The riot was an eruption of anger and frustration that has been building up for years. That is everybody's problem, but the blacks had been deliberately picked out by the police.

The police provocation was met by massive resistance by the whole community - black, white, male and female. They fought with anything they could lay their hands on, until they forced the police out of their area. When the police turned and ran, the youths moved in for the spoils. Taking what is theirs but what the law denies them. We were told that trolley loads of groceries, fags and booze were wheeled away, radio sets and HiFis carted back home.

St. Pauls Bristol: a little known working-class district before April 2nd 80. But the riot that started with a police raid on the Black and White cafe showed that the police are not invincible. Where there is anger and determination they can be beaten.

The police provocation was met by massive resistance by the whole community - black, white, male and female. They fought with anything they could lay their hands on, until they forced the police out of their area.
PAGI: TWO

My dream last year has not produced any more copies. Your left, you regard NF supporters as a bit of a bore. Of course, like all the Spearhead, their magazine, but I've been wondering what the hell is going on lately! I used to get copies of 'Xtra!' from the news-rack outside Balham Tube station. Of course, it's a bit of a bore. One meeting I brought along a workmate. That was a mistake. I got elected Branch Treasurer. This is how these vicious union bureaucrats are made. The next stage is in these vicious union bureaucrats. There's a sector of our branch that sends in money regularly without our knowledge. We don't know who it is. Would brother Johnson of the postal district please contact branch 1647, we need militants like you, maybe you can help spend your money. I like our branch really, it has a quaint sort of charm. We've got this SWP member with a speech impediment. He keeps on losing track of his line. There were these two pseudo-revolutionary 'make-an-end' conferences - one organised by Socialist Workers, the other by the Revolutionary Communist 'B deadly' (I think). He couldn't remember which one was which. So I sent him to the Revolutionary Communist's 'one of the sort of people I connect with'. We got a letter from the TUC last meeting. We were really chuffed. It said they were holding a Day of Action in a few weeks time and we were invited to participate. Of course, they weren't calling any strikes or anything like that, but if we wanted to take the day off, they'd provide the lunch. There was some spiffing good talk in the branch about general, strikes, arming the pickets etc. I said I'd carry half of our banned

ON ME AND MY UNION

I belong to a union. It's a union marked by the most heavy-handed authoritarianism, financial inefficiency, appalling communications and a horrifically apathetic membership. It's the biggest Union in the country - wonder what all these other Unions are like.

As a working class union none of your trendy sitting around in a circle stuff. At my first union meeting there were six people sitting on the platform and four people actually representing the 'membership', and I think they had a bit of a hard time. Everyone was in the wrong room and didn't want to be noticed by doing something positive like walking out.

Debate is at a really high level. Really participatory. I brought up really radical changes when I arrived - like voting. The chairperson, (though he wouldn't recognise that description) thought a motion was carried if it was merely proposed and seconded.

One meeting I brought along a workmate. That was a mistake. I got elected Branch Treasurer. This is how these vicious union bureaucrats are made. The next stage is in these vicious union bureaucrats. There's a sector of our branch that sends in money regularly without our knowledge. We don't know who it is. Would brother Johnson of the postal district please contact branch 1647, we need militants like you, maybe you can help spend your money. I like our branch really, it has a quaint sort of charm. We've got this SWP member with a speech impediment. He keeps on losing track of his line. There were these two pseudo-revolutionary 'make-an-end' conferences - one organised by Socialist Workers, the other by the Revolutionary Communist 'B deadly' (I think). He couldn't remember which one was which. So I sent him to the Revolutionary Communist's 'one of the sort of people I connect with'. We got a letter from the TUC last meeting. We were really chuffed. It said they were holding a Day of Action in a few weeks time and we were invited to participate. Of course, they weren't calling any strikes or anything like that, but if we wanted to take the day off, they'd provide the lunch. There was some spiffing good talk in the branch about general, strikes, arming the pickets etc. I said I'd carry half of our banned

FROM THE POSTBAG....

Dear As:

I've just got hold of 2 give away copies of 'Xtra!' from the news-rack outside Balham Tube station. Although I am far right, I DO read left wing mags to find out what you are saying. Xtra! I must admit, is in the LITTLEジャコット, stuffy and humourless but the usual output.

As an NF sympathiser, I've been wondering what the hell is going on lately! I used to get Spearhead, a socialist magazine, but either someone has made off with their subscription records, or their subscription, since my cheque last year has not produced any more copies. Your articles, attacks hostile to the Front, provide illumination in the blackout. Of course, like all the left, you regard NF supporters as collectivists, efficient in reasoning power (and they dismiss the whole of the left as subhuman). But at least you seem to realise that social deprivation, not just malice, may drive people into the NF. The logical conclusion is that just clashing fellow workers over the head won't solve the problems of the inner city, where both of you draw support. Dare I say it, but for the grace of Marx, some of you could have gone straight! But I'm middle class, ex public school, and can't understand why the workers don't try to get along with one another a little better.

The Front's main appeal to me is that we are facing an in-destabilising the de-Europeanisation of the U.K. I'm friendly with indivi-idual bourgeois to respect the Front have a point about the holy alliance between capitalism, and the left, who want raw recruits for demons. I'll buy the Front's stand on law 'n' order too, as we middle class like a bit of stability. However, as I look to Europe and voted for the Common Market, I oppose the NF's failure to sup- port the only WHITE rich man's club within reach. As for anti- semitism, this is a bit of a bore and doesn't grab my imagination at all.

