

# The Black Dwarf

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



# Women sex and the abolition of the family

Editorial

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

**YOUNG man, 25, who is genuine, intelligent, attractive, modern and not too way-out, wants sincere, affectionate and lasting friendship with reliable, gay chap of similar age. Photo with details appreciated. Box 47/41.**

**PLEASE help me, I'm young, and longing to live in London, need appreciated help, from respectable male. All letters answered. Photo if possible. Box 47/42.**

**GRADUATE, 27, seeks attractive, sensitive, educated ('A' level plus) and contemporarily-minded London girlfriend, interested restrictive practices, domination etc. If this is you, please don't be scared to write — your humanity matters as well. Fullest confidence assured, reply guaranteed. Write with photo Mr. C. Mathewson, 2a, Denman Street, Piccadilly, W.1.**

**HANDSOME male, 22, half Indian, seeks petite girl for friendship and exciting time in London. Box 47/29.**

**YOUNG man (27) seeks friends under 30. Photo exchange preferred first. No senior citizens. Box 47/33.**

**GAY versatile male (24) own flat and car, seeks similar for pleasure and relaxation. Photo appreciated. Box 47/34.**

**HANDSOME student 25 seeks lascivious amorous Apollo. Box 47/35.**

**QUEER 27, seeks male under 30 with own pad. English or Continental. Photo please. London area. Box 47/39.**

**GAY man — 29 — seeks friends 21—22. Box 47/40.**

**YOUNG friendly goodlooking German, 21, originally from East Germany, now based permanently in London, would very much like to settle down, with sincere genuine person. If you are under 27, and can put up with a 'Continental' please get in contact with me. Photograph appreciated, but not essential. Box 47/32.**

**GENTLEMAN with treasure seeks lady for pleasure. Photos returned. Mr. Denis Tullett, 63, Harewood Crescent, North Hykeham, Lincs.**

**WILL any lonely girls living in Birmingham write to a lonely boy 19. Photo if possible. Box 47/14.**

**A RATHER shy lad of nineteen, height 5ft 6ins requires a female friend in East Anglia, Home County. Box 47/17.**

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

The greatest degree of exploitation of women comes within the family and sexual relations. Women are brought up to play a particular role, that of housekeepers, mothers and faithful wives. But there is no biological reason why women should do housework or look after children. Physical strength is rarely a relevant qualification for modern work. In theory, men could stay at home and look after the children while women earn the bread. The establishment of nursery schools enables men and women to go out and work; in this sense they represent a step forward, but they still leave untouched the whole area of sexual relations, which is the core of the whole problem. If women are to be equal to men, they must have equal sexual freedom as well.

The standard ideology of our society, and that of many others, is that women are supposed to be virgin before marriage and faithful afterwards; men are not expected to be either. This ideology divides women up into those that conform, while those that don't are penalised by a set of legal and social constraints. Women are dependent economically on men in a society in which men work and women look after children; the divorce laws still penalise women insofar as they are financially weaker. The laws on legitimacy also discriminate in that the very concepts of 'legitimacy' and 'illegitimacy' are a means of forcing women to have children within marriage, rather than allowing them to have them how and when they want.

But the law is only one level of this oppression. The attitudes of society are still oppressive and require considerable courage to struggle against for those without the financial strength to establish their own independence. Within the given nexus, women are expected to contain their sexuality within the family; alternatively

marriage itself. There is no rationality in forcing people to formalise their relations by registering them in a church or a town hall. The very institution of a legalised, permanent relationship is one that must be criticised, as unnecessary and in many cases evil.

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

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

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

Engels' (1884), *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, is an analysis of the role of the family in capitalist society: although some of the historical anthropology that he puts forward has been superceded by subsequent research, his central theses remain. First, the family is not an

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The way in which the sexual change is formulated in our society at the moment is all wrong. One has only to read the personal columns of the *International Times* to see that there are a lot of very lonely people around, and part of the cause of this terrifying solitude and misery is the phoney publicity given to sex by contemporary media. Instead of being freed from traditional constraint, sex has become an instrument of salesmanship, and for creating neurosis on a mass scale among the young. The sexuality of *Playboy* is as much a result of capitalist society as was that of the Victorian family: and the frenetic pursuit of quantity in sex is also a crude psychological response to the quantification and competitiveness of private enterprise. A mechanical 'free-love' is no more a solution than socialist puritan-

