




THESE COVER-UPS

WILL KEEP OUR HEADS TOGETHER



HERE
AND
NOW



One of the first and most direct graffiti in Notting Hill. It was sprayed alongside the Metropolitan tube line, underneath the Westway.

Editorial

Without conscious planning, a thread has come to run through these pages, a tenacious link forged from our perception of these times. When we started *Here and Now* we were concerned to emerge from behind the barricades of Left tradition and gaze unblinkingly at the wreckage beyond.

What we see is a wasteland being sold to us as paradise. What we hear is the misappropriation of the vocabulary of liberation in the service of the economic. Orwell and others identified the withering of language at the heart of totalitarianism. The defenders of "freedom" and "choice" have launched a similar assault on meaning. We live in a time when the man most adept at saying nothing is christened "The Great Communicator"; when the extension of choice is equated with the elimination of variation; when bosses criminalise the withdrawal of labour and call this "the right to work"; when an employer bullies seamen into scabbing by the threat of mass dismissal, then calls this scabbing a "free vote".

The battle for human society is the battle for truthsaying. It is the resistance to the subsumption of all value to the economic.

It is the determined opposition to the lie that freedom reduces to the choice between Pepsi and Coke.



SADO-PORNO SOAP

Do you recall all those enraged letters to Radio Times protesting at the amount of repeats on T.V.? Well - in West Germany at least - that type of correspondent is now settling down daily to Cable T.V. twenty or so channels which revolve on precisely that principle: repeats.

There are two channels devoted to repeating the best of the West German equivalent of BBC 1 and ITV (ARD and ZDF respectively). There is a joint channel named revealingly 'Gestern'

[= yesterday) which provides you with the chance to view today what you might well have taken pains to avoid the previous day.

The most popular cable channel in West Germany, SAT 1, transmits virtually nothing other than repeats of Charlie's Angels, Star Trek, Waltons, Bonanza, High Chapparral etc. etc., sometimes twice a day, five times a week. Incredible Hulk was recently run every day from Episode 1 to Episode 36; the day after Episode 36 came to an end Episode 1 started again.

Two more examples of this pretext pluralism. Before Super Channel took over the Music Box frequency both Music Box (GB) and Musik Box (FRG) - spot the difference! - churned out exactly the same Top Twenty biased video clips all day long in a, for the discerning viewer, *slightly different order*. RTL (= TV Luxemburg) initially transmitted its sports programmes at exactly the same time as the ARD and ZDF, even covering the same events. Not that the great viewing public complained; it was the advertisers, who are already calling for set ad times simultaneously on all channels to prevent the viewers zapping away.

Across the board the emphasis is placed - with the honest, open cynicism of the New Right - on Happy News, Positive Weather Reports, untaxing quiz shows and non-political talk shows. Non-political means rightwing and celebrity obsesses. If you zap your way through the twenty channels at around 11 p.m. you will be confronted three quarters of the time by famous establishment male talking heads. An open access channel exists but nobody seems to bother about it much. Mind you, if some oppositional group did manage to broadcast anything remotely critical from it there'd be uproar.

Cable T.V. in West Germany is aimed squarely and conceptually at the silent non-disenfranchised majority. This is not just a matter of programming content it is also more significantly one of transmission time. Most of the channels, including the State ones, begin at about 4 p.m., in other words approximately at that time when the working masses in West Germany get back home. Non-

integrated outsiders such as the forcibly unemployed, the voluntarily unemployed, shiftworkers, night owls etc. are not just ignored - they are not even conceived of as having wishes; which is one of the reasons why the financing powers-that-be are now demanding more soft porn and soft violence, obviously prerogatives of your average consumer at large.

This standardisation of choice will ultimately mean a twenty to forty fold "choice" between various nationalities of soap. George Orwell got the technology right for 1984 but not the content; somewhere someday is going to make a lot of money out of a porno-sado soap serial.

Such pretext pluralism is a sign of the times. We are conned into buying CD record players so that, under the pretence of better hi-fi quality, we can restock our record collections with records we have already got. We have our homes cabled so that we can watch programmes we have already seen. Contribute your own examples.


BUT IS THAT THE REAL POINT?

Cabling is an inordinately expensive technology which could not be implemented without incredible subsidies from the taxpayer state, just like atomic-powered electricity. And, although it is now considered too heavy a burden for the taxpayer to fund a welfare state, it is only normal and reasonable that he/she pays for atomic electricity and Cable T.V. Twice. Now, for the installation of copper cables - though it is known to be an already outdated technology - and again in the not too distant future when these will be replaced by glass fibre. But then the technology required to install Cable T.V. is actually a two-way process, which means that clerical labour can be decentralised and deunionised to home point unit production.

Just a by-product of the drive to give us more choice, you understand.

Mephistophole

Evrata: P.23 of Here & Now 5. "Off The Rails" is available from B.M. Blob, London, WC1N 3XX.



LIBERATION SEXOLOGY

The movements of the sixties and seventies suggested an idea of a liberation which would, by throwing-off inhibitions, lead to a "natural" intimacy in human affect. From the end of repression at home to the end of repression in society?

But nowadays - Rediscovery of perversity disavowal of the power implicit in "liberated" behaviour. And moral panic about the situation of the young in the family. As suggested in articles in previous issues of *Here & Now* contemporary social concern tends to identify with the *victim* position: with the laboratory animal, with the culled seal, with the infant victim of child abuse. The condition of voicelessness is shared; subjecthood is at best deferred to a better future.

In medieval times, the Pope encouraged crusades as a diversion from concern with the state of Western society; today, media stars crusade on child abuse. The major difference is that this *debate* has no opposition - a few squalid individuals hardly substitute for Saladin.

But the victims are easily translated into feel-good Capital, whether in the resource bargaining of Council Social Work Departments or the T.V. Pledge Campaign. After a Thirty Years' War to eradicate all dangers of collective social otherness, by herding a former peasant and worker alike into the ghettos of their own castles, a new question looms: Once the fantasy goods have been bought what happens behind the curtains? The response is a *Childwatch*, a policing of affect.

For all their tauts, Seventies' pundits expected an anti-hierarchical neutralisation of sexualised power through intimacy. Contemporary caring professionals see sexuality in every gesture. Apparently the unconscious and phantasy were only patriarchal myth; the body's true proportions are revealed only in the positive discrimination of the totemic doll; and every touch threatens an overwhelming power. Only a child's discourse will eventually reveal and confirm this truth. And only a specialist can bring about this epiphany. To every power a counter-power, and the reversals happen quickly here. The caring professional, his or her intuition confirmed by some sign, arrogates a position of irrefutable Truth; dispute is useful only in that it may yield more material confirming this truth.

Such a strong power, once established and backed up by legal authority, has to conjure up a counter-power. An occult international of child abusers may yet appear. For the time being, dubious statistic piles onto dubious statistics; like the Kentucky Fried Ratbone, it always happened to someone else.

There is an implicit class perspective behind it all. Child sex abuse is considered a problem of the working class, although its opponents are delighted to think they have found it "even" in professional families (such as in Hereford recently). The industrial working class, corralled into council or volume-builder estates, bought the commodities they were offered. To carer and New Right columnist alike, this alone suggests gullibility, a weakness of will which implies unfitness to reproduce a healthy society. On the one side, the interventionism of the carers; on the other, the disdain of the New Right, who would write-off whole estates, towns and cities of people. For both, commodity society is an implicit evil; for both, it appears to have been freely chosen by those whose freedom was always curtailed; for neither does this suggest the need for a subjecthood beyond commodity society.

Alex Richards

RESISTANCE IN SCOTLAND

Anti Poll Tax activists in Scotland are entering a decisive period of mobilising against Registration as a preliminary skirmish prior to the battle for a mass refusal to pay in April 1989. They face the difficulty of being 'first', without a recent widespread history of active opposition.

Unlike the Anti-Census campaign in West Germany, they do not have a constituency of concentrated defiance in the squatter, communal living areas in Frankfurt, Hamburg, West Berlin etc., which dovetailed with the defence mechanism of the large migrant population anxious to avoid forced return to Turkey and so on. They are a minority, predominately young or community activists, faced with an apparently 'immovable object', comprising the population reared on Welfarist passivity and unchallenged Concensus Politics/Labour allegiance.

The strategy of the Tory Party depends on exploiting the discomfort of Labour Councils squeezed between a vocal minority refusing to pay and the 'silent majority' incensed at the level of the Charge. If the councils protect services then the charge is higher, if they reduce the charge they will have to privatise services and cut jobs. The problem for



Saying no to the Poll Tax 1381

Government & Councils alike begin if the minority is large enough & determined to go through with prosecutions & legal penalties.

An opinion Poll [*Scotsman*, 12th March] showed 75% against the Community Charge (Poll Tax) but more significantly 42% for non-payment & non-compliance with the enforcement of the regressive and anachronistic measure. The 50 Labour M.P.'s from an apparent position of strength, are trying to head off potential support for activist campaigns gathering momentum in Edinburgh and pockets elsewhere. They are prepared to endorse the delaying tactic of returning Registration forms with points of clarification requested but thereafter face a challenge from firebrand *Dennis Canavan* and other figures seeking to establish a Scottish Assembly by defeating the implementation of the tax. This does not suit the engrained habits of H.M. Loyal Opposition and opens the door to a 'popular sovereignty' being juxtaposed to remote Parliamentary representation.

The May District Elections resulted in only a slight slippage of Labour support, and heralded a revival in the fortunes of the S.N.P. who had cast the vote as a mandate for a Non-Payment campaign.

The unaccountable actions of zealous Registration Officers like Woods in Strathclyde has more or less rendered delaying tactics unworkable. The choice has narrowed down to non-payment or compliance. The extension of powers to arrest wages and directly recover benefit from claimants refusing to pay highlights the 'iron fist' of Government policy towards the less privileged. It is the politicisation of opposition which will assume greater pre-eminence since voluntarism and hyper-activity can become a short-term recipe for demoralisation once the Tax is imposed on an unwilling minority.

Jim MacFarlane

How to form groups: Info from p/h CR, 11 Forth St., Edinburgh EH1. (Encl. SAE).

AT BREAKDOWN POINT

I'm a woman who has worked for 10 years in one of the offices in dispute°

A strike has taken place by low-paid civil servants over the last 14 weeks across North London Dept. of Employment offices. It has involved Job Centre and D.H.S.S. staff who came out in solidarity when they were asked to do UBO work. They were suspended when they refused. It ended on March 31st in defeat.

Apart from one short news slot on London TV News, it has been virtually blanked in the newspapers, national as well as London local papers. Indeed it seems *La Repubblica*, the Italian daily, mentioned the dispute more than the English based newspapers. This has led many of us strikers to conclude that perhaps there might be an orchestrated conspiracy of silence as it was rumoured that Alan Robertson, the new principal manager for the DE's had Thatcher's full backing.

Certainly management acted in an unusually hard but predictably clever fashion and quickly dampened down and gave into disputes elsewhere in the civil service. Basically, management wanted some issue to get rid of once and for all, the militant disruption which has taken place over the last few years in the North London offices.

A few days after the strike started, a mole at Head Office let us know that one of the top managers had walked out of a meeting saying "This is the end of the CPSA[civil servants union]: It's finished". It seems that the Government wanted to inflict a defeat in the heart of North London's militant offices in preparation for a long attack on (civil servants work conditions). In order perhaps to prepare the stage for the horrendous April social security changes, merit wages and flexibility, YTS employment, the privatisation of the Employment Service, the possible abolition of the dole and/or welfare paid through a cash card unit you can't argue with! No civil servants. No problem. No claimants. No problem.

Since the amalgamation of Job Centres and U.B.O.'s under the new title of Employment Service, staff at some north London U.B.O.'s would be compulsory re-deployed to Job Centres without then filling the subsequent U.B.O. vacancies. Previously transfers had been conducted on a voluntary basis with the union. Camden 'A' was selected as the pilot office. On December 21st (just before Xmas and fitting in well with increasing managerial sadism) casuals at Job Centres were sacked and those - on a last-in, first-out basis - at Camden 'A' U.B.O. were compulsorily transferred to the Job Centre. One girl casual, in tears, came to say goodbye to her friends in the U.B.O.

There was an immediate angry response and the strike started. On January 11th, after a ballot, Marylebone 'A' and 'B' and Westminster U.B.O. walked out in support of their Camden colleagues. From then on the dispute accelerated to effect 30 to 35 U.B.O.'s, Job Centres and D.H.S.S. offices in north London.

Initially, the strike was a spontaneous angry response to managerial dictat. Strikers visited other offices to win support. Very quickly, however, the strike got taken over by Militant and S.W.P. Trotskyists who tried to use the strikers as cannon fodder for their own party political ends. Some non-party strikers didn't like the fact that S.W.P. members were usually the ones to visit offices because they knew colleagues elsewhere would be suspicious of their motives.