I'm in a dilemma, especially after reading Xtra! and other reporting on the NF. My favourite newspaper, the 'Nudes of the World' has carried stories about Martin W's gayhood, and the anti-semitism 'To Mephisto's Pillars'. It's good to know someone's on our side.

Optimism before the big Sellout

Our address is:
Xtra!
182. Upper Street
Islington
London N1.
accident in Piccadilly Circus where a model nuclear power station went 'puff!' and the people around it 'kinda' died (good spontaneous stuff).

The trouble with the march was it was too much like every other march. You know, you assemble, walk, chant a bit, try to find friends. And when you finally get to the end, you all cram into Trafalgar Square and all stare at a platform of assembly

It would have been more fun and relevant to replace the platform with a fair. Something to get involved in.

'STROLLIN...

Well there we were, assembled for the first major anti-nuclear demo. A stroll from Hyde Park to Trafalgar Square, in the company of 'nice' liberals, 'monsignors', etc etc. All to celebrate (if that's the word) the first anniversary of Harrisburg - or the first birthday of the day they nearly lost Pennsylvania.

Even without the tubes, a figure of somewhere around 15,000 people turned up, and the sun came out in solidarity, braving the cold with the rest of us.

The highlight of the march for me was dying in a nuclear mail, we are not afraid to point the finger. The two groups of dissolutes involved were the March 25th Group (which our informants suggest is based around Kent University) and the Hastings Anarchists.

It is time for ordinary decent people took a stand against the actions of this politically motivated minority.

'BUFF SAD...

The National Front holds its biggest rally yet - over two thousand participating - from the front steps of an empty house. Anti-Fascist demonstrators, confused by deliberate police blind alleys are to be found anywhere and everywhere from Elephant and Castle down to Peckham. It's a problem of communication. Next time: a radio to listen to Police messages? More people on bikes to find out what's going on and let everyone else know walkies talkies (?!?)

In this day and age, it is perhaps only to be expected that the very foundations of our society should be subject to mockery and cruel jests. The pristine splendour of the ancient ceremony of the new Archbishops enthronement was disrupted by what can only be described as hooligan elements. These unfortunate can only be seen as poor hapless tools in the pay of more sinister foreign agencies.

Both our front page picture and this one show these individuals at their game. Our police can only be praised for their forbearance and firm response.

'XTRA!...'

On October 10th last year, 96 women, all asian, stormed out of CHIX sweet factory in Slough after a 'meeting' in which the owner of the company Mr Denis 'The Fuhrer' Rose (home address available on request) refused to discuss the complaints of his 160 workers.

These 96 workers made up 90% of the staff. The other 10% were the supervisory members of staff, by coincidence; all white.

This strike has been made into a strike over union recognition, but that is only the superficial cause of this motion. Of the asian women have only a limited knowledge of English language and therefore could not express their complaints to the management. They were then given a chance to have an English speaking representative to act on their behalf, the all-powerful union official (Gent's General and Municipal Workers Union).

The strike was called when Rose refused to recognise the union but the reason for the strike was the conditions under which the women were working. It was the need to change these conditions that made them turn to the union for help.

The women were earning £9 per hour (£38 per week), working in poor conditions and suffering constant racist abuse from the all white management and supervisory staff.

The racist abuse has not stopped with the strike. Rose, straining his intellect to its limits, divides the pickets outside his factory into two groups. The Asians are 'apes' and the white pickets are 'unemployed, vog-loving layabouts'. The Fuhrer expressing his anger at any student protest said that in his Masterplan all universities would be closed for three years and all students forced to do engineering.

Rose has told the press that his wages are no lower than many other factories in the area but he fails to mention that since the beginning of the strike he has increased wages by 30p per hour to £1.25 per hour.
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We know war is coming. We know we’ve got to do something about it, but what? and what sort of support can we realistically expect from “ordinary” people?
Before the first World War socialists from all the soon-to-be belligerent countries were “united” in the 2nd International. They confidently believed working class strength would prevent full-scale war. Below we look at what went wrong and why it went wrong.

**Differences**

“Our exactions have been in vain. None of the socialists have only too often been surprised by the fact that war is upon us and we are menaced by the terror of foreign invasion!”

This declaration came from the German Social Democratic Party (SPD), on 4th October 1914. On the other hand French socialists in France, Germany and Austria voted for war credits, granting their governments the money to rearm. The German declaration expresses the views of them all.

Just what had happened to the international socialist movement? The question of how war was to be prevented had been a major topic at socialist conferences since the anarchists had introduced it in 1888. And since then a myriads of different theories and tactical approaches had been debated. But there were widely differing opinions on how socialists should react to war. The centrist marxists (including the bulk of the SPD) favoured a form of parliamentary opposition, backed up by street demonstrations. By and large, they reasoned, only socialism could end wars. And since they saw socialism as both inevitable and imminent, it implied that real action was a waste of time.

**Ouvrierism**

For this attitude French socialist Herve accused the SPD of transforming the “international socialist movement doing men of the world - massacre each other’ An extreme pacifist (that is, before 1914 Herve advocated mass organisation and desertions in the event of war. But his view was not shared by the vast bulk of French socialists. What they did not accept extreme pacifism, they did support the idea of preventing war. They denounced the real menace of the controversial general strike. The general strike was first proposed as a tactic against war by the Dutch anarchist Nieuwenhuis in 1891. And it was taken up by the French socialists largely as a weapon of uniting themselves with the main socialist union in France the CGT (Confederation generale du travail). This heavily anarchists influenced syndicalist union based its beliefs on “ouvrierism” - a rejection of intellectualism and politics in favour of economic action. It saw the general strike as the revolutionary tactic, a spontaneous, collective action of a proletariat on the verge of triumph. And as a tactic to prevent war it had the advantages of criticism of the war had been forcibly and raising class consciousness.
However, the most extreme version of anti-militarism came from Luxemburg, Lenin and the ultra-left marxists. Insurrection and mass strikes (not general strikes, this idea was tainted with implications of anarchism) would just be a beginning. With capitalism weakened war would provide the ideal moment for the revolution itself to begin.