**The changes in sexual patterns among the young in modern industrial society are part of the crisis of our society, but they need to be seen in the social and revolutionary perspective — as a weakening of the repressive family structure, as fragmentary anticipations of conditions under socialism and not merely as the aberrations of a dissident youth. There is a need to think through the implications of these developments. For the left, the demand for the freedom and equality of women must be part of their campaign: the change in sexual behaviour can all too easily be contained by bourgeois society which has already developed a vast mechanism of hypocrisy to accommodate deviations from the ideal of marriage.**

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

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

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



# Letters

## A very open letter to John Hoyland from John Lennon

Dear John,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Love,  
John Lennon

PS—You smash it – and I'll build around it.

## John Hoyland replies:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Decent British housewives

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

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

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

### English proletariat is not apathetic

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

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

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

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

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

Where do we go from here? Anybody know?

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

workers' and busmen's pay increase, is bringing about a fall in the workers' standard of living, after a period of a rising one. The English proletariat is not as apathetic as recent remarks would have one believe; it mobilised itself in the rise of Chartism, George Lansbury's opposition to the London council concerning Poor Law rates and the Hunger Marches of the early '30s. They may realise now that no Parliamentary party is seriously interested in their position and since the present Government has more than two years to injure its position further, revolution can come in the foreseeable future, if a leader emerges similar to Cobbett, O'Connor or Lansbury. The policy of *The Black Dwarf*, and all the other organs of the Left, must be to bring home to the workers their position in the system, to continue the criticism of the bourgeois-inspired PIB and to associate the struggle of the British workers with the US Negroes, the Vietnamese peasant and the Mozambique guerrilla.

Yours,  
Andrew Shallice,  
26 Queensway, Levenshulme, Manchester 19.

### Awareness of relative specificity

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

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

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

### Fred Halliday replies:

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

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

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

### DWARF ACCEPTS TRIBUNE CHALLENGE

By our political staff

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

We are confident that our understanding of student situation and our general revolutionary perspective will win over more and more students. I am sure that here we have an edge on the Dwarf. Your slogan 'Don't Demand, Occupy' may have had a some relevance to LSE in late October (Fred Halliday's reply to Roger Smith, 3 Dec) in general it is not simply adventurist but self-contradictory. We need demands, at LSE, around which to mobilise people to occupy. You are wholly out of touch with students if you think that the majority, down the country, are ready to occupy; that, on hearing a splendid revolutionary rallying cry from Carlisle Street. The revolutionary minority needs to connect the mass of students before anything can happen. This is the function of the demands which must be made (such as those we set out in our pamphlet).

Likewise with 'the theory of students as vanguard'. If all this says is that students 'detonate a proletarian explosion', what the 'theory' differ from a simple description of the French events? But does this make students a 'vanguard'? Can they lead the workers' movement to revolution - or do still require the intervention of a conscious revolutionary minority of the working class itself, organised in a 'party'? If the latter true then surely the notion of a 'student vanguard' is highly misleading. Students see the need to build a workers' party, not a student movement. Of course, we can do that such a leadership is not built simply proclaiming it in Clapham High Street, or anywhere else. But the necessity remains, to rid ourselves of some of the illusions of 'student vanguardism' is a prerequisite for ensuring that students do play their proper part in the building of a new revolutionary movement.

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

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

Nobody thinks that students are prepared to occupy just like that', but the role of the occupation can be critical, and the example of LSE, Hornsey, Birmingham, Bristol, Guildford over the last six months show that the 'tiny revolutionary minority' can cease to be tiny and become a significant vanguard - although still a minority - through occupations. In addition, the occupation is not an alternative to demands; it is a means of pressing for demands, and an experience of mass struggle that may radicalise great masses of students who are not radicalised by sending requests to university administrations. That is the sense of the slogan.

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



Logue poster

5s. post free

from

Che Guevara's  
Bolivian  
Diaries

# Women: the struggle for freedom...

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

But meanwhile

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

The present set up of the family puts great strains on us  
either we are struggling to combine badly paid work with  
bringing up a family or we are unable to do work for which  
we've been trained.