As more offices joined in, mass meetings were held every Friday in Camden's claimants union office who were expecting any day to be evicted by the Labour Party controlled Camden Council. In no time a self-elected strike committee, comprised mainly of S.W.P. members, came into existence. After that the meetings were totally monopolized by the S.W.P. who used the occasion to have their own private (but much publicised) battle with Militant (who, in their turn had a lot of influence on the official, N.E.C. appointed, disputes committee). Macreadie, deputy General Secretary of the C.P.S.A. and Militant member, was present on the platform at all these mass meetings. Basically, Militant didn't want the dispute escalated while the S.W.P. wanted an all-out London strike.

There was, in fact, a token one day all-out London strike on February 18th.

Brixton U.B.O. wanted to come out in support but was denied strike pay by the N.E.C. Macreadie didn't really want to see the strike extended to south London. In fact, Brixton did come out for a while and some staff there stayed out to the end.

After the mass meetings, Macreadie would report back to the N.E.C. about the strikers decisions. Finally, after weeks of procrastination, a ballot was prepared for an all-out London strike but with the rider that Macreadie and the N.E.C. had decided there should be no strike pay from the coffers of the C.P.S.A. which is one of the richest unions in the U.K. It was a calculated shoot-yourself-in-the-foot policy, which, (as probably intended) gave hard-nosed management a good laugh. As it was, after a low turn-out with only 60% of C.P.S.A. members voting, and with some offices not having ballots, the voting was reasonably close. 41% for, 59% against. Nobody really expected any other result. And, like the

miners before us, we've returned to work without an agreement which has filled more than a few of us with the horrors.

The mass meetings became jargon-slanging matches with many determined and well-meaning strikers not realising what was going on. Generally the same, long-winded boring speakers would have their say every week. They weren't talking to the meeting but trying to prove themselves to their party. A lot of strikers felt too intimidated by this speechifying party atmosphere to ask questions. Moreover, all speakers had to submit their questions to the chair and many questions were passed over with the excuse of insufficient time. One excellent proposal suggesting that there should be a mass picket targeting on a particular office decided secretly the night before (a tactic which would have terrified many scabs and possibly gained much needed publicity) wasn't even considered because it was a non-party proposal. Tactics, in fact, didn't emanate directly from the mass meeting but had been decided on in advance in closed party sessions. In fact, the different Trotskyists didn't want direct action and relaxed, open communication but behaved as pressure groups on lumbering, union bureaucratic procedure. Because all real discussion was suppressed, the meetings finally degenerated into mad debates on any unreal, fashionable issue. One of the last meetings spent half the time drooling on about whether members could smoke or not!

Non-Militant, non-S.W.P. strikers got rapidly pissed-off and didn't turn up for further meetings. Then strikers started to get suspicious about what was being discussed between the strike committee and management. Management let it be known to the scabs that all the strike committee wanted to talk about was S.B.S. (Staff Basing Scheme) figures which they wanted to stay over the 10% level. It wasn't what Camden 'A' had walked-out over in the first instance. Issues were being slung-in by the self elected strike committee which strikers knew nothing about and weren't informed about. This resulted in more scabbing, plus the fact that the strike seemed to be going nowhere.

Towards the end of the strike, a union rank 'n' file group called "Workhouse" produced leaflets criticising the running of the strike (a little too late). They had valid points (e.g. condemning the party political games/emphasizing the need to take control over the strike fund etc.) but after so much manipulation of strikers one was left with the feeling, maybe they too had an axe to grind!

In the Militant offices in north London because management over the years has been pushed back a lot, there's often quite a merry-prankster, bawdy, joking atmosphere which can make it a pleasure to be with your work mates. It's been said of one of these U.B.O.'s that strike there are an unholy alliance of the hard left and the hard drinkers. Some of this atmosphere got carried over into the strike. Although the dispute was serious business, the way it was conducted, meant the strike became farcical. Joking was one of the outcomes. In fact in no time at all, the jokers occupied the

REPORTS

front rows at the meetings purely to wind-up the platform and to bring in a bit of comic relief. When arguing over dates for an all-out London strike (the 14th or 28th of March) one hard drinking striker loudly said "April the 1st would be more appropriate". Another loudly cursed "Is Macreadie aenemic?" Another proclaimed after a meeting's conclusion, "that I haven't had such fun since my leg fell off". This repartee got the Trotskyists furious. Other comments were more serious. One person asked if Macreadie and company would contribute 50% of their wages towards the hardship fund. The platform remained silent.

A lot of U.B.O./D.H.S.S. staff earn a lot less than a sizeable proportion of the claimants moonlighting in the black economy (and good luck to them!) Throughout the 80's because we've been constantly standing up against further incursions by the Tory Government, plus a growing recognition of just how badly paid we are, there's been a growing sympathy from many claimants.

In one of our local west London pubs where U.B.O. staff were having a Xmas drink, a claimant gave a bottle of champagne with a nod and a wink to a desk clerk. Delighted cheers all round!

It's unfortunate but during the strike it was the poor claimants who were the real ones to suffer. Outside one office, pickets on a stint were confronted, on a bitterly cold winter's day, by a mam and dad with two kids who had no socks on their, blue with cold, tiny feet. These parents were enquiring about emergency payments. The pickets were devastated and suggested a whip-round to help them. In other circumstances this has happened before in the past.

Of all people though, the Fraud Squad was running emergency offices for pay-outs. One such was Paddington Green church hall. In fact there were heavy scenes and police were constantly called in. Obviously the Fraud Squad were scabs and ready to fill-in for striking staff but also they did this "service" with an eye to their future career. Obviously they were trying to nail claimants who were claiming and working. Job Club and Restart didn't strike (although in the one day strike against Y.T.S. in late '87 some Restart staff actually did strike).

Although receiving half take-home pay from the C.P.S.A., strikers supplemented their hand-outs by finding jobs (ironically considering our function) in the black economy. When doing these jobs they were afraid to say they were striking U.B.O./Job Centre staff because they were often working alongside people who were signing on. Strikers were worried in case some claimant recognised them and thought they were undercover Fraud Squad agents!

Once it became apparent we were being manipulated by the S.W.P. and others, a lot of strikers virtually forgot about the strike - even although they'd never cross picket lines. They silently got their heads down waitressing, baking croutons in a bakery, pairing up shoes in a shoe factory, handing out rush-hour free mags etc. Sadly quite a few of the best people

who could have made an imaginative contribution to the strike, left the Civil Service during the course of the dispute. The danger is that this could make the scabs cockier.

We returned to work on the 31st of March defeated but with our heads held high, to be told "welcome back" by the management. Maybe this was an individual response but it makes one suspicious. A lot of the scabs looked shame-faced and so they should, the amount of overtime they had been clocking up meant they had been doing very well by stabbing their striking colleagues in the back.

Management seem to be wary of crowing too much because of the imminent restructuring of the Civil Service. It's going to mean many fights in the offing.



BLOWING HOT & COLD

The disputes themselves have been almost totally controlled by the union apparatus, after the initial surprise of the Manchester night nurses and the Leeds Blood Transfusion staff. Health union officials seem to develop a peculiar knack of blowing hot and cold at the same time. Thus public exhortations on the St. James' picket line for greater militancy are contradicted by private manoeuvrings to secure a refusal to take part in the next day of action.

What seems to have happened is that after action taken by all hospitals in Leeds (except Cookridge Regional Cancer, I think) in February which was fully balloted according to Employment Act specifications, certain union officials were contacted by certain Labour Party officials. Oddly enough the result of these 'talks' was that the ostensibly militant union *N.U.P.E.* (my union) was forced to come across as moderate and refused to support the 14th March protest, called by the ostensibly moderate union *C.O.H.S.E.* These high table chit chats had absurd upshots. In the hospital where I work we have always held our mass meeting together in times of dispute. The same goes for our balloting - we all vote in the same ballot regardless of which union we belong to, and the counting is done by a selection of union officials and management. This practice legitimised strikes in '82 and it legitimised the February protest. However, suddenly our *N.U.P.E.* steward is told that the ballot which we held for the 14th

March pro test (result suppressed, although everyone knows there was a majority for strike action) is invalid, by her own *N.U.P.E.* officials. On asking why she is informed that mixing up the unions plus the fact that it wasn't a branch ballot but only a section ballot (the organisation of hospital unions basically conform to the spheres of influence of union officials - *N.U.P.E.* members are in fact all members of St. James Hospital Branch, for no logical reason other than the fact that St. James *N.U.P.E.* is powerful and wants to remain that way) means that the ballot was illegal, and furthermore the Personnel Officer of the Hospital was informed who hauled up the stewards before him and made them apologise with the sort of words: 'I'll let it rest this time, but if there's a repeat.....'

Needless to say this crazy behaviour upset many people who were all for leaving *N.U.P.E.* and joining *C.O.H.S.E.* only for them to hear that the *C.O.H.S.E.* branch secretary at the hospital [*C.O.H.S.E.* are a branch there) was being accused by his colleagues in *C.O.H.S.E.* of trying to set up a 'break-away' union at the Hospital by having mass meetings and ballots jointly. Out of this chaos came nothing. People were advised not to strike and to go on the demo in their own time. Calls for further meetings have so far met with silence and prevarication, a phenomenon which I have since learned is common to other hospitals.

The Campaign for Imaginative Action Leaflet got some people thinking. We distributed it around Leeds hospitals and on a health workers demonstration (1,000 copies printed, about 800 distributed). About 8 people turned up to the public meeting, which although it meant an interesting discussion, was not what I had hoped for. It went down quite well where I work and infuriated some S.W.P. members who maintained that only pressure for a T.U.C.-led General Strike could make a breakthrough possible. They obviously don't remember the last fiasco of a T.U.C. called General Strike a few years ago. Breaking out of the discourse of unionism remains our only hope. Dispensing with the automatism of left-wing struggle with its phantom armies of proletarian footsoldiers is the first step towards a kind of citizens movement which transcends the corporatist aims of pressure group politics. We are now tentatively involved with Hospital Alert in Leeds, a broad based movement concerned with N.H.S. funding. Of course this is no panacea to the absence of a confident combativity, but it does pose the possibility of a future critique of current health care, if present and potential patients are involved. We intend to keep meeting in the pub on some basis, not least to maintain some sort of permanent space for public debate to occur. Getting things off the ground at my work is proving more difficult. People want a meeting to discuss tactics, but no one will call one. The nurses pay rise may complicate things further, but few people at the Hospital are convinced that the struggle was about pay in the first place. I'll let you know what happens.

A Hospital Worker from Leeds



Notes on EASTERN EUROPE

"How could I, a Pole, believe in theories? That would be grotesque. Against the Polish sky, against the sky of a paling, waning Europe, one can see why so much paper coming from the West falls to the ground, into the mud, onto the sand, so that little boys grazing their cows can make the usual use of it."

Witold Gombrowicz, afterword to Ferdynand

□□□□

Vaclev Havel, the Czech writer, has been reading his Hayek too.

"When there is no natural plurality of economic initiatives, the interplay of competing producers and their competing entrepreneurial ideas disappears, and along with it the interplay of supply and demand, the labour and commodity markets, voluntary labour relations disappear too. Gone as well are the stimuli to creativity and its attendant risks, the drama of economic success and failure."

Stories and Totalitarianism - Revolver Review, April 1987. English translation in Index on Censorship, March 1988).

THERE IS A tendency to identify two 'camps within the tradition on Eastern European opposition to tyranny. The first is absolutist, moralistic and romantic and might have included figures such as Bakunin, Tolstoy and Solzhenitsyn in its ranks. The second is pragmatic and sceptical - one representative might have been Alexander Herzen - and the quotation at the head of this article captures its spirit precisely.

As a guide to understanding real situations this kind of academic party-game isn't very useful. Divergent strains of resistance split and recombine and sometimes come to rest within the person of the same individual. What are we to make of the present state of the Polish opposition, for example?

Solidarity still gets a fair amount of attention in the Western press, but almost everyone would admit its decline in influence and support. Young workers can't be bothered to join any more. A poll by Stefan Nowak, quoted in the New York Review of Books (Feb 18, 1988) revealed the following tendencies in Polish Society: -

25% sympathetic to Jaruzelski regime.

25% favour opposition.

50% indifferent between the two.

This would seem to be a major decline for an organisation which once claimed to speak for the soul of the nation.

The old guard of Solidarity, Walesa and the rest, were, within the terms of our previous categorisation, pragmatists, their defeated strategy being to conjure areas of social autonomy out of the hands of the monolithic State. From the experience of underground Solidarity a harder tendency, known as Fighting Solidarity, has been forged. Relatively small it rejects all negotiations and prepares for all-out confrontation. Its present condition is unclear. Its leader, Kornel Morawiecki, underground since 1981, was arrested last year and others may have followed.

Subject to a great deal of intimidation and arrest though it has been, the activities of the draft-resisting group Peace and Freedom appear to have led to the introduction of an alternative to compulsory military service in Poland. More or less outside the traditional arenas of political contestation, Peace and Freedom is in effect an embryonic Green movement its activities having embraced ecological as well as pacifist causes. On 6th September last year the Police used tear gas to disperse 3,000 demonstrators in Miedzyrzecz who were protesting against plans to dump nuclear waste. On 16th October police detained 4 Peace and Freedom activists during a demonstration against the construction of the Zarnowicz nuclear plant.