The nearest the second international got to consensus on the question of anti-militarism was at its Stuttgart conference in 1907. Its resolution was a remarkable achievement indeed. Synthesising a whole range of arguments into a statement that had something for everyone, it managed to avoid the trouble some problem of international action altogether.

Even so, the years leading up to World War One weren’t just characterised by endless discussion, Italy’s involvement in Tripolitania (1911) was met with a succession of protests and demonstrations across Europe, with a general strike in Italy itself. There were mass demonstrations in all of the movements affiliated capitals in 1912 at the outbreak of the first Balkan war. And the German Socialists mounted a full-blown psychological anti-militarism at home, even relaxing their differences with the French for a time. None of these actions altered the course of events. But it didn’t seem to matter that all much. By July 1914 several thousands of “sympathisers” had everyone in the socialist camp into a false sense of security. And the death of Franz Ferdinand caught most of the leaders in bathing suits enjoying summer vacations.

By the time that war was declared it was inevitable there would be little or no opposition - and, apart from some that took place in the soul-searching by the Germans, most of the parties had no trouble in switching their efforts to the “defence”.

Why was this so inevitable? The truth is the socialist movement had never been international. There had been cases where it had been moving in the same direction and suspicions between the various national groups. And in 1909 Nieuwenhuis had almost openly shouted down when he’d dared suggest that belief in the nation was “antiquated prejudice”. The German SPD was or was not a “defensive” war. Lenin concluded the only side with any justification in war was the small nation combating imperialism. But in the German camp, at least, there were people who fully supported imperialism on the grounds that it raised the living standards of ordinary Germans.

**Stake**

Perhaps more important the German and French had a stake in the existing order. The SPD was a massive bureaucratic structure with assets which made it an enemy of the corporatist who had greater parliamentary strength and also felt more could be gained within than outside. The British, beyond their其余 snakes to go to war was so like that of the British liberals as to be indistinguishable from it. The trade unions, on the other hand were in many ways (with the exception of the CGT) even more conservative than the parties.

When it came to making a real stand both parties and unionists had more concern for their own organisations (and thus also for the nations in which they operated) than they had for stopping war. And this is hardly surprising. The Germans were still uneasy that anti-socialist laws might be re-imposed. The French were aware that a list (carnet B) of potential “troublemakers” in the event of war had been drawn up by the government. It was also not surprising that ordinary Europeans were nationalistic and conservative in attitude. Most of them had seen what seemed like a transformation in their own lifetimes. Socialists were making massive electoral gains; they were taking part in government. They seemed to be moving towards a position of strength which would benefit the working class.

The only real exceptions to the backsliding majority were the Russians. In Russia bread riots and wave upon wave of strikes marked the beginning of revo lution. The July Manifesto is often viewed as being to right - anti-war protest (albeit after the war had started) could lead to revolution and withdrawal from war. But if the socialist parties had given up protesting by 1914, this wasn’t true of all the people they purported to rep resent. In the forces there were deserters by those who were individually disillusioned. More important there were strikes, walkouts, demonstrations and takeovers by groups of the disillusioned and these were increasing in number as the war continued.

Many of these mutinies were small and short lived. Several hundred RFC men at Biggin Hill went on strike for, and won, better living conditions. 20,000 soldiers on strike took over Southampton docks. Similar actions was taking place throughout Europe, and it was involving hundreds of thousands of people.

Neither was protest limited to the armed forces. At home the fires were being kept gently smouldering. In Britain, for example, the 1915 Munitions Act made it illegal for those working in the war industry to strike. It also tried to prevent workers from moving out of munitions - by prohibiting other employ 3ers from taking them on within a speci fied period of their leaving such employment. The Act was never completely successful. A powerful shop stewards movement, including many who had been syndicalists, consistently opposed the measures and strikes continued - as much to the annoyance of Trade Union Officials as to the government.

It cannot be said these examples did not have an international effect. Few of them were revolutionary. But they did prove that war tends to polarize class conflict. The working class - as cannon fodder and producer - is pushed to its limits and is prepared to fight back.

**Bankrupt**

If the example of the First World War tells us anything it is that protest will happen no matter how bankrupt left wing leadership proves itself to be. In fact, by capitulating when it did, the left effectively legitimised nationalism and quite possibly slowed down the amount of protest there might have been. As Hitler was to write of the German Socialists: “To argue......that in 1914 the SPD worker did his duty is false. For it was not the avowed Marxist who did his duty at that time but the German who, in a state of inward elation, temporarily re-nounced Marxism.”

The Second International provided links that should have enabled it to coordinate its anti-militarist propaganda. Today those links do not exist, but we must succeed where it failed.
That means not just talk but action. Direct and deliberately illegal action has to be backed up with propaganda. And if we are to have any success at all, we have to start now - warning people about what we’re being psych up to. Appealing to people as the individuals who will be facing the firing line. Appealing to working people as the class which will pay for the war they never asked for.
Why

Capitalist Economies

Spel the War

Wars to end all wars, that was how the two great imperialist holocausts of this century were portrayed both before and after they took place. The First World War was depicted by the Allies as a crusade against secret diplomacy and Prussian militarism. The Second was explained as a crusade against fascist and Nazi barbarism.

