mutual aid and the ego weren’t antagonis- tic at all, they were complementary. First of all the ego has a herd of barbaros - why do they herd together? For the maximum of safety that’s mutual aid. It comes from the self, the ego, the individual. So there’s nothing which is incompatible in the ego and mutual aid in that respect, and that was pointed out to Jimmy Dick and Eddie Shaw and we heard no more about it.

JTC: George Woodcock in his study of anarchism refers to the Glasgow anar- chists as a small group who are still Stirnerites, believing in egoism. Now, I know that Eddie Dick lived that, he once had a job and he was a crude Stirnerite. He said to me “I believe in Number One! Get what you can out of it.” And he’d be a capitalist but a socialist. You see the one that’s going to give you the most, and hang on to that. That was his concept.

CR: He didn’t relate to it the group. Conscious Stirnerites, through self-interest, would identify their safety in numbers and that we can achieve more in numbers than as an individual...

JTC: True, that’s very accurate. They were making the fourth year apprentices do men’s work.

MB: And sending an apprentice along with an apprentice.

Q: What about the printing press question? You’ve talked about the problem with Free- dom in London. Guy Aldred had his own printing press, but it was the one time there was a very strong anarchist group in Glasgow - do you ever think of doing your own paper?

MB: We did.

CR: After the split we did produce a paper, “Direct Action” but it was mostly indis-
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In August 1987 the Rainbirds, who had been living in Australia for many years, returned to Glasgow for a visit. This provided a rare opportunity to bring together some surviving members of anarchist groups in Glasgow during the 1940s for a public discussion on the movement and the lesson which can be learned.

**JR:** The people whom make a living from propaganda. He could draw a crowd; he could hold a meeting, but you always got the lesson which can be learned.

**MB:** ... and the young apprentices were anarchists-communists - in simplistic terms, an ego is not a person bounded by his skin from head to toe, an ego is a ramification of all his associations... and his associations go back beyond his present time, beyond your 20 years away back into the past, so that we inherit much of our ego, much of our responsibility. Therefore a centre of our egoism should be a concept of the community. He tried to prove this was a predominating feature in biology from the beginning of time and one of the causes of evolution - not more red in tooth and claw as Darwin had said and the capitalists were using... That's two different clash you had. You can, when you join a movement, have at the back of your head "I'm but an integral part of a community. What do I have to do to be related to the advantage of a community. Mixed with other people I can develop what's inside myself, my own personality, that's my anarchy... You do not accept standardised authority for its own sake.

That's two different types of anarchism. Bakunin had a slightly different one...

**Q:** What may many people sitting here think was this all happening in the middle of the Second World War, which was meant to be mass united patriotism unless everyone against the common foe. Here we're getting a picture that in Glasgow it was a bit different. Maybe we haven't talked about the industrial front, as well, the opposition to the CP collaborating with the bosses.

**MB:** Yes, that certainly did happen.

**JR:** I understand that at that time when the CP in New York were discussing it, one doped went to the toilet and when he came back the position of the group had changed!

**MB:** That was the debit side of Eddie Shaw, but there's another side of him. He was an asset of the movement, I recognised that. I didn't agree completely with the type of propaganda he was, he was comical, funny, entertaining, a carefree type of person. There was a place in the movement for him, he was an asset. Mollie gave you another side of him, but then you could live with that, it wasn't doing the movement any harm. Except that you learn from certain anarchists who broke up and disappeared. We have to ask ourselves the question: why? what happened? We don't learn from them, it's worse. I'd suggest to young anarchists today to day to consider these aspects of the problem. I'd say the responsibility to prevent these splits is to be vigilant about person- alities and see that no-one conquers power from the group, once that happens it's the beginning of the end for the group. We have been a bit too innocent to consider these aspects, but you have to understand I still liked Shaw, in spite of all the we've said about him. Leech I couldn't - some people excused him by saying he was naive - he was naive but he was dangerous. He contributed most to the split within the group by his activities.