And then there's another tendency, one to be found in oppositional circles throughout Eastern Europe; the believers in 'economic pluralism', the readers of Hayek and Friedman. The interest in this sort of thing is the most depressing thing about the Eastern opposition for the Western anti-capitalist, especially when it embraces a second rate opportunist and self-publicist like Roger Scruton.

This is not an easy passage to make sense of. What, for example, are 'voluntary labour relations'?

The crux of Havel's argument is this. For human individuality to flourish there must be plurality of choice in all aspects of social life. Logically therefore there must be 'economic pluralism' i.e. a market economy.

"...without a plurality of economic initiatives...without competition, without a market place and its institutional guarantees, an economy will stagnate and decline."

What can we say? Only that in our experience market economies do not lead to meaningful choice, indeed tend always to the elimination of plurality. The paradox of 'choice' in a consumer society is that it is achieved via the elimination of every little local variation in produce, culture and tradition. Apparent increases in choice always mask the destruction of many more possible choices than are ever offered. Market economies are not about risk but the elimination of risk, not about competition but the crushing of competition, not about the proliferation of entrepreneurs but their agglomeration into massive corporations, individually richer than many nation states. Ultimately market economies are about the standardisation of choice and the standardisation of desire.

An example. The spread of the supermarket has brought with it an apparent increase in the variety of goods available to us. Vegetable counters are stocked with green and red peppers, aubergines, courgettes, mangos, kiwi fruit, etc., items mostly unknown to the ordinary person only twenty-five years ago.

At the same time individual differences at the local level are being eliminated. One would be forgiven for believing that carrots are always cylindrical in shape, less than six inches long and fairly tasteless. The massive variety of size, shape, texture, and flavour - the hundreds of carrot varieties in fact - are increasingly foreign to us, because the supermarket requires a standardised product. There are hundreds of varieties of apple, but the supermarkets carry at most half a dozen, most of which are imported (an ecologically crazy thing to do). The perfect supermarket apple is the bland French Golden Delicious - uniform size and shape, no special character, long shelf life. We are invited to 'choose' it.

The ECLIPSE and RE-EMERGENCE of the ECONOMIC MOVEMENT

THIS YEAR, MEDIA commentators are celebrating '1968', the sepia-tinted central event of their youth. Others who never clambered out of the Left vanity press reflect these celebrations with rancour. Did 1968 lead to Thatcherism? Scan the biographies of the New Right for evidence... But such suspicions touch only the student movement, implicating a set of prominent radicals whose careers were established that year. The proposition collapses if '1968' is taken to mean the social movements in the ten years from 1965; struggles in factory, housing scheme and shopping centre (in forms varying from country to country, area to area) – in sum, a contestation of *authority* in any form.

Faced with the emergent 'consumer society' of the fifties and sixties, modernisers of socialism could highlight the status and struggles of the mass worker in the factories turning out cars, etc., and the dismal new towns built to house them. The contestation movement fed from the alienation and socialisation of such workers.

Whatever vitality did exist in society at the time appeared to be driven by the criticisms which such movements made of the existing state of things. Legitimised by this, the Left functioned as an energiser in the institutions, taking areas out of contestation (the process described as '*de-commodification*' in the article on '*New Social Movements in Here & Now* 5) and often eliciting participation where none was volunteered. Whether as the 'artificial negativity' of which Piccone wrote, or as Baudrillard's political class trying to elicit response from the a-social black hole, the Left performed a vital role in society's functioning.

A path to the future was clear: even an economist could write that '*exertion of active control in place of passive submission corresponds directly with the elevation of the political will over the blind interplay of economic forces.*' (Helinbroner, '*Business Civilisation in Decline*', p.62). Acquisitiveness being "*a dubious source of social morale*", it seemed "*plausible that the economic institutions of socialism may prove superior to those of planned capitalism*" (p47).

This could hardly have been written subsequent to 1976. In the years since, the situation has seemed to have changed almost completely. Contestation, in the forms and at the levels previously seen, decreases under the onslaught of '*the crisis*' and its panacea: *Enterprise Culture*. The areas of '*de-commodification*' have come into crisis: despite the Left's self-recognition as providing rationality (matching Heilbroner's position), much of what was provided was the arbitrary. The result is the onslaught of re-commodification.

The downturn in such contestation necessitates re-appraisal, not merely of contemporary developments in the organisation of life (in work, leisure and domestic arrangements), but also in the whole area of radical politics. The crisis generates an ever-bigger subclass, on which many radicals pin their hopes for the future. Some (such as Guattari and Negri) insist on a continuing pressure, effortlessly blending the Italian movements, Solidarnosc, the Iranian Revolution and South Africa. But this hardly touches the dynamics of life for the larger number in

work, for whom recent years have brought pressure for new mentalities. We feel that these must be explored, and have started trying to do so in *Here & Now*.

Enterprising

What then is enterprise culture? It presents itself as a re-emergence of eternal truths which had become shrouded, as radical novelty which returns to the well-worn path. It must be viewed from various angles, both in the present and in the past which it claims for itself.

Restructuring within the enterprise has subverted the fusion of individual and collective goals. The solidarity of those who work together is tapped by defining them as a production or project team, designated as a profit or cost centre (as described in '*The Invasion of Exchange*' in *Here & Now* 4). Discontent with line management then increases this team-spirit, thus diverting it towards the enterprise's goals. Simultaneously, possibilities for increase in salary and status are individualised through performance review systems and gradings.

Such measures are common in 'enlightened', un-unionised, high-tech enterprises, and other firms aspire towards it as a way of dissipating potential trouble. 'Old' attitudes are undesirable – so recruit the wives of those who worked in the older industries. In the case of Nissan in Japan, such management arose with the training of a new workforce after a protracted 'old-style' industrial struggle was met by the 'new-style' response of '*sack the lot*'.

In those instances of recognisable mass struggle which do erupt, it is often the individualisation of reward which is contended, particularly by the Trade Union hierarchy, who see their collective bargaining rights evaporating. Apparently all they can now offer is a 'better' personnel package through single-union deals. The solidarity of order-takers against order-givers which some saw in the struggles of twenty years ago appears to give way to the pursuit of individual liberation through cash relations.

As important as material changes in work relations has been the re-legitimisation of the idea of the entrepreneur-as-hero. Seen in the growing respectability of Management Studies course and textbooks and their bastard offspring, managerial memoirs, it matters little that yesterday's hero may be today's casualty (Laker, Sinclair, Saunders...). The role remains, and a *can-do* attitude is a popular self-image (particularly for those who get-others-to-do).

Local Labour councils, too, aspire to the enterprising role, anxious to be seen as more than grudging providers of basic services (of which more later). The fashionable name for a council-funded office becomes 'Enterprise Centre', for example. The former apostles of a planned economy now fall prey to 'visionaries' who can sell them a 'plan for the future'. In Central Scotland, for example, around £1m has gone into *Stirling Futureworld* – a grandiose tourist-based vision of glass escalators and international hotels, which has amounted to little more than artificial turf on the local football ground!

From time to time, terms such as 'service industry' are brought into play to denote some vital project. Strategic deployment of such concepts effortlessly conflates and neutralises two extremes of the working environment: the highly-paid sector of managing finance capital circulation and the low-paid hamburger-shop sector. All they have in common is a vigorous working environment and the 'designing-out' of means for pursuing collective goals.

Similarly, self-employment has been promoted, not merely as a way of reducing the dole queues but also as a means of restoring Capital's values to their rightful dominance, supposedly bringing corresponding social benefits.

Rewriting the History Books

In written and administered prescriptions, programs of re-commodification are being realised. Most disturbingly, their power often derives from their also seeming to be the re-insertion of the *human* into stultified social processes.

Revisionist histories legitimise such feelings. In Britain (as Pete Grafton, following Orwell, noted in his book '*You, You and You!*') a widespread (and perhaps pre-revolutionary) discontent with the rulers in the period around the Dunkirk rout, was healed as much by the myth of national effort as anything else. The courage of Jack Hawkins on the Bridge and a Cockney sparrer in the Engine Room diverted attention from such conflicts as the 1944 Lanarkshire Miners' Strike. A postwar electoral consensus around the spectacle of Labour leaders elected in officers' uniforms brought the implementation of the liberal Beveridge proposals on the building of a 'New Jerusalem'.

Until recently, only anarchist writers (many of whose attention remains focussed on that time) highlighted chinks in the armour of postwar consensus. Even if the policies of the consensus were dead, the founding act was above denigration. Now, however, the spectacle of the-nation-pulling-together has become fair game. In war historian Corelli Barnett's '*The Audit of War: The Illusion and Reality of Britain as a Great Nation*', each sector of the War Effort (coal and steel production, ship and aircraft building) is examined in turn, and demonstrated to have shown little of the supposed 'productivity miracle'.

Barnett's attack is socially and historically wide-ranging. He is contemptuous of the culture of the British Ruling Class, the Arnold ethics of the Public School, the pro-classics, anti-engineering bias dominant from the mid-19th century; he has scant more regard for the provincial engineering capitalists with their complacent acceptance of 'rules-of-thumb'; and little-to-none for the industrial working class itself, in its attempts to maintain craft traditions in the face of imposed change. Barnett sees the 'New Jerusalem' approach of the writers of the Beveridge Report as an almost willful avoidance of an economic reality which should have been paramount, as an uncost refusal to modernise the economy, with consequences faced only in the 1980s.

Barnett's willingness to stress the importance of class conflict in his historical model (although regarding it as an obstruction to economic necessity) indicates the different perspectives admissible in the New Right. Sympathetic as they may be to his contempt for such moralisers of social engineering as Beveridge, new Conservatives such as those around *The Salisbury Review* find such a class-driven outlook unacceptable. Nor would they be attracted to any replacement of moral education by technocracy.

But such Conservatives would agree with the tone and nature of Barnett's concluding remarks, in locating the roots of many social ills, when he states that "*the illusions and dreams of 1945 would fade one by one...at the last, New Jerusalem itself, a dream turned to a dank reality of a segregated, subliterate, unskilled, unhealthy and institutionalised proletariat hanging on the nipple of state materialism*" (p304).

Making Claims

Welfarism is under attack on various grounds. Some claim it

to be redistribution of resources from the poor (whose taxes finance it, but who are less likely to take-up benefits) to the well-off (who are more likely to 'know their rights'). By this neat sleight-of-hand, the Islington Leftist who demands proper NHS treatment is accused of exploiting the Bengali sweatshop worker who lacks the articulacy in English to obtain such treatment. From this viewpoint, only a true living wage allows everyone the freedom to obtain equal treatment.


Others, such as former Primer Ministerial adviser Ferdinand Mount, consider that the first two terms of the present Conservative Government curbed inflation and trade-union power, and that the overall task of the third is a 'reclaiming of yob England'; the working class apparently failed to live up to the expectations placed upon it by the founders of the Welfare State. A former minister having claimed that "*council housing breeds slums, delinquency, vandalism, rent arrears and social polarisation*", Mount saw much of this as having been founded in "*the worst mistakes of the Welfare State - the virtual destruction of the old Friendly Societies, the building of the council tower blocks, the erosion of the independence of the church schools, the destruction of the grammar schools; and so on*" (*The Spectator*, 28/6/86).

Housing policy is central to much contemporary political debate. In the first place, there is the current Government's bias towards individual home ownership - probably inefficient in direct *capitalist* terms (a reinvestment of resources in fixed materials), but extremely efficient in its fragmentation and reconstruction of the community. Secondly, in the field of public housing, there is the developing critique of the postwar housing scheme programmes. '*The Material Community*' (in *Here & Now* 2) tried to place the development of the crisis in this area in the context of development of Capital's needs.

Both our critique and that promulgated today are driven by the experience of involvement with local authority Housing Departments. Even the Left concede that this has often been unpleasant: "*Even a brief browse through (Local Government Ombudsman reports) gives the unavoidable impression that Labour authorities make lousy landlords.. (Council) housing is an undemocratic jungle and it's partly the fault of Labour landlords. The concept of choice...is quite absent.*" (Jolyon Jenkins, *New Statesman*, 19/2/88). A free-market conservative like Sir Alfred Sherman instead stresses that "*...benefits like council housing leave such wide scope for administrative, political and personal discretion as to generate arbitrariness, unfairness, political corruption and eventually personal corruption.*" While both acknowledge the crisis in allocation schemes, the ex-Marxist Sherman emphasises the systematic level, while Jenkins wishes a more humane implementation of the current system. A similar crusade for 'choice' is the prevailing tone of the Kinnock-Hattersley '*Statement of Democratic Socialist Aims and Values*'; tail-ending 'enterprise culture' by celebrating consumption.