After the First World War we were told that the powers would spontaneously disarm. After the Second they told us that, on the contrary, it was the very existence of stockpiles of arms which would safeguard peace.

What rubbish will they come up with after the next disaster for humanity? Already we are being prepared for the next ‘crusade’ with a barrage of ideological propaganda, the Russian ruling class ranting about capitalist encirclement, the Western elite about Soviet hegemonic ambitions. Underlying this mystification is capitalism (on both sides of the Iron Curtain), locked in a cycle of crisis, war and reconstruction. After World War II capitalism seemed to have solved its contradictions by balanced expansion of internal markets through deficit budgeting (that is, high levels of public spending) and controlled wage bargaining by ‘responsible’ trade unionism. But the days of peaceful reconstruction are at an end, the system has proved itself once again unstable. Why? Capitalism must expand or collapse. Businesses must increase their rate of profit to support the capitalist class itself, to support the capitalist system, and the destructive capacity of the capitalist powers makes this an absolute necessity.

The preparations for imperialist war must be overtaken by class war – just as the strain of rearmament demanded sacrifices by the German working-class, whose revolt could have caused the destruction of the regime.

In the face of the world situation, factories, offices, homes, etc, as an additional overhead, on the market sectors of the economy, Ams represent an investment which demands a return – a return that can only be found by using them for imperialist plunder.

For instance, when Hitler accelerated his war-course in 1937, he did so largely because the strain of rearmament demanded sacrifices by the German working-class, whose revolt could have caused the destruction of the regime.

In fact, the peaceful alternative of massive rearmament is only an illusionary one. Every time the bourgeoisie now tries to raise production to all-time heights of capital accumulation, it is faced with the destruction of the regime.

The proletariat is the only class capable of reversing the drift to war. But there are limits to how far they can exploit workers – so rates of profit tend to fall. Therefore permitted consumption must be expanded, which means creating vast, ever-changing desires; but on the other hand, obsolete plant must be replaced to increase productivity, which means consumption must be curbed to invest on an ever-increasing scale.

The inherently revolutionary nature of the proletariat will only reveal itself when it acts autonomously of such constraints, resisting all austerity measures whether or not mediated through the unions and the ‘workers’ parties. Only then can the permanent tendency of capitalism towards war be reversed; only when capitalism in its totality is swept from the face of the earth to be replaced by a human community producing for need and not artificially created desires, will the scourge of war disappear altogether.

The preparations for imperialist war must be overtaken by class war - the destructive capacity of the capitalist powers makes this an absolute necessity.
**TOWARDS A REVOLUTION**

**That T.U.C. March**

TUC activists and their wives (in thick jumpers and high-heeled shoes) waded through the mire of Hyde Park. It was annual demo time - when you do your bit for Labour by mouthing all the politics. But we aren't the only ones who can't remember which cause this day of inaction was supposed to be supporting.

Well, let's face it, it was boring. And the cops wouldn't let us sell papers in the park, so it wasn't even going to be profitable.

Comrades gathered by a park kiosk. Word had gone out there was going to be a bit of 'entertainment'. Well, it was funny, there were only about thirty of us - and thousands and THOUSANDS of them.

Do it yourself posters were hysterically funny. Anarchists are amazingly good at ripping up placards, but when it came to attaching our own posters we could have done with an SWP hack or two, complete with the tools of the trade. (Ever tried to buy sellotape in Wembley?)

**Energy**

All that surplus energy and yet no way were we going to take over any marches.

We started at the back behind the Young Socialists, but we wouldn't have stayed there for hours. Blowing whistles, chanting anti-trot irrelevancies and trying to keep a few new war dances, we moved round the park. We even had a few people dancing. And paper sales, rose dramatically, especially when we gave them a free blow on a whistle too.

People seemed a bit hesitant at first, glancing roundふつふつを to be sure friends weren't watching.

Now, we could have just kept on going round. But we didn't want to end up being the Park attraction. So, we'd join the demo as it meandered its way out of the park. A pair of scissors made short work of the white tapes penning in each 'section' (y'know, Nos. one to ten, union leaders, MPs etc, workers at the back)

No-one seemed to want to join us - apparently they were prepared to wait ten years to move off, rather than disobey stewards (after all they've got ARMANDS on!).

**Exit**

It could also have been because as we carressed across the park towards the exit, a line of cow-uniformed stewards (which group were they with?) started moving down to meet us.

OK, it wasn't on. One comrade was warned for being scissors-happy, (wonder what you charged with for cutting bits of white ribbon?).

One quick dash straight across the park and we're in the middle of the demo itself, followed by two luckless cops demanding to know what was happening. (We're not doing anything about when we're going and what we intend to do. When we laugh they're confused and clearly don't believe us.)

We decide to cut across to Trafalgar Square. Chants of 'autonomy' don't seem to appeal to anyone but us and we are told to disappear in time-honoured English.

**Mayfair**

The inhabitants of Mayfair are a bit bemused by the group of black flags bearing down on them. (surely they must be lost? - 'Hey! the demo went thataway!')

Yeah, well a panda car seems to have lost too, (what luck something for our lot to do for all that!).

The next thing we know the heavy mob are upon us. In a show of spontaneous mass decision-making, the comrades turn right into an alley at breakneck speed, with SPG contenders for the Olympics (Neadan, not Moscow) in hot pursuit.