**Q:** What may many people sitting here think was this all happening in the different schools of anarchism. Guy used to say there were 7, but two which seem to.com on to the fore now and again were anarchism and egoism, that is Max Stirner's "Ego and His Own" in which an anarchy was an individual and a multiplicity of anarchists were a concourse of individuals, and these individuals had to some common denominator in running society, but these individuals were all persons in their own right. Now, the Kropotkine anarchists were anarchist-communists - in simplistic terms, an ego is not a person bounded by his skin from head to toe, an ego is a ramification of all his associations... and his associations go back beyond his present time, beyond your 20 years away back into the past, so that we inherit much of our ego, much of our responsibility. Therefore a centre of our egoism should be a concept of the community. He tried to prove this was a predominating feature in biology from the beginning of time and one of the causes of evolution - not more red in tooth and claw as Darwin had said and the capitalists were using... That's two different clash you had. You can, when you join a movement, have at the back of your head "I'm but an integral part of a community. What do I have to do to be related to the advantage of a community. Mixed with other people I can develop what's inside myself, my own personality, that's my anarchy... You do not accept standardised authority for its own sake.

That's two different types of anarchism. Bakunin had a slightly different one...

**Q:** Can we explore the situation in the 1940s with these three different movements: Guy Aldred's U.S.M., the Anarchist Group, Willie MacDougal's group. Did people get along?

**JR:** Well, it's hardly very intelligent then, is it?

**MB:** Mrs Thatcher in one of her last speeches you must listen to Mrs Thatcher, she's a genius of mediocrity) said that a person should do the best for themselves and get the best out of society and pass on to their son. She said that is the deepest morality. That's not the deepest morality.

**JR:** I believe literally in what you just said she said. Because I don't think she means what it means. That you should screw everyone else - that's hardly intelligent self-interest. I think the norm of intelligence doesn't lie very much and we're all products of our environment, which includes even our parentage and our upbringing.

**MB:** No, I'd say the fact of economism, trade unionism gathers strength in countries before anarchism does, people who re out for what they can get. That has been the bugbear of socialism.

**JR:** The people who make a living from trade-unionism are very much to the fore in persuading people to accept that outlook.

**MB:** Very few strikes are entirely idealistic, in fact all the people in the labourers got a rise: they're differentials.

**Q:** What about the strikes in 1944? the apprentices, the strikes in Lanarkshire, etc.

**MB:** What was the apprentices strike about in 1944?

**JR:** Wages.

**MB:** They were still getting 8/- a week and with the war there was inflation of wages, but the boys weren't getting it.

**Q:** And fighting for their rights.

**MB:** Plus the fact that boys who were not fully-fledged journeymen were doing men's work.

**JR:** That's true. They were making the fourth year apprentices do men's work.

**MB:** And sending an apprentice along with an apprentice.

**Q:** What about the printing press question? You've talked about the problem with Free Trade in London. Guy Aldred had his own printing press, but it was the time there was a very strong anarchist group in Glasgow - didn't you think of doing your own paper?

**MB:** We did.

**JR:** After the split we did produce a paper, "Direct Action" but it was mostly illus...
JTC: What was the name of the old fleapit cinema you (JR) used to fill every Sunday?

MB: Oh, the Grove.

JTC: When was it started?

MB: Originally in Bakunin House, merely a let. That was my first visit, I was 5 or 6 at the time. They moved away then, and it was too far for us to travel from the north of England. The College Sunday School was presumably ILP, have you heard of it? There was a bond between even pink revolutionaries and I heard later that you gathered together. We went to the College Socialist Sunday School. It started down at College, votes went against us. After it burst up - there's no socialist Sunday School.

JTC: What do you think caused the pull in support towards the Second World War?