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

So what are we complaining about?

All this and something else besides.  
A much less tangible something - a smouldering, bewildered  
consciousness with no shape - a muttered dissatisfaction - which  
suddenly shoots to the surface and EXPLODES.

*We want to drive buses, play football, use beer mugs not glasses. We  
want men to take the pill. We do not want to be brought with bottles  
or invited as wives. We do not want to be wrapped up in cellophane  
or sent off to make the tea or shuffled into the social committee.*

But these are only little things.

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

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

So we don't know how to find one another or ourselves.

*We are perhaps the most divided of all oppressed groups.  
Divided in our real situations and in our understanding and  
consciousness of our condition.*

We are in different classes.

Thus we devour and use one another.

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

*We are with families and without them.*

*Hence we distrust one another.*

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

*The single woman feels the married woman is subtly critical because  
she is not fulfilling her 'role' as homemaker, her 'function' as  
child bearer.*

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

THEY tell us what we should be.

As we grow up, especially from puberty, we are under  
intensive pressure to be 'acceptable' - not to put ourselves  
outside the safety net of marriage.

From small girls we are taught that failure means not being  
selected by men - the shame of being a wallflower. The sign  
of intelligence and subtlety is a contractual bargain as we

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

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

*To stray from the definition of what 'they' want is to risk being  
rejected in a double sense. There is a 'moral' force behind this urge  
to conform. The girl who is critical of the stereotype presented to her  
can be condemned not simply like a boy as a rebel but as a slut as  
well. The latter is much more difficult to cope with. There it is still  
the whole dirty, frightened, patronising world behind slut, tart, old  
slag, nymphomaniac, dolly, bird, chick, bit of stuff, bit of crumpet,  
old bag, silly cow, blue stocking.  
These words have no male equivalents.*

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

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

THEY tell us what we are.

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

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

But no connection is obvious. She cannot see a condition of women.  
It is not until she becomes older, grows less decorative, has babies,  
that the rather deep cracks in the gloss of 'emancipation' appear.  
She has the rest of her life to explore the limits and ambiguities of  
her 'freedom'.  
And what a spurious freedom.

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



...Continued



Some advice



# Equal pay is not enough

Audrey Wise

Vast numbers of women go to work for about 70% of men's rates of wages. This is economic exploitation on a grand scale and equal pay is clearly an elementary demand.

But equal pay need not mean equality, and we must ask ourselves in any case, equality with what? Do men have such idyllic lives that we want the same for ourselves? In a world where people are valued as economic units rather than as people, to be an equal economic unit must not be the height of our ambition. What we want is a reevaluation of all people, men and women, in human terms not as adjuncts to machines.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As long as most women accept the burden of the 'double job', they will not have time or energy to take their places in the community, in political and trade union activities. As long as even many left-wing husbands expect their wives to stay at home with the babies while they go out to be

in the vanguard of the struggle, there will be these missing women, absent from a struggle which concerns them at least as much as men. Last year's Workers' Control Conference was a splendid Conference - but it was very similar to the TUC and the Labour Party Conference in one way, in the proportion of women present.

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

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

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

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

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

# Lil Bilocca and Hull trawlers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# Dwarf profile: Barbara Castle

One of Harold Wilson's more successful achievements has been the total destruction of Labour as a reformist party. To this effect Wilson has completely castrated the Bevanite wing of the Labour Party, in the main, by buying it over. In this he has been helped considerably by the Labour Left and especially by Barbara Castle whom he refers to affectionately as 'my little minister'. Barbara Castle was one of the leading lights of the Labour left in every sense of the word. She was seen on CND marches; at the head of Anti-Apartheid demos against 'fascism in South Africa', etc. In Oxford she was known for her 'servant socialism'. Inside the Labour Party she was a consistent anti-Gaitskellite and after the 1959 election she attacked the Gaitskellites in the Clause 4 controversy: 'No comrades', declared the 'fiery' redhead, 'it simply won't wash to say that nationalisation is fusty and out of date'. She caused further consternation by visiting Cyprus at the height of the anti-British struggle and saying: 'our troops are being permitted to use unnecessarily tough measures.'