Three comrades are stopped and searched, then released again in the alley, (we keep this one peaceful ladies). A fourth in a show of revolutionary solidarity quickly disappears. A revolutionary insinuation in favour of a brisk walk and a reassuring whistle.

**Garner**

In the Haymarket the group stops to point out to an erring TUC worker that he's eating in Garners. He seems unimpressed.

But not nearly as unimpressed as the armed ranks of union stalwarts when we start heckling in Trafalgar Square. Apparently we're all scrumming and/or paid by Moscow and none of us know what a bath's for.

They, of course, do know what a bath's for. They're also hot on what cameras are for. A steady flow of people takes time off from revolutionary chanting to take the tourist pics of Number Ten that will grace family albums for years to come.

Say cheese Maggie....

We are not beautiful
We are not ugly
We are ANGRY

A man in striped swimming trunks wearing a Miss Stereotype sash. The basis for the stage lights were removed and hidden before the show.

3) Smoke bombs in the theatre during the show.

5) Bags of flour and eggs to be thrown among the audience during the show.

6) Rape alarm to let off.

8) Men in bikinis to storm the stage.

**Practice**

The picket was received with enthusiasm and joyful shouts of 'who'd want to exploit Your bods?' etc. There was some disagreement among the women about who should - some of us didn't like the chant 'men are sick, cut off their pricks'. A policewoman asked us whether we knew anything about the stolen fuses. We told her that we didn't know who had done it: Most of us didn't. The show was delayed, but eventually replacement fuses were found.

Some of us had gone into the theatre with tickets - others sneaked in during the interval. Inside, the contestants were being interviewed. One of them was asked why she thought there were women protesting about the contest. She giggled and replied she thought we wanted to be beauty queens but didn't have the confidence.

During the interviews the smoke bombs exploded, filling the theatre with smelly red smoke, sending the audience scampering out yelling 'FIRE!' (until calmed by the compere). Flour and eggs were thrown, one bag of flour landing at the contestants feet. All the bombers split fastish, but were spotted by

We are not beautiful
We are not ugly
We are ANGRY

**About Those Tickets**

They'd planned their precious debate for months. Getting hold of tickets was no problem - forgery was easy. Next year. Naomi Delaney, Miss Oxford: I think it is a shame people of that mentality should do that sort of thing.

**Heckler: What about workers' councils?**

Second heckler: ... but Dave I keep trying to tell you

- I don't want to work!
It was billed as the debate of the decade. Tony Benn on how the Labour Party is the only hope for socialism, despite the last eighty years. Paul Foot on why working class militancy needs a vanguard party and Tariq Ali on why revolutionary should work through parliament and 'please Tony why can't we join your party?'

All these sterile little ideologues trying to blame each other for the decline in the left over the past ten years and their failure to relate to ordinary people. Ten years ago they saw themselves as a force for the future, today they've got a reactionary government with more conviction than they have themselves.

Yes, we had come to destroy the meeting. There were thirty-nine of us in all, consisting of anarchists and autonomists. The two main groups were the London Workers' Group and the Monday Group, with a sprinkling of odd Tyrants (some of them very odd indeed). Punk was the word most used to describe us. But I'd say we were more into black leather, Still, enough of these poetic details.

We started off at a gentle pace, with the Revolutionary Communist Tendency and the Sinn Fein leading the way with vocal interjections. However, by the time Tony Benn started up Peter Hain (chairperson) could detect he had a 'sloganising disruptive minority' to contend with.

As far as I can remember the meeting voted to throw us out, but all the stewards stood around in the aisles and made no moves. As if to illustrate the value of solidarity, an isolated Irish heckler in front of us was bravely attacked by about half a dozen stewards. This led to a unique autonomist-Sinn Fein alliance.

The reaction of the rest of the audience were typical of the weaknesses of the left as a whole. They were angry at having their meeting disrupted, yet they were so passive. Serried ranks ranks of mutely protesting little militants. About as much life and vigour as a trade union committee. All Tariq Ali could do was protest to the New Statesman that we supported the Red Brigades (that's odd, I thought he did...).

So, after giving Paul Foot a hard time (of course our interruptions did not appear in OW's account of his speech), we filed out. Afterward I was told the meeting became even more turgid and boring. At least we injected some excitement into their wretched debate.

Incidentally neither the steelworker nor Hilary Wainwright (co-author of Beyond the Fragmentations) were heckled that much. Wainwright emphasised the extra-parliamentary opposition of, for example, women's and rank and file groups. And she opposed opportunistic party building.

Some anarchists would criticise our actions on the lines of Paul Foot's 'don't call them anarchists - any self-respecting anarchist would be shocked at their behaviour'. But then brown rice and vegetarianism aren't in themselves revolutionary forces. If you want a liberating revolution, Paul Foot and Benn of this world are going to be even more upset.

On a final point, we were told they were recording the debate with the aim of producing an album. 'Revolutionary slogans for the converted', I suppose they'll have to put it out as a single now.

'Even though the oppressed masses have often rebelled against capital and its agencies, they have only done so under the leadership of the intelligentsia, and the firm solidarity and discipline won in this common struggle subsequently proves to be the strongest support of the system once these leaders openly go over to the side of capitalism'.

So wrote Anton Pannekoek in England.

The Debate of the Decade was a superlative example of the role played by the middle-class intelligentsia as shock absorber of any revolt from below. Not a single worker on the stage, very few in the audience. Keep quiet; people have come to hear His Master's Voice. If you want to say something write down a question and we might consider letting you speak. Sssh! You will give us revolutionaries a bad press.