MB: There's always been a continuation of splits. Anarchist movements have drifted away and disappeared, but there's always another crop up again. Right from the beginning of socialist anarchism, as Caldy described, there will always be an anarchist movement in Britain now. We've got to try to attract just what has happened to those movements which disappeared. They didn't have charisma or anything like that. They had級 children or even children could be thebasis of the whole thing, because you can appeal to children.

JTC: Were the socialist sunday schools connected to the Clarion club?

MB: No, I was taken at young age to the ICP, I knew about the rooms in Clarion Street, and also about Bakunin House, Tom Anderson ran a Socialist Sunday School. They met.

JTC: They met in Methven St in Govan but there may have been other places...

MB: Originally in Bakunin House, merely a let. That was my first visit, I was 5 or 6 at the time. They moved away then, and it was too far for us to travel from the north of England. The College Sunday School was presumably ILP, have you heard of it? There was a bond between even pink revolutionaries and I heard later that you gathered together. We went to the College Socialist Sunday School. It started down at College, votes went against us. After it burst up - there's no socialist Sunday School.

JTC: What do you think caused the pull in support towards the Second World War?

MB: There's always been a continuation of splits. Anarchist movements have drifted away and disappeared, but there's always another crop up again. Right from the beginning of socialist anarchism, as Caldy described, there will always be an anarchist movement in Britain now. We've got to try to attract just what has happened to those movements which disappeared. They didn't have charisma or anything like that. They had級 children or even children could be thebasis of the whole thing, because you can appeal to children.

JTC: A general deterioration of socialist standards which happened at the end of the war, because the war broke down inhibitions. Young fellows of 19 or 18 were smashing windows in Germany and picking things, they carried that back with them. They didn't break them down in a revolutionary sense, where you did things because you were an anarchist or because you were showing you were opposed to authority, you did it for sheer irresponsibility. All the framework of society had been shattered and looked and it's how it started and it helped destroy the Clarion.

MB: They didn't have a watch committee at first, but it was yours, so everyone looked after it. It was a workers' thing. Parents could let very young children go cycling on their, backs in the stronger weather for the weaker - there was none of this out-to-win. In the rooms it was the same, you just saw that the rooms were looked after.

JTC: They also had caravans pulled by horses from village to village...

MB: That's right and social evenings, which all helped to defray expenses. The Clarion Club covered a long period, and they had camping facilities out in Carbeth. They went in and started to run it too. By the time they were done, there was no group.

JTC: But also the deterioration in social standards helped. The Clarion had a place in Glasgow, not so much as a club, but in no time the billiard balls were pinched up into the tablecloth. - all sorts of things never happened before the war. Things were sabotaged, graffiti on the lavatory walls; that never happened before the war.

MB: Even during the war.

JTC: A general deterioration of socialist standards which happened at the end of the war, because the war broke down inhibitions. Young fellows of 19 or 18 were smashing windows in Germany and picking things, they carried that back with them. They didn't break them down in a revolutionary sense, where you did things because you were an anarchist or because you were showing you were opposed to authority, you did it for sheer irresponsibility. All the framework of society had been shattered and looked and it's how it started and it helped destroy the Clarion.

MB: They didn't have a watch committee at first, but it was yours, so everyone looked after it. It was a workers' thing. Parents could let very young children go cycling on their, backs in the stronger weather for the weaker - there was none of this out-to-win. In the rooms it was the same, you just saw that the rooms were looked after.

JTC: They also had caravans pulled by horses from village to village...

MB: They didn't have a watch committee at first, but it was yours, so everyone looked after it. It was a workers' thing. Parents could let very young children go cycling on their, backs in the stronger weather for the weaker - there was none of this out-to-win. In the rooms it was the same, you just saw that the rooms were looked after.

JTC: They had tea rooms, all these things...

MB: Snooker...

JTC: Willie MacDougall did his own "Solidarity" for another pub, wasn't it? But, of course, Shaw and Leech sabotaged that too. But with the benefit of hindsight, as Mollie said earlier on, the majority weren't anarchists, just camp-followers suffering from a leadership complex.