In the mid-1970s (as described in '*The Material Community*') the housing crisis was acknowledged under the rubric of 'urban deprivation'. Many ills identified by the New Right were perceived then, but were subjected to institutional palliatives intended to manage them out of existence. More recent critical perspectives step outside that perspective and attempt to provide a historical rationale for what went wrong with public housing, rejecting any systematic critique of everyday life but allowing a certain reflexive space. The fashionable palliative measures for housing schemes are those recommended by Professor Alice Coleman in '*Utopia on Trial: Vision and Reality in Planned Housing*' (1985) and subsequent reports.

She places much of the blame in the application of the Garden City-type housing ideas of the early 20th century: Utopia "*aimed to liberate people from the slums but has come to represent an even worse form of bondage. It aspired to beautify the urban environment, but has been transmogrified into the epitome of ugliness.*" (p.180). Abandoning the failed deterministic belief that the new housing schemes would improve human behaviour and happiness, the housing bureaucrats substituted a possibilism, that "*it is perfectly possible for everyone to be good and happy regardless of the nature of the environment and if they were not, it was because they were problem people. The concept of*



1. Individual front gardens encourage responsibility
 2. Integral garages cut down thefts
 3. Windows facing street make observation easy
 4. Mixed housing encourages social integration
 5. Proper fences create sense of privacy
 6. Back walls at least 6' high cut down easy access

'sink estates', populated by the dregs of humanity, followed in the wake of this volte-face..." (p.19). She instead proposes investigation of the extent to which environment does affect social behaviour.

The provisional conclusions were that a set of structural alterations could affect behaviour. Broadly, these were to increase the tenants' 'defensible space' by dismantling overhead walkways, reducing the numbers of people using each external doorway, splitting the 'confused space' of large green areas into individual gardens. Such measures resemble neighbourhood watch schemes in that they elicit a limited community self-policing, returning a limited amount of self-respect and reducing the extent to which people feel themselves to be mere objects of a Housing Department allocation plan.

It may be surprising that such technical assessment of housing scheme design while ignoring the wider social background, was initially unpopular with the technicians of the central government bureaucracy. However, design assessment by indexation of dog turds and urination could have appeared as statistics gone mad. Only after they were taken up by 'enlightened' commentators (such as Robert Chesshyre in *The Observer*) was a more enthusiastic response generated. Her proposals appear to offer a scientific, commonsense solution to the 1980s social disorder. Sometimes this is explicit, such as when their publicity level rose dramatically in the wake of the Broadwater Farm events. Now these are officially encouraged, as the Department of the Environment's decentralist *Priority Estates Project* and the Home Office's 'Crime: Together We'll Crack It' campaign. So not the least reason why housing is a central issue in political debate is that it deals obliquely with the control of space and circulation.

Coleman's ideas were probably received coldly because she considers such remedial work as only making the best of a bad job: "It would be far better to quietly phase out the DoE's intrusion into housing design and return housing initiatives to the free market, with minimum regulation and maximum consumer choice, so that architects, builders and developers can become responsive to residents' needs... Housing choice and responsibility for one's home should be decisions made not by the bureaucrats but by the occupants." (p.184). So here again, maximum 'freedom' is seen as resulting from otherwise disinterested principles coming together in the market place: the equality of the commodity.

Healthy Crisis

This article has said little about the crisis engendered by the Conservative Government, except to note that 'crisis' as lifestyle becomes a form of permanent revolution in the profit centres of the large corporations as well as of supposedly weaning people off the 'dependency culture'. The most recent changes in social security may yet prove to be a step too far,

widening a perception of injustice done. But the immense power of the project comes from a simultaneous centralisation and abdication of power through recommodification, which deprives opposition of a material target.

The ground for the debate over the 'crisis' in the funding of the National Health Service has shifted in a similar manner. Once a model is accepted within which the productivity of the economy is a real limit to resource allocation, the supposedly 'rational' decision-making on the allocation is laid open to challenge. As Stuart Hall put it: "What the Right argue is that, once this limit is reached...then there is not much to choose between rationing by price (which they would prefer) and rationing by queue (which is what has been going on in the NHS for decades)." (*Marxism Today*, March 1988). And such rationing by queue has always been overlaid by irrational and arbitrary criteria: people have been present in the system as objects. And, as mentioned above, privilege has been present (but hidden), almost as much as in private medicine.

While the Right as a whole sees virtue in the promotion of Enterprise Culture, this virtue is not perceived as identical to the pursuit of money itself. In this respect, for example, *The Spectator* has published editorials opposing the yobbishness of city yuppies interested only in money and against 'economic value' being taken as the only social value (for example, in closure of University Departments which don't 'give value for money'). As mentioned above in relation to the re-appraisal of the Beveridge heritage, social conservatism and economic liberalism criss-cross in complex ways.

The major triumph of recent years have been feelgood consumerism. Parallel with the stress on balanced books has been a consumer boom paid-for by credit. The collateral for this boom has come from escalating house prices and escalating investment incomes, and, internationally, from the depressed prices of raw materials since the recession of the early Eighties. The events of Black Monday last October may indicate that this was only a passing phase, with a true crisis to come.

One of those most deeply involved in the consumer boom, Sir Terence Conran (of the Mothercare-Habitat-BHS conglomerate) has recently begun making gloomy predictions: "We have reached a consumerist plateau... People do not want more. They have lived the cycle of the early Eighties when they demanded goods that were exciting, new, desirable - not just the postwar commodities they once needed. Now people no longer want anything much...there is no imperative to go out and buy. With low inflation, consumers are not moved to buy unless excited or in need. Arguably the only goods people need are food and nappies." (*The Observer*, 21/2/88).

At first sight, this would seem to be an example of the naturalism of needs to which the Left used to be prey ('people only need so much') coming from someone who has made his money from knowing better than that. On the other hand, Conran may just be confusing the consumerist phase of those who bought in his shops with the consumerist phase of those like himself who spent the period devouring other companies. But the quotation remains strange...

In each aspect described above, Power is re-fragmented in ways which would have seemed unthinkable to the Left of a previous generation, who saw only the prospect of a steady growth in monolithic power. And this fragmentation proclaims a new freedom for all, confident that in each of its moments, with each transaction, Capital as the principal social relation is being renewed.

The crisis has been a remarkably successful manoeuvre for revolatilising society around an acceptance of economic relations. Left journals, by stressing familiar concepts of crisis and struggle, have tended not to do full justice to the extent of the struggle, have tended not to do full justice to the extent of success of the economic project. Can it be more than wishful thinking to suggest that the values espoused be turned against their advocates? Certainly, nothing will come of any project privileging decision-at-the-point-of-consumption, the purchase of lifestyle masquerading as self-will, as the Labour Party Policy Review seems likely to favour.

Alex Richards

The NEW LIBERALS

Channel 4 has recently re-run the series "The New Enlightenment", as part of its "Diverse Reports" production. Fronted by Professor Kenneth Minogue, the series followed the standard format of these productions: no attempt was made at an unbiased "both-sides-of-the-story" narrative, and the six-part documentary allowed intellectuals of the libertarian right to put their case across without T.V.'s usual "balancing" act (despite the complaints of some left-wingers when the series was first mooted). The series was accompanied by a book, also called "The New Enlightenment" (MacMillan), which attempts to explain their ideas in greater depth.

Mention of the phrase "libertarian right" conjures up media-inspired images of immature Tory youth wing loonies - the newly christened "loony right". Perhaps this is part of the reason these intellectuals have chosen to call themselves Liberals, and you can tell they don't mean the SLD/SDP when you learn that the subtitle of the book is "the rebirth of liberalism". The proponents of this political theory see themselves as renewing the propagation and development of ideas first expounded in the eighteenth century. A key passage early in the book states:

"We have called this book **The New Enlightenment** because the movement we describe is a lineal descendant of the Scottish Enlightenment which flourished in the eighteenth century. In the Scottish Enlightenment the concepts of individual liberty developed by the English philosopher John Locke were joined by the free-market ideas of the Edinburgh circle of Adam Smith, whose **The Wealth of Nations** was published in 1776...What marks this tradition is its commitment to individual liberty".

Clearly these "New Liberals" are pro-markets, and pro-capitalism. They argue that Socialism is "anti-individual", and that it has been tried and that it has failed to deliver the promised political and economic freedoms. (Some of the more virulent libertarian right supporters would argue that Socialism has been tried and has been found guilty.)

An argument they put forward, which has great topical relevance, is that the Welfare State, Socialism's great success, actually makes people poorer by creating an atmosphere of dependency among the population. This is seen in many sections of the media as a cornerstone of Thatcherite policy, but a very similar viewpoint was put forward a few years ago by the libertarian left journal "Workers Playtime".

ARE THE NEW LIBERALS THATCHERITE?

The idea that libertarian right ideals and Thatcherism are synonymous has been propagated by many sections of the media, both mainstream and minority. This misses the very important point that Margaret Thatcher and her main political supporters have only picked up the sections of New Liberal thinking that appealed to them. The most massive diversion concerns the role and structure of government.

While the Tory government's public utterances talk about the freedom of the individual to choose, and that their aim is to reduce governmental control over people's lives, a number of their policies and actions have in fact increased the hold that central government has over the populace. This is in total contradiction to the ideals presented in the T.V. series, which held up the Swiss Cantonal system as an ideal government. In Switzerland, the local Cantons (federated regions) can, via public meetings, overturn the decisions made by the central government. Major decisions are taken by regular referenda. Its executive is "representative, emasculated and virtually anonymous". This executive consists of a seven-member federal council, composed of representatives of several parties. The presidential term is 1 year, and each member of the council becomes President by rotation. One can see why this system would be anathema to a power-seeker like

Margaret Thatcher. Indeed, strip out the emphasis on capitalism, and the Swiss governmental structure seems almost anarchistic.

WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RIGHT-WING LIBERALS AND THE LIBERTARIAN LEFT?

Clearly the most obvious disagreement concerns capitalism. The New Liberals are pro-capitalism, seeing it as the fount of all freedoms, and the true and only source of economic well-being. The Libertarian Left obviously see capitalism as a repressive economic system. However, both movements agree on a pro-individual, and anti-government/anti-bureaucratic standpoint, but strongly disagree on the way to achieve these aims.

This leads to some odd areas of total agreement. For instance the book's authors argue for self-help organisations to be set up in deprived areas, outside the control of the local bureaucracy, something that nearly all Left Libertarians would agree with. There are some areas that are greyer, such as the New Liberals support for family units, and antipathy towards single-parent families. They argue for this on economic grounds, saying that it is extremely difficult for single-parent families to support themselves, especially those with very young children, and that they merely become a burden on society. In addition, they also state that the state-aid for single-parent families merely increases the number of these "units", and does nothing to solve the problems (one of a number of "misguided" socialist attempts to improve people's lives, which the New Liberals say has had the opposite effect).

The subject of social relationships (with particular reference to prejudice and bigotry), a key area for the Libertarian Left, was not discussed in the series. Their own logic would dictate that bigotry interferes with efficiency, and is anti-individual in outlook, therefore it is wrong. But many of their Tory supporters are undoubtedly bigoted against numerous sections of the populace (gays being the most obvious example). But as the New Liberal views are **not** exactly the same as the Thatcherite Tories, they may well follow this logic. Certainly their strong support for a "Bill of Rights" on the U.S.A. model would suggest that this is true (and as this is something that Margaret Thatcher is strongly opposed to, it further strengthens the argument that the New Liberals have to be thought of as a separate entity).

WHY ARE THEY SUCCESSFUL?

In the present public sphere, there are two clear reasons why the Thatcherites have been successful with their selective "New Liberalism". Firstly they have been using powerful positive language and imagery, which the Left has attempted to combat with negative complaints. David Selbourne, in a recent article in *The Guardian* put it thus:

"...the popular presentation of this Tory counter-revolution (which is what it is) in 'positive' terms of 'opportunity', 'choice', 'incentive', and so forth has far overtaken, in energy and insistence, what seems like Labour's merely 'negative' complaints about 'unfairness', 'hardship', and 'social injustice'."

Secondly these "negative" complaints are not even perceived as being backed-up by coherent alternative policies - a sort of self-fulfilling of Margaret Thatcher's "there is no alternative" prophecy. Indeed Labour politicians such as Brian Gould have been rushing to embrace the new "share-owning" electorate in an attempt to regain some lost votes.

At a deeper level, even the Libertarian Left seems bereft of alternatives. They are generally good at stating what they are against, but they are much less clear about what they propose to do instead. Most of all, with most of the Left's economic

theories appearing discredited, there is no coherent economic argument to throw against the dominance of capitalism. And on the Anarchist fringe (which, according to a recent report in the Observer, is going through a revival), they are reduced to night attacks on "yuppies" in the London Docklands, and running nails down the sides of cars, which seems more like desperation than revival.

The question "Why have the New Liberals been successful at all?" has had a number of answers along the lines of "the time was ripe". However, it should also be noted that, unlike most of the Left, the Libertarian Right did not direct their propaganda at "the masses". It was aimed fairly and squarely at those in power, and more importantly at those on the edge of power. Tories such as Keith Joseph and Geoffrey Howe were early converts, and through them the message reached Margaret Thatcher - all of this occurring before they came to power. Their successes in getting anti-governmental propaganda to the centre stage has been far more successful than anything achieved by the Libertarian Left in recent years.