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

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

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

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

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

is about power" and you have got to be in power to get things done. If we want socialism in this country, we have got to have the power to bring it about.'

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

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

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

**In the House of Commons the women in the refreshment room get 30s a week LESS than men.**

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

makes them a trifle more alarming than the politician who knows he's talking crap and doesn't bother to hide it. The new breed of social-democrats combine reformist rhetoric with reactionary measures, but they will fail. They have deceived the workers of this country for too long and in the long run they will be the losers. Some workers will invariably move to the right. Others will look for a non-reformist, non-Stalinist alternative. The sooner this alternative begins to exist the better. In short, comrades, unity of the revolutionary left should become the watchword.

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





# Nixon is king

by Douglas Gill

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



1969 catalogue available soon. Send for free copy Pamphlets from the works

# Support Tunisia!

Forcibly Anonymous

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

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

(Perspectives Tunisiennes) have publicly shown up the contradictions in the regime. They have denounced the collusion between the national bourgeoisie - incapable of building an independent economy - and imperialism.

Action by the militants has been aimed principally against imperialism in an attempt to force the Tunisian regime to show itself as it is: police repression, pseudo-socialism, mystification of the workers and servility to US imperialism.

After a demonstration denouncing US and British Imperialism directed against the embassies of the respective countries, Tunisian students saw their comrade MOHAMED BEN JENNET taken and sentenced to 20 years' hard labour (a sentence dictated by US imperialists who thereby struck at their most dangerous and efficient enemy - the students). In March, 1968 an important demonstration for solidarity with Ben Jenjet took place, which - in spite of police provocation, special forces, fascist students and party fanatics - rapidly transformed into a student strike with meetings and further demonstrations of considerable size.

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

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

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

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

SUPPORT TUNISIANS IN THEIR STRUGGLE

DWARF DESIGNER SEEKS GIRL:

Head girl typer

Our 'CHE' poster, 16" x 21". Only 3/- post free. 20% discount on 20 or



# Pakistan: the crisis and its origins

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Sino-Pakistan Relations

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

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

## 1966 Railway Strike

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

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

## The present crisis

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

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

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

to opt out of political opposition to the Ayub regime. At a recent demonstration in Lahore over 2½ miles long, the Maoists stayed away. What they fail to realise is that in a right-wing dictatorship even the demand for 'bourgeois democracy' has revolutionary undertones. There must be a limited freedom to educate and influence the masses before a revolutionary party can make any headway.

## Conclusions

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

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

It is possible that with the emergence of Marshal Asghar Khan, an honest version of Ayub, as an Oppositionist the Armed Forces will not interfere if Ayub is overthrown. Whether that is true or not the Opposition parties should unite and fight for civil liberties. That is the most pressing need of the hour. Socialists should demand the release of political prisoners, freedom of speech, press and ONE MAN, ONE VOTE. And Maoists must join his opposition; they should stop acting as the frontier guards of Chou state policy and come out in a principled opposition to the dictatorship. Why should they ask themselves have the Chinese ever ignored the struggle for political liberties in Pakistan. Why does Mao receive a million-dollar delegation from Pakistan headed by Yahya, the C-in-C of the Army, the same way as students are shot down in cold blood. They should demand of the Chinese comrades a more display of internationalism in practice and a little less slogan-mongering. At the time of writing I have just heard that a section of the left-wing NAP in East Pakistan has participated in a demonstration against the dictatorship. The demonstration took place in Dhaka on 7 December and troops were called on to aid the police. According to a government press release two demonstrators have been killed and 20 wounded but the actual figures are bound to be considerably higher. On this occasion for this particular demonstration Ayub's visit to East Pakistan. His regime consistently treated East Pakistan as a colony and it is hardly surprising that the workers and students of Dacca treat him as they would the representative of any occupying power. This display of solidarity by East Pakistan with the struggle in West Pakistan is of immense significance. The realisation that the parts of the country face the same problem could go a long way towards creating a united opposition!

Today the acid-test is the struggle for civil liberties. Those who call themselves Marxists and Leninists must participate in this struggle. If they choose to ignore this struggle they themselves will be ignored in time to come. Meanwhile all Pakistanis living abroad should set up action committees. They can give material and moral support to the masses inside the country. They can write and distribute pamphlets explaining the situation