MB: We had one good wee Irish guy, wee Reilly, he had a huge meeting one Sunday in Princes St, and was doing quite well and got very excited and said "if I was a leader I'd lead you!" The majority did require a leader.

JTC: Was that the name of the old fleapit cinema you (JR) used to fill every Sunday in Partick?

JR: No, the only one was the Cosmo in Rose St.

MB: Oh, the Grove.

JTC: Did the women play a distinctive role in those days?

MB: No, women play a part, they're merely a part. I am against all this gay movements and black movements and women movements and I was supporting. If you're an anarchist, you're an anarchist and it doesn't matter what section of them you are. If you start splitting them into groups you're going to have less.

JR: Babs was minutes secretary...

BR: And also made tea!

Social Life

Q: What social events were organised besides the business meetings?

MB: Well, they had dances, we had groups playing... CB: Drinking sprees...

MB: Even in Guy's... JR: Babs was minutes secretary...

Social Life

Q: What social events were organised besides the business meetings?

MB: Well, they had dances, we had groups playing... CB: Drinking sprees...

MB: Even in Guy's... JR: Babs was minutes secretary...
Just like a ball and chain...

Introducing the electronic ball & chain...
A little black box attached to the ankle or wrist marks the start of new curfew laws in Britain. Home Secretary Michael Howard has announced trials of electronic tagging of 'offenders' which he believes will eventually become the principal form of supervision with up to 20,000 orders imposed a year. People will be confined to their homes for between two and 12 hours a day for up to six months. If they leave the area, they will be automatically recorded on a designated telephone box to signal a central monitoring centre.

Security have 'won' the £1.4 million contract for the trials in Manchester, Reading and Norfolk to begin in June of this year. They will be required to consider all violations of a curfew order and take appropriate action. Security experts told the Clarion that "being absent from home for more than 24 hours without a reasonable excuse" which would trigger immediate action and be supervised by Security. Other violations include "interference with the monitoring system caused by the actions of others such as pets, children or friends". That's not all. If one is trying to get people to stay at home, we should use the same tactics. People will be encouraged to stay at home through a combination of the power of the telephone, the door... etc.

The departure is now just part of the Government's plans for the electronic tagging of offenders but it could soon be violently widened to cover a range of police roles. Groups have already made representations to take over running what they term "police custody suites" (in reality: police cells) although they understand not to be interested in street patrols.

There is no accountable regulation of private security industry which now has more personnel (167,000) operating in the UK than police officers (127,328) and which firms already possess dire reputations.

Is this the end of the police as we know it? A review by "Police functions which could be taken over by private security companies in is the pipe-line. Are some police functions going to be privatised? Will the polis be up for competitive tendering in the near future?

One thing is sure, rent-a-cops are still cops.

NATIONAL DNA DATABASE (FORCED MOUTH SWABS)(Section 59,CJA); ARBITRARY STOP & SEARCH (“SUS” LAWS) (Section 60,CJA); CHILDREN’S PRISONS (Part 1, CJA); BUILDING PERSON GRIPS (Section 106, CJA); BLANKET SPY CAMERAS (incl. Section 163, CJA); MORE FORCED MEDICATION FOR MEN; MORE FORCED MEDICATION FOR WOMEN; MORE TRUTHS (Supervised Discharge Orders, Mental Health Act amendment); ABOLITION OF RIGHT TO SILENCE (Section 34, CJA)...

McQuotes (continued)

"On any given day, McDonald’s serves less than half of one per cent of the world’s population. That’s not enough. We’re like Oliver Twist, we want more." - Michael Quinlan, Chief Executive of McDonald’s quoted in “The Independent” (27/4/94).

"One of our tasks is to reach families through children.” - John Hawkins, McDonald’s UK Chief Marketing Officer.