ARE THERE LESSONS TO BE LEARNED?

The successes so far for the New Liberals pose some interesting questions for the Left in general and the libertarian left in particular. For the parliamentary Left the main question appears to be: "How can we attack the seemingly invulnerable Thatcherites and successfully seize the initiative?" From the analysis outlined above, the answer would not seem too difficult to find - attack them on their own ground. Take the following logical sequence as an example:

- a. The Thatcherites profess to be "champions" of the rights of individuals.
- b. They generally profess to believe in New Liberal principles.
- c. The New Liberals are in favour of a "Bill of Rights".
- d. A "Bill of Rights" would strengthen the cause of the individual vs. the State.
- e. Therefore the Thatcherites should be strongly in favour of a "Bill of Rights".


However, it is well known that Margaret Thatcher at least is strongly opposed to a "Bill of Rights". This would seem a perfect cause that could unite all the opposition parties in an attack on Thatcherism. A "Bill of Rights" campaign could be presented in a completely positive manner, and if it was handled correctly, it could do severe damage to the Thatcherites image as "champions" of the individual. The fact that some sort of positivist, undermining campaign has not yet been launched is yet another indicator of the present feebleness of the parliamentary Left.

'The major political event of the twentieth century is the death of socialism.'
Irving Kristol

Since the mid-nineteenth century the imaginations of the West have been captured by socialism. But the economic failure of the post-war years has brought growing disillusionment, and today a major new revolution in political thought is underway. Right-wing intellectual ideas are beginning to storm global politics and especially to inspire President Reagan and Mrs Thatcher. *The New Enlightenment* maps the influence of these ideas and explores the international dimensions of the most important political shift of our century: the rebirth of the classical tradition of liberal individualism and free-market economics. The leading exponents of the 'New Enlightenment' around the world - Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman, George Gilder, Irving Kristol, Lord Bauer - explain their ideas and the book sets their views in their social, political and historical context. It assesses their developing influence as they argue that erosion of choice and of individual and family responsibility leads to stagnation, inefficiency and poverty. The intellectual right is enjoying astonishing success in Britain, Europe, Japan and the USA. Is a new moral and political consensus on the way? Should governments step aside? This is the important and controversial subject of *The New Enlightenment* - a subject that must hold the attention of any thinking citizen today.


The New Enlightenment is a major six-part television documentary series from Channel Four's prestigious *Diverse Reports* team.

ISBN 0-195-64183-6
 Macmillan £6.95 net
 7 80333 74183 6



The New Enlightenment
 the rebirth of liberalism

David Graham and Peter Clarke



A CHANNEL FOUR BOOK

For the Libertarian Left the problem is more specific. Why has the Libertarian Right been successful at bringing many of the arguments of libertarianism in general into the centre of political discussion, something the Libertarian Left has completely failed to achieve (at least since 1968 and all that)? Is it purely because the Libertarian Right have hooked libertarian ideals to a capitalist economic structure? Or is it that the Libertarian Left have stuck to negative anti-this, anti-that arguments? And finally, here are three questions that have to be answered if progress is to be made:

1. What positive arguments can be put forward?
2. Are there alternative economic theories that can counteract capitalism's dominance?
3. Should Libertarian Left propaganda be aimed more at those in power and positions of influence, as well as the "masses", the Left's traditional constituency, aiming for a revolution of the mind, rather than a "physical" revolution.

John Alexander.

H&N welcomes reasoned replies to this and other articles.

RIPOSTE RE THE THIRD ASSAULT

In response to the points raised by A.D., some clarifications are in order:

- 1] The 'Note' stands as a contribution to a debate occurring amongst those whom I perceive as engaged in 'post situationist' theorising. With apologies for the introduction of a fresh 'post-ism', I think the term is necessary to cover the attempts to use but also go beyond the thought of the SI, and I do think, despite raised eyebrows to the contrary, that this specification unites the diverse undertakings of Here & Now, The Pleasure Tendency and Smile.
- 2] The 'Note' was brief and therefore abrupt to the point of brutality with finer details, and so, some confusion has arisen. The periodisation offered three eras of theoretical and practical activity. However, simultaneity of theory and practice is not claimed. So, although the theoretical initiative which launched the Second Assault can be placed in 1923, the practical activity of the First Assault did not cease the day before or after Lukacs published *History and Class Consciousness*. The Third Assault analysis builds on its predecessors and accepts the precise delineation of the practical activity of the First Assault advanced by the SI: "...the classical workers movement began a few decades before the official formation of the international, with the first linking up of communist groups of several countries that Marx and his friends organised from Brussels in 1845....it was completely finished after the failure of the Spanish revolution, that is, after the Barcelona May days of 1937"(1) The thought of the First Assault started rather earlier, with the Young Hegelian project of making truth worldly. Incidentally, the crises arising from Surrealism's attempts to 'serve the

revolution' are attributable precisely to a mismatch consequent upon this period of overlap, 1923-1937, when the theory of the Second Assault tried to serve the practice of the First Assault.

- 3] The 'Note' identifies a need to consciously initiate the thought of the Third Assault. It follows that theorists of the Third Assault do not yet exist. Third Assault theory, like pataphysics, "is a branch of science which we have invented and for which a crying need is generally experienced."(2) There is therefore no attempt to recruit figures like Derrida et al to the Third Assault camp - the only claim made is that their thought, in addition to that of the Situationists et al, must be responded to in developing the Third Assault perspective. Which is to state in a different way A.D.'s point that we require breadth, and should not espire to discipleship - not either the SI or the postmoderns but both, and neither: what we can use from both, and rejection of the irrelevant from either.
- 4] I have addressed here only the points arising from the First/Second/Third 'boundary disputes'. I hope to respond to the other points at a later date. The position may be clarified if it is understood that 'Third Assault' title has been adopted to build on the following: ".....a new epoch has begun. After the first attempt at workers' subversion... we see... a new spontaneous struggle... the portents of a second proletarian assault against the class society...having become other and yet remaining the same..." , from 1967. At a time when attempts to analyse what has happened in the period 68/88 abound, the Third Assault provides the best reason for

'BEWARE THE BARMAID'S SMILE!'

WHEN BREWERY REPRESENTATIVES went to the 'Red Anchor' in Chelsea in order to arrange the departure of its landlord, Mr Ken Chapman, last year, they were met by scores of demonstrating 'regulars', arguing for the preservation of their pub as they had known it, and not as a twinkle in a marketing manager's eye.

When the directors of Fulham Football Club and Queens Park Rangers F.C. cooked up a plan for merger, under the clumsy moniker of Fulham Park Rangers F.C., fans occupied the pitch at Fulham and the plan was withdrawn, for the moment. Both incidents point to a source of embarrassment for the current *consensus* about the ability of the commodity market to 'give people what they want' and they indicate the resurgence of an area of popular struggle which has been overshadowed by the *workerist* obsession with the point of production, fueled by the syndicalist & Marxist domination of the Left.

Beware the Barmaid's Smile(1), examines what has happened to the pub in modern times that could so excite political passions. It reveals the ways in which beer consumption has become an area increasingly invaded by sophisticated manipulators whose loyalties lie completely with the accumulation of abstract value (money) even at the expense of the nominal '*values*' which the company, to which they happen to be attached, purports to embody. As a result, the other side of the commodity system, consumption, becomes a possible bone of contention within modern capitalism.

The fact that to struggle for dignity and freedom it is *not* necessary to be organised in the great factory of mass production is good news for anyone concerned about the effects of British 'Perestroika' on the capacity and willingness of people

to combine for shared goals and ideals. The decentralisation of work, its dispersal into smaller units of production, the regeneration of the artisan entrepreneur, and the automation of processes previously accepted as labour intensive have broken down the imperative of combination - the potentially revolutionary, reformist or reactionary army of labour is no longer assembled by the forces of production. In fact it is being broken into 'self managed' units with ostensible independence from Central Command.

Recognition that such a process is taking place has inspired many jeremiads from the Left about the decline in the community of struggle upon which many of the major disputes of the past have relied. However, close physical proximity and shared employment are *not* the necessary preconditions for collective action? the experience of the 'social' movements in the 60s & 70s prove as much, although they severely curtailed their potential by assuming a community of identical interest, thereby attempting to mimic the imagined unanimity of past movements.

The absence of combativity in 'decentered' industries and the self-employed sector has not arisen out of some structural compulsion which has rendered the non-mass worker utterly passive and obedient, it is simply that the new structures of work demand new arrangements of opposition. Perhaps the organisations of the 19th century Luddites & Swing rioters provide an example for comparison. The Luddites were largely drawn from small workshop artisans and others working in the dispersed cottage industries of Nottinghamshire & Yorkshire; the Swing rioters were agricultural workers scattered amongst the farms of Southern England. Both movements achieved considerable levels of collective organisation without formal or vertical structure. One can only assume that in contrast to 20th century trades unionism a greater reliance on voluntarism and horizontal discussion enabled them to shake up the effortless progress of industrialism at that time.

It is somewhat ironic that the focal point for, in particular the Swing rioters, the ale-house, should once again be a contested area in 1980s England & Wales(2).

These secular meeting places, which provided enough free *public space* for the farm-workers of the 1830s to discuss plans to challenge the modernisation of the English countryside, now find themselves vulnerable to 1980s modernisation, a process described in *Beware of the*

Barmaid's Smile as a strategy of depoliticising the pub:

The aim now is to have customers using pubs whose presence in them has been brought about by social engineering and cynical manipulation. The outcome will be drinking places which are parodies of pubs, where the genuine long established social interaction is constantly being subverted by an insidious directing of people's activities through well planned brewery strategies - the purpose of which is to get people to consume more of anything and everything in a drinking place of the breweries choosing.

□□□□

Whereas many pubs have long since stopped being active centres of political debate & radical talk, it is clear that the potential to be so remains. Even the punitive licensing laws of England failed to prevent a pub in Leeds being used as an unofficial strike centre during the 1981 Healthworkers dispute, and the continuing tradition of holding meetings both formal and informal in pubs, indicate their surprisingly unsung worth as popular meeting places for public discourse. One does not need a conspiracy theory to see that what for a brewer looks like a quick way to a profit, for the contemporary individual looks like the further diminution of places where he can go for public and civilised chat.

The transformation of pubs into peep group 'venues', with the inevitable bouncer on the door (the pub in Leeds which played an organising role in the 1982 strike is now so policed) mirrors the wider process in today's society which seems to suggest that the ordinary person is not a fit and proper subject to be involved in political debate. 'Free' time becomes synonymous with 'leisure' time that is time filled with entertainment and consumption, the only alternatives to work on offer in Mrs Thatcher's capitalist utopia. It is chilling to imagine the look of incomprehension on the faces of our leaders if it was suggested that people might actually want to spend their time in discussion, and outside the patronising control of Kilroy-Silk's and Robin Days.

Beware the Barmaid's Smile describes the monetary processes behind the assault on the pub, from an insider position. It explains why the interior decor changes with such bewildering rapidity, and why the major brewing companies are so willing to give a pub a social label 'youth venue', 'family pub' etc. It shows how this is a travesty of the pub tradition which, for all its faults (not least the exclusion of women) accepts



REVIEWS

ed a variety of ages, and which gained in conviviality as a result.

It points to the abyss of difference between 'economic investment' and 'social investment', and how increasingly they are coming into conflict. That which the market considers to be played out like old football teams, pubs, traditional rituals seem to have grown in importance for people, perhaps as a strong antidote to the creeping utilitarianism of the times. Certainly the pamphlet has identified a future area for combativity, and one which fits in well with the way contests may have to be conducted when the dusts of Perestroika have settled.

For the defence of the pub will have to

come from people who have been persuaded that the cause is right, and not the captive constituency that the old labour movement have been leaning on for some time. Disobedience to the authority of capital cannot rely on the reflex responses of blind class loyalism but will need genuine critical contemplation if shared commitments are to be made and shared risks taken. The fact that the pub remains one of the few physical spaces within which this public contemplation could take place makes the importance of winning the argument in their defence all the more vital.

Beware the Barmaid's Smile has begun the debate; it is by no means immune from criticism itself (more does need to be said about traditional pub culture's

intolerance towards women on their own and different racial & sexual groups), but it has already shaken up a near moribund CAMRA, and its identification of conflicts outside the traditional confines of mass industry should cheer who may have feared that the government's policy of the abolition of conflict was succeeding.

Steve Bushe

[1] **Beware the Barmaid's Smile** by Chris Thompson, Pelagian Press, P.O. Box 85 London N16 6DY. Price £ (2) The situation in **Scotland**, although facing the same pressure, is different due to the different tradition of drinking places. The pamphlet concentrates on the English & Welsh experiences.

CLEAR SIGHTED MINORITY?

In periods of reflux the recurring theme of the 'role' of a fighting minority comes back to haunt debates among self-styled revolutionaries.

In the absence of any common forum for debate - as *Intercom* was set up to develop a couple of years back - followers of theoretical exchanges often have to cross-refer to a number of journals to pick up the threads of the argument.