We must understand the rules these people perform. They have plenty to say about the forms protest must take - build the socialist party, sell our newspaper, come on our demonstration. But a fetish for organisational forms is only a wet blanket on any spirit of revolt. Where rebellion is mediated through unions, parties or controlled de-1920 about the class struggle, it is separated from its source. It is lost on attempts at reform, where no real reform can be offered.

Organisation is important, but only so long as this is moulded by the current mood and objectives of the people in struggle. Beyond that, organisation becomes an end in itself, and therefore one more obstacle to revolution.

Only by consistently challenging this control over protest, only by taking protest beyond what is permitted, will people gain confidence in themselves, a spirit of autonomy which is the precondition of any social revolution.

Anyone who has been on a demonstration where anger and indignation have broken free of the constraints imposed by police and leaders will know what I am talking about. It has to be experienced to be understood. A sudden upsurge against the latent violence of everyday life, and, instantly, if only momentarily, you feel the beginning of popular power. Any demonstration, any 'protest' that follows will be oppressive if it less than that moment. It will be revealed for what it is - a process of letting off steam while they are still in control, subverting any sense of class unity.

No one can doubt the left believes it has the answers to the crisis. But whenever we allow them to channel our spirit of rebellion away from what is really vital - the assault on capital and all its agencies, our energy is being deliberately wasted.

The left may offer more rational, more equitable, more just, or more libertarian forms of exploitation, but not an end to it, since they are part of it.

On this basis we must examine critically every single form of permitted protest and understand its political content - anti-fascism, anti-sexism, anti-nukes, anti-toryism and the rest. If we make ourselves unpopular in the meantime, if we are accused of sectarianism, that is the price of clarity.

Only when the present political hegemony enjoyed by the likes of Foot, Benn, (and Thatcher) is totally smashed, does the debate begin.

*World Revolution and Communist Tactics

And from SOCIALIST CHALLENGE...

After organising the spectacularly successful Debate of the Decade...the Labour Co-ordinating Committee meets in Birmingham this weekend.
Defence Of SYNDICALIST METHODS

They produce the paper 'Bread and Roses' currently the only anarchist (semi-)agitational paper (apart from the Beano) which is reasonably down to earth and cheap (15p). It mainly suffers from a lack of contributors and irregularity.

The LCG, currently working very hard to promote a front organisation called 'Resistance' (to the cuts) which is enjoying some measure of success, is a bit perplexing. While continuing to say it is anarchist, members have stated in their paper 'Libertarian Communist', that 'building the revolutionary party' is of importance and they have joined the Socialist Unity group which stands parliamentary candidate.

The near certainty of years of turmoil and suffering of much worse than present conditions, and the chance of being killed or injured, makes revolution a totally acceptable prospect. Yet people revolt.

Councillor and other offers of what a revolutionary society will be like, fail to give any indication of how that revolutionary society is to be achieved. They say: 'how can we organise?'

Two Functions

At the same time, every trade union would federate the Alliance, from a federation of Industrial Unions.

However, Rocker says nothing of how the trade unions would be internally organised, or how these federations would interact.

The IWW is often thought of as being of classical syndicalist design. It is organised into industrial unions which are linked via local and regional federations. These would be grouped according to districts and regions to form a National Federation of Labour Chambers. This federation would provide the co-ordination of work, education production etc.

Councillor and other offers of what a revolutionary society will be like, fail to give any indication of how that revolutionary society is to be achieved. They say: 'how can we organise?'

The organisation should be controlled horizontally, where people delegated to do some organisational duty do precisely what the rank and file members tell them (and not in a pyramidal fashion where leaders give orders to those below them) and federatively where all groups with a common purpose are federated directly together and (not in a centralist manner where orders and co-ordination are expected on one place and group of people).

The self-determination of each group is put above everything else and so consensus agreements are required. Education is considered to be of the utmost importance.

However, many anarchists would say that this is anarchism in general and not specifically syndicalism, as such. We have to take it a bit further.

Rocker in 'Anarchism and Anarcho-syndicalism' says that trade unions of a city or district would combine in Labour Chambers. These would be grouped according to districts and regions to form a National Federation of Labour Chambers. This federation would provide the co-ordination of work, education production etc.

form of wage bargaining, lead to revolution?'. They will not dirty their hands with what must occur in practice. And where practices and theory are at odds, it is the theory which is wrong!

To get away from this theory and back to practice, the IWW is an alternative union for workers to join. It lacks a large bank balance which established unions have, but in most strikes, strike pay is never paid and the millions owned by the big unions are invested and used to pay bureaucrats. It also lacks a large membership to support groups in dispute, but little support is ever forthcoming from large unions as the centralism stifles it.

Syndicalism rests on the idea that workers organisations should collectively replace all governments. If people realise the necessity of such organisation, and more members put something into it, the DAM will become the most significant development in the anarchist movement since the war.

UNIONS & RACISM

The I.W.W. has been fighting to unite the working-class since its inception, and has reached racial equality when such ideas have been fashionable or when they could get you lynched! It is appropriate therefore, that the union's first major publication for some time in this country is an examination of racist practice within unions both in Britain and the USA. The subject is not looked at as purely a religious, ethical or philosophical viewpoint but rather from the historical.

Divide and rule has been a tactic of the employing class. All with first cover group, then another, the bosses play off these groups against each other. Whenever prejudice and discrimination of any type, puts one group of workers at a disadvantage, the living and working conditions of everyone suffer.

The group being discriminated against knows that the other group's coming to the rescue; the so-called 'privileged' group is 'encouraged' to lower their demands to the level of the job or whatever being given to the 'non-privileged'.