"Children are often the key decision-makers concerning where a family goes to eat.” - Offering toys is "one of the best things... to make them loyal supporters.” - British Airways "an important way to generate added sales and profits". - Ronald loves McDonald’s and McDonald’s food. And so do children, because they love Ronald, a member, children exert a phenomenal influence when it comes to restaurant selection. This means that you should do everything you can to appeal to children’s love of "weird and wonderful". - Extreme from the corporation’s official and confidential "Operations Manual".

"I brainwash youngsters doing wrong... I want to say sorry to children everywhere for selling out to concerns who make millions by murdering animals.” - Geoffry Uliano, the main Ronald McDonald actor in the 1980’s who quit and publicly apologised.

The Truth behind the mask!

Transcribed in November 1993 from a not-always-casual tape cassette.
Audio copies can be obtained by contacting Scottish Anarchist. Part of this review is contained in issue 1 of Scottish Anarchist.
McDonalds, McProfits, McLibel

Conceived 40 years ago, trash food giant McDonalds has achieved a notoriety previously reserved for international tobacco, oil, mining, pharmaceutical and weapons manufacturers.

As annual turnover exceeds $28 million, the corporation ruthlessly maximises profits despite widespread concern about the effects of the company's advertising and the impact of its practices on the environment, on millions of farmed animals, on human health, on the Third World and on the burger chain's own staff.

With this corporate culture it will come as no surprise that Mrs Thatcher chose to open McDonald's British Headquarters. Not that her former election agent is on charge of the Communications Department and that her former press secretary, Sir Bernard Ingham, is a non-executive Director.

McDonald's have claimed that the widespread criticism of their operations contained in a leaflet produced by London Greenpeace has defamed them. So they launched a libel action against two people involved in this group, Dave Morris and Helen Steel.

Just before the start of the case, McDonald's issued a leaflet calling their critics liars. Helen and Dave took out a counter claim for libel against McDonald's and this will run concurrently with McDonald's libel action.

Helen and Dave have denied a jury trial, at McDonald's request who claimed that the issues were "too complex" for the public. They also have no right to Legal Aid and so are forced to conduct their own defense against the corporation's team of expert libel lawyers.

McQuotes

The following quotes, most from the McLibel trial transcripts, indicate the extent of the cynical deception practised at McDonalds.

"I can see [the dumping of waste] to be an environmental benefit, otherwise you will end up with lots of vast, empty gravel pits all over the country" - Edward Oakley, Chief Purchasing Officer and Senior Vice President of McDonalds UK and Ireland.

"Foods that contain nutrients", Edward Oakley when asked what "nutritious" meant in the "nutrition guides" he is responsible for and which are currently available in McDonald stores.

"Provides nutrients and can be part of a healthy balanced diet" Mr David Green, the corporation's Senior Vice President of Marketing when asked the same question. He admitted this could also apply to "a packet of sweets".

"McDonald's line that their food can be eaten as part of a balanced diet is meaningless. You can eat a roll of sellotape as part of a balanced diet." Dr. Tim Lobstein, co-director of the Food Commission.

"McDonald's should attempt to deflect the basic negative thrust of our criticisms... How do we do this? By talking 'moderation and balance'. We can't really address or defend nutrition. We can't sell nutrition and people don't come to McDonalds for nutrition." Internal Company Memo, March 1986.

"A diet high in fat, sugar, animal products, salt, and low in fibre, vitamins, and minerals, is linked with cancer of the breast and bowel and heart disease." McLibel defendants quoting the London Greenpeace Fact Sheet on McDonald's.

"It is being directed to the public than I would say it is a very reasonable statement." Dr. Sydney Arnott, McDonalds Expert witness on cancer.

"When you see the Golden Arches, you're probably on the road to the Pearly Gates." Dr. William Castelli, director of a major work on heart disease.

"It is our objective to dominate the communications area... because we are competing for a share of the customers minds." Alistair Fairgrieve, McDonald's UK Marketing Services Manager.

McQuotes continued on page 31