Henri Simon's book on Poland 1980-2 had been reviewed by the left-communist group, *Wildcat* and stress made by the reviewer on the reactionary content of consciousness in the Solidarnosc workers movement. In response (1), the *Echanges* periodical (co-produced by Simon) identified vanguardist conception in *Wildcat* which is consistent with their stress on a minority organisation acting as the carrier of communist ideas.

For *Echanges* (2), "a strike without any political content can have very deep political consequences and a riot with an evident political content could have no political consequences". An effective rebuttal is constructed against a position which measures violent confrontation, as enshrined in riots as the litmus test of authentic action and consciousness. And this leads to the conclusion that "the essential problem is not to beat the state by insurrection but to suppress capitalism by practising communist relationships of production (destruction of value) and at the same time destroying the state".

Suspensions that such a counterposing of positions didn't correspond with standard left-communism is gauged from an interesting text announcing the dissolution of *Wildcat* and its relaunch "under a new title" after a process of regroupment. Among those that have

left the project were advocates of "a clear-sighted minority fighting the state despite and against the mass of the working class which was dominated by ruling class ideas". (3). Drawing from the experience of the Miners Strike, the text highlights the position of the miners Hit-Squads which carried out actions despite the ability of militant Trade Unionists holding the ascendancy in the mass assemblies. This observation, in the context of an exhaustive debate over respecting 'democracy' in mass struggles leads to the formulation:

"In the past workers' councils, mass assemblies and factory committees have emerged as organs of struggle. The weakness of these organs has been the extent to which they reduce themselves to organs for "democratic self-management" of enterprises or to "parliaments of the working class". At any given time it is usually only a minority of the working class which is in struggle. They don't struggle because they are more "conscious" than other sections of our class but usually because they are more under attack. Consciousness emerges through struggle as we become aware of the terrain of struggle and the nature of our enemies. The role of revolutionaries in all this is to promote links between these struggles internationally and promote/participate in and spread those actions which are seen as the greatest threat to the maintenance of capitalist social relations. Minorities may be the spur to action but it is mass struggle alone, eventually encompassing the vast majority of the working class, which will overthrow capitalism".

Related to this debate is an element of Euro-centrism in *Echanges* view of global struggles, a hangover from council communist theories such as Pannekoek. (4). It is instructive to note the volatility

of societies such as Brazil and South Korea where strikes and riots of become fused in class based struggles where the channelling of demands is so effectively recuperated or absorbed political systems enmeshed in questions of global economics.



Assigning a privileged position for developed societies, the "Teuto Castles" is nevertheless retained in newly translated text which strives for "analysis for an anarchist perspective against post industrial capitalism". The author, the Sicilian neo-anarchist Alfredo Bonanno, continues on from earlier published texts (6) but project

tendency in production and social life which will relegate workplace struggles to the periphery of contestation.

The advanced post-industrial societies, drawing from Italy and Britain, are hrowing up a potential cleavage between the excluded and the included. Any dignity of labour' has been replaced by a few underclass of workers and unemployed scratching a living serving the privileged occupying capital intensive work and intellectual/managerial occupations. The 'excluded' are therefore a proletariat diffused and disenfranchised, "deprived of a language of common reference, the ghettoised will no longer be able to read between the lines of the messages of power". Hence their recourse to riots since real reform and representation has been robbed of meaning. Bonnano emphasises the codes' of the included which deny communication and access to the alienated, downtrodden mass.

His preoccupation is the progression of riots into Insurrections. This is only possible due to deserters "asphyxiated" by the lifestyle of privilege and who devote their efforts as an informal movement of insurrectionists to "transmit concepts" and the knowledge necessary to counter "disinterest and mental closure". Much more than this he new vision does not illuminate. The ossified Programmes of education beloved by anarchists and marxists unable to grasp "the sunset of the workers' leading role" are redundant.

But, the features of the informal groups and their affinity structure is left vague.

Despite the more advanced "Teutonic Castles" in Japan and the U.S., it is the example of the 1980's riots in inner city England which serves as a model for where the main revolutionary hope is to be located. By stressing organisation, however informal and flexible, as the key the author's perspective is rooted in an anarchist tradition that ranges from the narodniks of 19th century Russia to the autonomists of late capitalism in Italy.

There are real insights and challenging ideas in all the texts reviewed. All suffer from revolutionary elite discourse, from the objectified categories such as "sections of the working class" (Wildcat) to the lack of concrete referents in Bonnano. A pragmatic approach would not denigrate or designate as peripheral struggles in spheres of social life as different as work, education, concentration of deprivation, public services and so on. It is difficult to be as certain as Bonnano who states, "if we were only to take account of the most backward situations we would not be revolutionaries, but simply recuperators and reformists capable only of pushing the power structure towards perfecting the capitalist project". After all, is a ghetto any more of a new invention than wage labour? The need to have hope should be measured alongside a global coverage of how social life is changing and how struggles contain contradictory elements, including riots, which can advance the

project of domination currently being engineered.

Jim McFarlane

- [1] Poland 1980-2, Class Struggle The crisis of Capital [Black & Red] Interestingly Echanges have ignored the points about 'reductionism' in H & N 3, by T.D.
- [2] No. 53, February 1988 from BM Box 91, London WC1 N3XX. A different line of argument, by T.D. in Here & Now [on reductionism] has been ignored by Simon.
- [3] Letter of 'dissolution', Wildcat, March 1988, Box W, 180 Mansfield Road, Nottingham.
- [4] The book, "Workers Councils" has been published in four parts by Echanges and marks a return to the work of the Dutch astronomer/philosopher. A correspondence between Pannekoek and Castoriadis in 1953 is resurrected to draw a parallel between Wildcat and their bete noir, then a leading figure in Socialisme ou Barbarie. An updated article on the Greek/French theorist appears in the Edinburgh Review 78/79 issue by Alex Richards, "The Academicisation of Castoriadis".
- [5] From Riot to Insurrection, Elephant Editions 1988, £1 from BM Elephant, London, WC1 N3XX.
- [6] Especially Critique of Syndicalist Methods & Workers Autonomy, Bratach Dubh, available through Elephant Editions.

DEEP ECOLOGY

FIFTH ESTATE AND KICK IT OVER both attack something called 'Deep Ecology' in recent issues. Fifth Estate's Fall 1987 issue has a 27 page essay by George Bradford called "How Deep is Deep Ecology" and KIO's Winter 1987 issue includes an ecofeminist critique of De by Janet Biehl, and an article by Murray Bookchin entitled "Social Ecology vs Deep Ecology".

Deep Ecology is a tendency within the Ecology movement. Its categories are biological rather than social. It rejects all "anthropocentric" ethics i.e. those which privilege 'humanity' over 'nature' in any way. It treats humanity as an undifferentiated mass responsible as species for looming eco-catastrophe. No nit-picking here about the fate of the planet originating in a specific nexus of religious and cultural traditions, the State, and Capitalism. The problem is much simpler. First, humanity, in seeing itself as separate from nature, has become a cancer on it. Secondly, there are simply too many humans.

De mixes a sort of Taoism, wrenched from any religious and cultural under-

Money II The Pleasure Tendency, P.O. Box 109, Leeds LS5 3AA

Today, there is something that binds us all young or old, male or female, East or West

A notion so powerful that it has its own logic, rules and common-sense — even overriding our own ...

... to the extent that it becomes harder and harder to see any other way of doing things.

But the absurd and cruel consequences of this idea continue, and are all too apparent.

Resistance, however, has long been around:

It is within all of us, everyday, and the age of the gift draws nigh!

pinnings and expressed chiefly in a hazy notion of 'oneness', with a revived Malthusianism. The fact that much of this rests on a simple logical fallacy doesn't really matter, since reason is merely a 'humanist' fetish. After all mountains don't construct syllogisms.

The implications of these views aren't nice. De's emphasis on reducing population to the planet's "carrying capacity" [500 million or less they claim] leads them to advocate that the starving be left to starve, that no attempt should be made to find a cure for AIDS, and that the borders

of rich nations be closed to protect 'their' resources from the wretched of the earth.

Between them the various critics of De do a fair demolition job. Fundamental questions are examined - the role of reason, social vs biological accounts of human activities. See for example Janet Biehl's deconstruction of the term 'wilderness', a notion fundamental to De as a sort of a priori absolute but in fact originating in Western economic and cultural practices

Jack Murphy

REVIEWS

MAGAZINE REVIEWS & ASSORTED MATERIAL RECEIVED, 1987-88.

No. 16 of **SOLIDARITY: a Journal of Libertarian Socialism** is largely devoted to publication of a leaked copy of the IVth International **International Committee's** report on the corruption of the Workers Revolutionary party, in particular, its client role in relation to arab governments. Particularly generous with funding were Kuwait and Libya: the WRP helpfully rewrote its aims to snuggle up Qadhaffi's **Green Book**. Continuing on the theme of expediency and corruption in radical politics, the magazine also includes two reviews of Teresa Toranska's book **Oni: Stalin's Polish Puppets**, neither of which adds anything to the book. 80p from **Solidarity**, 123 Lathom Rd. London E.6.

VAGUE 20: Televisionaries is a magazine somewhere between post-punk and post-politics. Apart from anti-work, anti-free-mason and anti-ALF articles and cartoons, this issue is largely devoted to a 40-page chronology of West German terrorism, centered on the Baader-Meinhof Group/Red Army Fraction. While not as useful as the **West German Guerilla: Terror, Reaction & Resistance** (published by Cienfuegos Press in 1981), this text does demonstrate the distance between such activities and any liberating perspective. £2.50 from BCM Box 7207, London WC1N 3XX.

PLAGIARISM: Art as Commodity and Strategies for its Negation is a 30-page pamphlet containing various essays on the emergence of "art" as a separate area, in tandem with the development of Capital, and on current possibilities within and against this and all categories. £1.25 from Counter Productions, Room 101, 308 Camberwell New Rd., London SE5.



ABIEZER COPPE, Selected Writings, £3.50 from Counter Distribution, 308 Camberwell New Rd., London SE5.

VARIANT[Art&Ideas]No.4, from 76 Carlisle St., Glasgow G.21, £1.30.

EDINBURGH REVIEW: cultural journal, £12 sub from 48 Pleasance, Edinburgh.

COMMON SENSE nos 3&4, £1 each from Richard Gunn, Dept of Politics, 31 Buccleuch Pl., Univ. of Edinburgh.

DISCOURSE: No.s 1&2, from Dept of Philosophy, Univ. of Glasgow G12, 50p + p&p

MENDEKU[Revenge]: Translation from Basque [donation] from BM Blob.

AND YET IT MOVES: by Boy Igor (The realization & Suppression of Science), Zamisdat Press. 5\$

ONCE UPON A TIME THERE WAS A PLACE CALLED NOTHING HILL GATE. £1 from BM Blob, London wc1N 3XX.

Once Upon A Time There Was A Place Called Nothing Hill Gate.....



A True Story With Pictures
By PADDINGTON BEAR.

COUNTER INFORMATION: nos 16-19, from 11 Forth St., Edinburgh (donation).

MAKING TROUBLE; J.D. Young, £4.20 + p&p from Clydeside Press, 37 High St., Glasgow G1.

BLACK CHIP: A Radical Journal of New Technology, from R. Alexander, Cwm Gwen Hall, Plencader, Dyfed, SA39 9HA £3 sub.

THE POOR FOLK'S GUIDE TO THE REVOLT OF 1381, Box 19, 17 Chatham St., Reading RG1 7JF (donation)

ATTACK!, BM 6577, London WC1N 3XX (donation)

MODERN TIMES; £1. FROM Box 14, 136 Kingsland High St., London E.8.

UKRAINIAN PEACE NEWS: Survey of Independent Peace & Labour Activity in the USSR & Eastern Europe, Vol 2 No.1 £5 sub., 50p + post each issue from 168/10 King St., London, W6 0QU.



ON GOGOL BOULEVARD; described as a "networking bulletin for activists east and west" consists largely of support material for pacifists in the Soviet bloc and in the USA. The Winter 87/88 issue includes analyses of the current situation facing groups such as **European Nucleur Disarmament**. \$1 from 151 First Ave., 62, New York, NY 10003, USA.

WORKERS INFO. RAG3: produced in New York, donation; from PM. c\$ Zamisdat Press, GPO Box 1255, Gracie Station, NY, NY 10028.



CULTURA LIBERTARIA: Apda 1687, Vitoria 01080, Espana

TOTAL BRAND: Box 150, 15 104 65 Stockholm. Sweden, Anarchist magazine

INTERROGATIONS: Pour la Commune Humaine, 10F + post from Insecurite Sociale, BP 243, 75564 Paris Cedex 12

COMMUNISM [in english] 75 + post from 1666 Centre Monnaie, 1000 Brussels Belgium.

SCHWARZER FADEN nr 27, 5DM from Postfach 1159, 7043, Grafeneu-1, Federal Republic of Germany (incl. Bookchin interview).