Divide and rule is the name of the game and there are many forms of it. Colour of skin, colour of hair, colour of clothes or anything which divides people will be used by the bosses. The message is: you're better off than the other lot so don't rock the boat, and it will stay that way. And therefore the lower status group must be stopped from rocking the boat as well.

Division no longer such a trendy subject as it was, but has in no way disappeared. (See the article on CHIX in this issue) And remember, we are all minorities.

Unions & Racism is available from Xtra! for 50p post free.
Bail

When it comes to making objections. If you’re convicted. That way you have to say. Interfere with the course of justice, or interfering with prosecution witnesses. If they try this one on you, cross-examine the officer to give his statement under oath. If the real objections the police have are; you didn’t play ball at the cops; refused to confess; and didn’t help them by clearing their beds; you should bring this out in court.

You may hinder police enquiries. Criminals and the officers on exactly which enquiries they have to make. How will you hinder them, and what are the facts to support this suggestion? Also point out that police enquiries tend to drag on forever. (After all, they’re not very bright and detection rates are far less impressive than fit ups!)

You are of no fixed abode (NFA). Under civil law, if your residence is a squat it does not automatically constitute NFA. Remind the court of this fact, emphasise how long you have been there. Talk about your possessions, commitment to the area and so on.

It may also be suggested you are living in a doss house, or have no strong ties in the area, especially if you’re an ex-con. Have a respectable friend ready to tell the court about the sincerity of your residence, work you do in the community etc.

If the objection is still being raised, suggest to the court that you will reside at an agreed address as a condition of bail.

d) You are already on bail for a similar offence.

There’s not much you can do about this one. But you might try something along the lines of ‘the court may think a week or so inside is nothing, but I must protest these charges and will have great difficulty proving myself innocent if I’m in custody’. Also if you’re the subject of some promotion-seeking CID squad, make the point to the beck that the second arrest was to stop your bail. Your sureties are not unacceptable. A surety is someone who agrees to put the money in cash, but they don’t have to prove to the court’s satisfaction that they are worth the amount - for example that they own a house, TV, car and other personal possessions.

Your best bet is to choose a surety who has a steady job, no record and who is a householder and respectable member of the community. This person should be someone who knows you for a fair amount of time.

Police objections can be anything - that your surety doesn’t know you well enough, or knows you too well, or that a woman is not acceptable as a surety. You should argue all you can and if this doesn’t work, find some others.

Sureties

It’s best if your sureties are present in court, although they don’t have to be. Bail may be arranged with sureties who are ‘acceptable to the police’, which means your sureties have to make a trip to the cops rather than the magistrate’s court. If the police don’t accept them, sureties should apply in writing for a reason and pay a visit to the clerk of the court to examine them.

According to the letter of the law, you are permitted to submit sureties who have previous convictions and the magistrate is supposed to take into consideration the nature of the offence and how long ago it was committed. Good luck on that one. Also a surety is not required by law to be a householder, but again it helps.

When bail is refused

If you don’t get bail straight off, insist the magistrate gives you a written notice stating the reasons for refusal. If he kicks up tell him he has a read of 967 Criminal Justice Act, Section 12, subsection 8. The magistrate should be doing this anyway, as well as advising you of your right to apply to judge and chambers.

Having done that you might as well remind the court of your existence as often as possible, by reapplying for bail. If you want, you can make an application every single week after tying up your cell. There’s no law preventing you from applying as often as you like.

Then there’s a little question of money, the small’s pace of legal machinery and class justice. What it amounts to is if you’re out of pocket, you’ve got lousy legal service and a long wait ahead of you.

If you’re not having a jury trial

Unless you and the prosecution agree to a long remand or you get remanded for medical reports, you will appear before a magistrate after eight clear days to be remanded again. Take up some of the court’s time and reapply for bail. If you don’t have legal aid or magistrate, speak up and tell the beck you want to apply for bail yourself.

If the amount of bail is too high, or there are any other unreasonable conditions, argue to get them changed. Each bail application before the magistrate will be more or less the same. But some of the police arguments may start to wear thin.

If you’ve been kept inside while the police are enquiring, ask them why they’ve not finished and point out they may be obstructing justice by preventing you from properly preparing your defence. Point it out to the magistrate if their objections change week by week - make sure he understands you’re being given the run around. Have new sureties available, or fight it out with the prosecution over previous objections.

Changing bail conditions

If you’ve been granted bail and they’ve got you signing in at the cops house five days a week, demanded enough sureties to ransom the crown jewels, taken away your passport and generally made your life a misery, try to get the terms of your bail altered.

The character to see about this is the old judge in chambers. And it’s back to forking out pound notes to get a brief to do five minutes work. Legal aid up to £25 is available for the paperwork on the application, but this does not cover the lawyer’s fee for moulding at the judge.

Bail pending appeal

When you’re convicted, if you’re considering an appeal, get on to it immediately. Once your appeal is in, you can reapply for bail pending appeal in your bail during the waiting time. Obviously bail can only be considered if you are appealing against conviction. Only a handful of applications are ever argued before a judge in the court of appeal. Again it’s a case of a judge sitting in private, bound by law to consider the question.

What are the chances of winning your appeal? Appeals against conviction are dependent on

1) The blatantly biased summing up of the judge.
2) The judge misdirecting the jury on points of law.
3) The discovery of fresh evidence. Any other factors on the conduct of the trial, which renders the verdict of the trial unsafe or unsound.

The appeal cannot directly challenge the jury’s interpretation of the facts. However, in this respect the jury’s verdict is final.