FIFTH ESTATE: Challenges Radical Environmentalism. Vol. 22 No 3 & 4 \$7 sub. from Box 02548, Detroit, MI 48202, U.S.A.

KICK IT OVER: Anarcho feminist magazine, £4 sub. currency, from P.O. Box 5811, Station A, Toronto, Ontario Canada, M5W 1P2.

ANARCHY: A Journal of Desire Armée No. . Articles by Zerzan & Chomsky from, Cal., P.O. box 380, Columbia Missouri, 65205 USA. sub. \$6 issue

NOIR & ROUGE: (issues 6-8), 18F each from N&R, 0201185F, Limpoge France.

ADVENTURES IN SUBVERSION: Flyer & Posters 1981-5, Anti Authoritarian Anonymous, P.O. Box, Eugene, Oregon 97440 USA.

RABIES, A MAGAZINE & BIZARRE PROCESSED WORLD: by Stephan Klein, from Bound Together Books, 131 haight St., SF, Cal. 94117. 2.50\$

PROCESSED WORLD 21: 41 Sutter St San Francisco, Cal. 94104, 2.50\$

ANGRY WORKERS BULLETIN no. Shattuck Ave., Berkeley CA, 9470 (like 'Wildcat' group, donation).

LOMAKATSKI, no.2: Box 633, 1377 Street NW, Washington D.C. 20005, sub to critical 'green' magazine.

NEWS & LETTERS: Vol. 32 No 11, late Raya Dunayevskaya, 25c + pc from 59 E. Van Buren, room 707, Chicago III 60605.

LIBERTARIAN WORKERS BULLETIN Vol. 9 no. 1, from P.O. Box 20, Parkville 3052, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia Donation, comprehensive listing of title

ENLIGHTENED ANARCHISM: Swami Nirmalanandra, Karnatka, India

THE THIRD ASSAULT: FURTHER POINTS

para. 115.

Gus McDonald.

giving a damn: to create the pre-conditions for what may happen in period 88/98.

- (1) from 'The Bad Days Will End' IS/7 (1962), in the SI Anthology p84.
- (2) from 'Ubu Cocu', Alfred Jarry, in the Ubu Plays p78.
- (3) from 'The Society Of The Spectacle', Guy Debord (1967)

Some materials developing the Third Assault analysis will be produced in the next six months, and in the first instance will be available by mail to anybody who shows an interest in them - to 'subscribe', please contact Third Assault, c/o Here & Now. Supplementary to this, anybody interested in participating in a discussion group on matters arising who lives in the Sheffield area is also invited to make contact.

LIBERATION OF

LEARNING?

SACRIFICE

New York City, Nov '87.

Hello,
Found a copy of issue 5 of H&N in our [Libertarian Book Club] Box. I was absolutely compelled by the title to read its contents and am glad I did.

I really enjoyed the article "Gift Against Commodity". But one thing that was ignored was the concept of gift-giving to obtain a commodity, an emotional commodity, the PERSON as commodity. It was mentioned that gifts become what their values represent; what their values really represent is a concept of sacrifice, that the willingness to sacrifice is equated with the affection one has towards another, and in the case of the gift, one vies to see how much money one can sacrifice to purchase a gift. The motivation is not unselfish, as is perceived, but is to impress people by living up to a standard of generosity. This is done in the search for the REAL commodity, but as the affection or gratefulness of another person, and very often their love, friendship or cooperation. Thus the acquisition of some sort of emotional gratification, based on their position of desirable commodity as the reward for the action of giving. Even when it is done in the name of happiness, it is usually an attempt to reward a person for behaving in a manner that made YOU happy in the first place.

What do you think of these ideas?

Laure Akai-N.

FETISHISATION

Poplar, E.14, 1987.

Dear H&N,
Thanks for the copies of H&N & CI that arrived this morning.

First off, nice to see that old photograph of the British Library in a state of disintegration during the blitz reproduced on the cover. The editorial has an urgent tone about it, but I think is too dismissive: "nobody it seems, is asking what kind of life we are being trained for or what we can actually do to determine the future ourselves". I think people are always asking these questions, although the way this is expressed varies a lot - 'New Social Movements' are an example of this, if sometimes in a very limited way.

I found the 'Power of the Powerless' article interesting simply because I knew very little about Charta 77, beyond the name, before reading it. Steve Bushell's ideas on individuality & morality don't always strike a chord in me - that's putting it mildly! However, I have a lot of sympathy with the optimistic way in which he concludes his piece.

'Gift against commodity' & 'Notes on Credit' were both good for demonstrating the abstract nature of money/economics in accessible language, and thus - of course - that economic realism has no grounding in 'reality'. It's good to see this point made in a straightforward way!

Peter Suchin's essay was good for demonstrating where post-modernism is coming from, and effectively dismissing it. However, he fails to grasp that art is a social process that serves the bourgeoisie-ruling class - bureaucracy. At the core of this lies the fact

that the practices granted the status of art represent the interests of the ruling class. Thus in the West, beauty is considered a matter of personal taste, and art is whatever the museums and private collectors can be persuaded is art and will consequently buy. Duchamp, among others, exploited this fact and used it to secretly ridicule his patrons. But art, as Roger Taylor explains in his book "Art an Enemy of the People" is not autonomous of social processes and actively serves the interests of the bourgeoisie. And art is not, as Suchin seems to think, universal or eternal - it actually materialised in the

seventeenth century at the same time as modern science - prior to that art had a very different meaning. Besides, as Pierre Bourdieu points out in his book "Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste" art is not only essentially a form of snobbery - in its efforts to celebrate the lifestyle of the bourgeoisie, it increasingly avoids any reference whatsoever to the social. Instead it contains references to its own past which demand it to be perceived historically so that it may be referred to as the universe of the past and present works of art, rather than register an external referent, a represented or designated reality. It is an idealist illusion to imagine, as Suchin does, that art can fulfill any critical function, beyond their overturning of previous artistic traditions.

I take "The Third Assault" as an extract from a work in progress. What is needed, and I presume Gus McDonald is working on, is a rigorous critique of what he defines as the second wave. Using what I've just said about art, one can quickly see that this can be applied as a critique of Situationist writing on this subject. To say, as Debord does in "The Society of the Spectacle", and Vaneigem in "Revolution of Everyday Life", that art ended in dada & surrealism is a complete misunderstanding. Art is a social process that takes place under capitalism, the SI treated it as having an essence - which is mysticism. Art is not to be "realised and suppressed", that's just bullshit that implies something transcendent. I won't go into a full blown argument, but the SI's inability to understand art is not an aberration, basically it was a mystical organisation as a study of its use of the dialectic will show. The SI's claim to use materialist analysis is belied by the facts when it comes to art - and this is true of Lukacs, Adorno, and numerous other Marxists as well.

I felt Colin Webster's piece missed the positive aspects of a lot of the new social movements - and these movements have certainly been the root causes of positive changes in the left. Also there are greens, such as Cohn-Bendit, with a global and internationalist perspective. An ecological movement that doesn't deal with the planet as a whole isn't worthy of the name. After all, a planet is the smallest unit of life we know - all the food chains are connected across the globe, if you fuck the ozone layer you fuck the whole world etc.

Issue 5 reinforced my opinion that the magazine's basic problem is the fetishisation of what the contributors 'see' as 'economic' and 'political'... This substitutionism found its most fetid expression in Colin Webster's 'New Social Movements'. Along with Peter Suchin, Webster views 'culture' [defined in the restricted, normative sense of ordinary usage] as autonomous of other social processes. He goes so far as saying:

"To 'politicise' sexual or cultural orientations merely delivers up identity to surveillance, manipulation and subjective critique of 'behaviour'."

But then it's not a question of 'politicising' sexual or political orientations; it's long been a banality that 'the personal is political'. If the 'personal' is not an integral part of the social totality, then at Webster's insistence we must accept a pluralist view of this world - and such liberal perspectives belong to the right not the left. Which is why Webster's position is ultimately that of a bourgeois individualist.

The "Open Letter" ends the thing on a positive note. I find developments like the Glasgow Free University inspiring - showing that not everyone's completely cynical. The back cover was more traditional libertarian fare - but still amusing. Anyway it was nice to see a smartened up presentation too - although the anti-design of the last [H&N 4] knocked me out too.

Stewart, [Editor, 'Smile' Magazine.]

In the last issue, an 'Open Letter' makes passing reference to a 'free university' in Glasgow*. Over the past 15 months or so this has involved the majority of the Here & Now collective in the West of Scotland.

For us it has been an *opening out*, creating forums for discussion which in turn have spawned more focussed *autonomous politics* forums. From late August 1987, the F.U. project has organised a series of fortnightly discussions. These have been fairly eclectic in subject matter but have addressed contemporary issues such as the commercialised *Garden Festival* and the Poll Tax implementation.

Among the more notable from our perspective have been:

a panel of veteran anarchists on the 1940s Anarchist group & its rivalries;

a debate on Joseph Beuys, subversive art and a fundamental *Green* approach; *The Pleasure Tendency* on the decline of *Social Hope* & class politics;

computing networks & new technology struggles;

Simon Frith, Rock columnist, on the new structure of the Music Industry & its inter-relation with advertising;

& the editor of *Smile* on the futility of *realising & suppressing* Art by Lettrists, Situationists & Neoists.

Related to the project, there was a mildly successful post-General Election public forum in June and attempts to establish a Social Centre with funding. Compared to similar initiatives like the *New University* in Birmingham, the F.U. is probably less *alternativist*, being committed to creating a *public sphere* and taking the discussions outwith the *West End* radical & alternative ghetto.

* contact p/h 9, 340 W. Princes St., Glasgow G4. (send stamps to be mailed).

INFINITE

Glasgow, Sept '87.

Thanks for H&N. Very stimulating advance into new ideas - instead of churning up the old familiar brew. The editorial states the present very clearly. I find special interest in "Power of the Powerless". "The Third Assault" makes explicit what was implicit, as do the other articles.

I think the return of the moral principle is a concept that would be very hard to popularise; not because of inherent defects, but because it would be liable to infinite interpretation.

The moral principle may be returning. It is well to note that it has never been absent. It's alleged assassin, materialism - especially dialectical materialism - was really its assertion, for the dialectic portrayed as the inner working of a human urge to social justice. There is much more to be said on this subject.

JT Caldwell [biographer of Guy Aldred].

FURTHER COMMENTS ON ANIMAL LIBERATION

I thought AD's essay* on ALF was far the most interesting thing I've read on the subject from anyone on "the Left". *"Such a way of thinking has a certain power because it permits a position to be taken on everything, a confidence that behind every great commodity there's a suffering animal. It is the global nature of this meaning which is its attraction to the adolescent young, searching for a way into a seemingly hermetically-sealed society dominated by trivia and status-battles."*

This seems to be getting somewhere. It is right that we should look for the *positive* aspect of the Animal Liberation movement and identify ourselves with it, rather than take up a posture of lecturing them on the error of their ways from the standpoint of a fixed truth which we already know. The following notes are meant as a response to AD's "positive" criticism, offered in the same spirit, with a view to reaching greater clarity, and hopefully leading to a *better* understanding of the issues.

First, I should declare my interest: I'm not an ALF supporter, but I am much more in sympathy with their moral sentiments than AD seems to be. I got into vegetarianism and ecology-mindedness around 1970 with a small bunch of people in Oxford, and we published what must be one of the first books expressing the new wave of protest against exploitation of animals: Godlovitch & Harris (Eds.) *"Animals, Men and Morals"**. I'm not saying this just to claim any priority, but to establish my claim to know how these people think, because I recognise entirely their way of seeing the world, and I still *share* their feelings about the unspeakable horrors that go on in "scientific" research.

In fact, I still suspect that people who criticise ALF from a "Left" or "radical" standpoint themselves, when they acknowledge the cruelty inflicted on animals, do so *"with a moral system which bases itself on a concern for life in the abstract rather than the concrete"*. In other words, you go something like "OK, yes, these things are horrible, inexcusable, but..." and proceed to discuss the issues in abstract terms. I will refrain from describing in detail the particular experiment which "converted" me, in a flash, to the cause; the point I'm making is that it is *concrete reality* which is what morality is or should be about, and this is true *even if* many people develop "false" ideologies to make sense of their experiences.

Where I don't go along with AD is not just that he lapses into this abstract dichotomy between "humans" and "animals" (in his last paragraph) - Don't you know that what is done to animals is soon enough done to people, and it is done to animals because they *are* similar to humans? (Otherwise what value would the experiments have?) More important is the imputation of a breakthrough against "Commodity Fetishism" to the ALF ideology: *"(They) base themselves on an outrage against a "truth" perceived behind the shining polythene on the supermarket shelves, in the seemingly-agnostic commodity from which all traces of its production have been erased". Unfortunately, the Animal Liberation critique of the exploitation of animals does not grasp the connection between the exploitation of nature and the alienated mode of production symbolised in commodity-status of products. Would that it did. The "greatest error" of AL thinking is its uncertainty about the root cause of the evil it sees.*

A more fruitful line would, I think, be to take up the point AD starts with: the *tactics* of the ALF. He gives us a variant of the old Gauchiste wisdom *"I disagree with your aims but I approve of your methods"* This is the point at which the ALF people can begin to identify *themselves* with the concept of Capitalism, of Fetishism and the rest of the analysis which, I fear, AD is *reading into* their ideology. If they are going to make the connection, it has got to be done by going at least half-way with them and recognising where they are coming from.