Bail pending appeal will cost you like any other judge in chambers application. But in any controversial case, where there is a strong case to put to the appeal court, it’s worth another £50 or so, so have a bash.
The Legalise MacDonalds Campaign has been given a much-needed boost by the recent report of Government-sponsored Committee of Enquiry into the Hamburger industry, which recommends that the possession or consumption of MacDonalds by convicts should no longer be a criminal offence.

The Secretary of State for Education and Science, Mr. Innocent, has commented that this new legalisation would be a welcome development, especially for the health of the nation's children. He went on to say that the committee's recommendations were "eminently sensible" and that they would be implemented without delay.

However, some legal experts are concerned that the new laws may lead to an increase in criminal activity, as people may be tempted to commit minor thefts in order to feed their craving for MacDonalds. Others argue that the new laws will simply lead to an increase in the number of people who are unable to afford to eat MacDonalds, and that this will simply lead to a greater demand for cheaper, inferior food products.

The campaign for the Legalisation of MacDonalds has been underway for several years, and has been led by a group of dedicated activists who believe that the ban on MacDonalds is unjust and unenforceable. They argue that the ban has been ineffective and that it has simply led to a increase in the black market for MacDonalds.

In conclusion, the Legalisation of MacDonalds is a significant step forward in the fight for social justice. We should all support this campaign and work to ensure that a simple, clean, and delicious hamburger is available to all, regardless of their circumstances.
Xtral has been criticized for not providing enough coverage of political issues. "You can't separate music from politics," according to our culture vulture reader. So here is a full, extensive guide to the whole political/pop scene.

The Libs.

"Has-beens" is the best description of this lot. Under their popular former lead singer Ewart ("Farty" to his friends) Gladstone this band had an unbroken string of hits and was a success. Now a hundred years later, they blame almost total lack of success on their lack of originality. Their chart system whereby the Tories and Labour only have to sell 100 records to make the chart, whereas you have to sell more than 20,000.

Well, we couldn't miss it, could we? Time Out had plugged it for weeks on end, as had all the left press. Even the Tory graph liked it. "The Accidental Death of an Anarchist" is what I'm referring to. We weren't sure quite what to expect, but we knew it would be satirical, enjoyable, making telling political points - a Good Night Out.

It wasn't. It was the worst play I had ever seen. Funny? The loudest gales of laughter were produced by the liberal scattering of four letter words. But honestly, the standard of humour scarcely reached the level of Little and Large. Pulling faces, donning "bunny" clothes and makeup, falling over, shouting, blowing raspberries... I prefer my local pantomime.

Time Out

And what about the political content? Time Out's gushing reviews should have been a warning. The standard SWP-type line - you know, "anti-authoritarians" (providing, of course, that the authoritarianism comes from the right). All the worst excesses of standard Labour-critical claptrap. But honest, the standard of humour scarcely reached the level of Little and Large. Pulling faces, donning "bunny" clothes and makeup, falling over, shouting, blowing raspberries... I prefer my local pantomime.

The Church.

Though many 'puntists' claim that this group has never recovered from losing its most famous lead singer (who died of a heart attack at the age of 29), the Church still makes a great deal of money and has a large fan following. Their performances are often criticized by the police for being too 'political'.

With last year's sell-out tours of Ireland and America (part of the "God's Answer" tour), the church had its second big comeback. Their sound varies between bright, energetic and poignantly melancholic. They are a dreamy, tender sort of band, punctuated by a gruff baseline and whining guitar.

The back lash starts here...

ACCIDENTAL DEATH OF A WESTENDER

The Marxists.

This group first came to prominence in the eighties, with pretentious concept albums (often double or even triple sets) such as "Dan Capital 194", "Works Vol. 20, 248" and "Live at Conway Hall". Formed by hairy lead singer Karl Marx, the Marxists have scored tremendous successes all over the world, literally monopolizing the charts in Russia, China etc - though many people think that such charts are totally rigged and that other bands never get any airplay. In recent years several members have left the band to form "solo" breakaway combos such as The Militants, SRP and the Communistists - and yet others have joined "established" bands like The Socialists and even The Tories. Constantly tipped as The Next Big Thing both by their "mavericks" (Socialist Worker and the Morning Star) and by their enemies, Xtral confidently predicts that The Marxists are poised for the brink of oblivion.

The Anarchists.

This little known band is predic- ted by some to be the Rising Hope of the Eighties.

The Flying Pickers

This band broke away from the TUC a few years back - it's more of an energetic, new wavey type of band. They have scored tremendous successes all over the world, literally monopolizing the charts in Russia, China etc - though many people think that such charts are totally rigged and that other bands never get any airplay. In recent years several members have left the band to form "solo" breakaway combos such as The Militants, SRP and the Communistists - and yet others have joined "established" bands like The Socialists and even The Tories. Constantly tipped as The Next Big Thing both by their "mavericks" (Socialist Worker and the Morning Star) and by their enemies, Xtral confidently predicts that The Marxists are poised for the brink of oblivion.

The Police.

One of the most amazing success stories in recent years. Their success is truly international - they are huge in Russia and South Africa, and very popular everywhere. Recent hits include 'Message in a Trampoline', 'The beat goes on' and 'We don't need no education' (what we want is thought control!). In Britain they tour regularly with other bands such as The TUC, The Flying Pickers and although they are supposed to be the support act, they almost invariably end up as the headliners.

The Anarchists.

This little known band is predic- ted by some to be the Rising Hope of the Eighties.
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Is there something the Army isn't telling us about Anti-terrorism?
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