MIKE PETERS

* * ²¹ Gollancz, 1972. Hard to get hold of now, because there was a libel suit which stopped publication. This was brought by the Research Defence League against *one sentence* in the chapter on animal experiments. Don't underestimate the forces the movement is up against!



1988	Low	Stock	Price	Chng	Yld	P/E
3	325	Miller & S	390	-2	1.0	44.8
1	234	Morrison W	245	xd-1	1.1	14.2
1 1/2	825	Moss Bros	£10 1/4	-	0.9	41.1
8	255	Next	263	xd+2	3.2	13.6
1	51	Norman Gp	52	-1	5.5	11.7
10	340	Oliver G	400	xd	4.3	29.7
10	183	Oriflame	200	-	2.8	-
17	250	Osborne&L	253	-2	2.3	16.4
10	600	Owen & Rob	650	-	0.2	13.9
15	108	Pentos	123	-	1.4	70.4
18	104	Preedy A	235	-	2.7	10.5
71	219	Rainers	251	xr-3	2.2	22.0
30	217	Sainsbury	232	-4	4.4	15.2
1	122	Sears	134	+1	2.4	22.2
32	240	Smallbone	292	xr	4.0	14.4
17	276	Smith WH A	291	-2	0.4	47.3
30	200	Sock Shop	263	xd	1.7	40.8
39	166	Stanley AG	298	-	5.6	16.1
19	92	Stead&S A	100	-4	4.4	13.5
33	216	Storehouse	275	+2	2.5	47.6
30	233	Stylo	270	-1	6.2	8.6
5	64	S&U Stores	88	-	2.6	13.9
1	147	Tesco	152	xd	5.1	15.6
38	190	Tele Rents	228	+12	1.3	25.6
1	115	Tie Rack	130	-1	2.8	15.2
36	153	Time Prods	195	-	2.4	23.0
30	109	Underwoods	144	+2	3.8	10.2
45	292 1/2	Ward White	317	xr-3	0.5	23.7
73	236	Wickes	260	-	1.5	-
27	148	Wigfall H	223	-	4.2	17.4
25	158	Wilding	198	+7	4.2	8.5
09	250	Woolworth	291	xd+3	4.3	14.3
10	76	Wid of Ltr	103	-	-	-

SERVICES & AGENCIES

23	180	AGB Res	215	-	4.9	17.0
78	259	AMI	260	-	1.7	-
3	55	Acis	70	+2	-	-
6	44	Ald Plant	52	xd	3.9	12.4
03	98	Aukett Ass	101	-2	-	-
27	90	Blue Arrow	117	xd	0.9	17.6
98	413	Christies	564	xd-3	3.2	12.4
68	145	Clarke Hpr	146	-	2.5	16.0
15	162	Comp Pile	182	xd-3	2.7	13.0
95	315	Fitch & Co	372	xd	2.9	13.4
6	56	Glentree	58	-2	1.5	45.3
18	75	Hambro Cty	95	xd-1	3.7	13.1
68	393	Johnson Cr	468	xd	5.4	12.0
12	31 1/2	Kunick	39	-	3.5	-
90	175	MIL Resear	175	-	2.3	17.0
01	76	Nestor BNA	92	+1	2.8	16.6
53	142	PCT	142	-	3.5	20.7
08	86	RCO	101	+3	0.9	24.7
205	165	Reed Exec	193	+1	2.9	17.4
65	130	Robertson	137	-	3.1	14.7
105	210	SecuricorA	302	-3	0.5	42.6
203	163	Securigard	193	+3	3.5	14.8
292	210	Sec Serv	288	-4	1.1	30.0
395	343	Sketchley	373	-	7.0	12.5
555	400	WPP	536	+22	1.6	16.7
165	118	W York Hsp	163	xd	3.8	15.3
253	90	Whinney ML	100	-	3.8	12.8
157	123	Wood JD	145	-	2.4	14.7

TEXTILES

380	300	Ald Text	351	+2	3.6	16.7
372	337	Alexon	372	+2	2.4	16.3
280	208	Atkins Brs	280	+2	4.3	15.6
54	31	Amber Day	45	-	0.0	-
505	388	Baird (Wm)	493	-	3.6	11.1
278	225	Beales J	232	-	3.3	7.4
118	105	Beckman A	116	xd	6.8	11.4
63	33	Bolton Tex	43	+1	0.0	29.8
208	180	Br Mohar	195	xd+1	5.2	8.5
93	68	Casket plc	80	-3	4.8	9.4
288	226	Coats Viy	240	-3	5.0	8.2
88	55	Corah	60	+1	3.7	17.0
394	298	Courtaulds	386	+2 1/2	3.5	10.0
115	90	CoxMoore	93	+3	4.8	-
191	104	Crowthier J	181	+4	3.3	10.1
231	187	Dawson	209	-	4.7	10.4
54	40	DewhirstJ	47	xd+1	2.7	10.4
130	100	Drummond	113	-	3.2	8.8
124	102	Earlys ofW	105	xd	1.7	28.8
73	55	Ellis & Gd	65	+5	5.5	11.0
325	270	Foimister	320	+5	3.2	10.1
130	110	Foster J	120	-	4.6	38.8
78	56	French T	78	+12	5.1	21.3
149	118	Gabicc	138	xd	3.6	12.0
62	50	Gent (SR)	55	xd	2.9	16.4
40	25	Goodman Gp	32	-1	1.4	34.4
163	133	Haggas J	140	xd	2.9	11.0
24	17	Hawtin	21	-1	2.5	75.0
255	231	Halstead J	238	xd	4.2	10.6
46	33 1/2	Helene Lon	34	-1	6.6	10.6
71	51	Hicking P	63	+1	0.0	26.9
65	57	Hollis	60	-	6.2	13.8
182	125	Illingwt	164	+9	3.5	13.6
238	165	Jerome S	225	xd+7	4.0	9.1
210	150	Jones Strd	170	-	4.2	11.1
288	228	Lamont Hld	280	-	3.4	9.0
83	65	Lawtex	73	-	3.8	6.6
505	295	Leeds Gp	375	-3	2.3	13.1
62	27	Leslie Wis	55	-	5.0	9.5
144	111	Lister	116	-	4.1	6.6
190	160	Low RH	185	-	2.1	10.9
118	94	Martin A	108	+1	5.3	9.0
54	41	Munton Bro	51	-	-	-
195	163	Parkland A	176	-2	4.0	12.6

UTILITIES

186	171	Brit Gas	174	-	5.1	-
260	220	Br Telecom	248 1/2	-1	4.9	11.8
382	314	Cable & Ws	337	xd-7	2.4	16.8

RECENT ISSUES

Stock	Price	Chg
Dag Motors	113	-2
Handley W	145	-
Hldrs Tech	144	+1
Johnston	138	-
Micrellec	124	-2
Moorfield	126	+3
P&P	182	+1
Printech	85	-
Reflex Inv	80	-
West Trust	45	-

RIGHTS ISSUES

Stock	Price	Chg
Astra N/P	22	-
Br oflineNP	50	+1
Barclay NP	131	-
ComsoftNP	15	-
F&H N/P	42	+1
Power N/P	27	-
SD - Sci N/P	21	-
West TstNP	40	+2

HERE & NOW - Number Six CONTENTS

- 2 Editorial.
- 2 Reports
- 2 Sado-Porno Soap.
- 3 Liberation Sexology.
- 3 Resistance in Scotland.
- 4 At Breakdown Point.
- 5 Blowing Hot & Cold.
- 7 Features
- 7 Notes on Eastern Europe.
- 9 Eclipse & Re-emergence of the Economic Movement.
- 9 New Ideas
- 12 The New Liberals.
- 14 Reviews
- 14 Beware the Barmaid's Smile.
- 16 Clear Sighted Minority?
- 17 Deep Ecology.
- 18 Short Reviews & Listings.
- 18 Correspondence

- 8 Third Assault Debate (continued on pp 13 & 18).
- 19 Liberation of Learning.
- 19 Letters.
- Graphics on pp 6 & 15 by **Graham Harwood.**
- ***
- Published by the Here & Now Collective in the West of Scotland:-
- p/h 2, 340 West Princes St., Glasgow G.4.
- NOTE: POs/Cheques made out to **G.P.P.**, not Here & Now.
- Subscriptions: £2 for 3 issues, U.K. □ £2.50, overseas, □ £4, Institutions.

Printed by Clydeside Press, 37 High St., Glasgow.

Distribution: orders via Glasgow address apart from:-
 West Coast USA, Flatland Distribution, 1844 Foothill Boulevard, Oakland.
 E.Coast USA: a.Distribution, 396, 7th St., Jersey City, 07302, New Jersey.
 London: A.Distribution, c/o, 84b Whitechapel High St., London E.1.
 Stalls/offers of bulk distribution, enquire via Glasgow address.

Back-Issues are available at 50p (add postage if overseas):-

- no.1:** Management of Schooling; Kampuchean Communism; Post-68 Arena of Discontent; Non-work struggles; Political Personality.
- No.2:** 5th Generation Computing; The Re-making of the Community; Critiques of Castoriadis & Germaine Greer; The Subversive Past; Authenticity.
- No.3:** Perception of Riots, Animal Liberation; Leftist Marketplace; Poland; Nomenclatura in the U.S.S.R.; critique of Christopher Lasch.
- No.4:** Invasion of Exchange; Bookchin & Municipalism; Greens after Chernobyl; Critique of Baudrillard; Return of the Moral Subject.
- No.5:** Notes on Credit, and Gifts; Havel's 'Power of the Powerless'; Third Assault; Art & Fashion; Critique of New Social Movements.

No.7 will be produced in West Yorkshire, send articles, reviews, correspondence by end of August to Glasgow address.

320	470	Wrest
267	213	York C
125	105	Yule C

DRINKS

429	322	Ald - L
60	33	Alpine
609	543	Barr A
867	746 1/2	Bass
50	42	Beihav
154	127	Boddin
32	10	Brewrr
207	153	Buckle
183	147	Bulme
151	120	Burton
395	332	Clark I
337	292	Devoni
364	325	Eldridg
508	480	Fuller :
211	195	Gibbs
505	430	Grand
221	175	Green
494	436	Green
323	271	Guinn
697	655	Hardy:
115	76	Highla
215	167	Inverg
850	523	Macall
12 1/2	11 1/2	Maodc
460	405	Mansfi
121	110	Marstr
390	330	Merryt
503	463	Morfar
246	235	Nichol
294	206	Scot&I
358	275	Stn Af
583	480	Vaux
318	271	Whitb
396	350	Wolv i
370	317	Yng B

UNDATED

448	340	AB Eli
56	31	AMS
37	22	Acorn
116	88	Alba
290	217	Alphai
173	113	Amstr
362	262	Apd P
114	93	Apnc
170	110	Arlen
448	344 1/2	Atlant
137	77	Audio
263	223	Auto I
66	35	Beacc
45	33	Benne
186	133	Blick
352	301	BICC
218	174	Britan
91	71	BSR
194	160	Bowth
121	85	Borin
24	13	Bulgr
88	53	CASE
120	106	CML
94	72	CPU I
243	193	Camt
58	34	Camt
303	191	Cap C
631	540	Chem
65	47	Chlor
23	10	Cifer
170	125	Circa
53	38	Comp
257	160	OCF
210	170	Cnt I
85	75	Crant
237	203	Cray
183	141	Cryst.
75	50	DDT
105	75	Dale
65	38	Dens
58	38 1/2	Dewit
222	178	Diplo
64	53	Dow
214	117	Dubal
204	15 1/2	Eagk
70	35	Ealin
210	176	Elect
150	105	Elect
92	65	Elect
430	367	Emer
362	267	Eurol
90	32	F&H
143	112	FKI t
181	147	Farm
81	58	Feed
93	76	Ferre
315	250	Fst S
69	50	Fonw
169 1/2	142	GEC
214	192	Harri
69	46	High
143	84	Holn
278	195	Hosk
36	19	Hum
65	45	ITL t
24	5	Imte
85	70	INST
210	150	Jose
455	410	Kels
54	40	Klarf
383	328	Kodk
355	250	Lec
298	237	Logi
220	123	Lorli
643	511	Luca
286	225	Mac
83	63	Mac
145	60	Man
25	19	Men
237	173	Men
95	69	MBS
75	74	MTL
180	85	Micr
433	288	Micr
315	244	Micr
312	260	Micr
44	28	Micr
190	120	Mite
98	70	Mit
79	43	Mul
44	28	Mur

INDEX

120 1/2	117 1/2	Tr
101 1/2	98 1/2	Tr
136 1/2	127 1/2	