

# "Julie no traitor," friend says

## Open Road:

I feel it is imperative, if you intend to continue sharing mailing costs with *Resistance*, that you support or endorse the content of that rag.

I was enraged and appalled by the article in Spring 86 entitled 'Julie Rats Out'.

I won't even bother to be critical of the sensationalized shoddy piece of journalism it is. I'd rather enlighten you to the truth.

Recently, while waiting bail I spent five months getting to know Julie and am honoured to have her as my friend. The article is so full of half-truths and innuendo that its hard even to know where to start.

First, Julie is anything but all the things described in the article. When Julie went to the Kingston Prison for Women she did some very serious soul searching and decided that, no matter what the cause, violence just perpetuates more violence. She experienced genuine, sincere change.

It's not so much that she renounced anyone or anything. Rather, she no longer thinks and feels as she once did.

I feel that it takes a great deal of courage to take on an entire 'political community' knowing that alot of people will share the opinion of the article's writer.

I've spent many years in federal prison and am pretty angry at the accusation that 'Julie informs'. The accusation is based on her rejection of financial support from the Five's defense committee.

You could never have had any real support for Julie as a person or you would accept the fact that she has change. You people have no reality about what lead her to her personal decision about violence.

Also, to set the record straight, in terms of free university courses available through the prison project, criminology and english are basically all that's offered.

To comment on the innuendo about Gerry and Julie's break up: In prison, it's so very hard (near impossible) when you really love someone to sustain anything but a lot of broken dreams, the pain of caring through the other person's absence, and the unbelievable oppression of knowing that two strangers, representatives of the State, will read your letters before they are received.

Another thing untrue in the article is the mention of 'Julie's

slide into religion'. Julie has been a catholic all her life.

It is, in my opinion, total bullshit that Julie is a traitor or an informer. If she was either of those things she could have been a crown witness against the others and received immunity at the time of her arrest.

If any of you even knew her as I do, you'd realize the inanity of that article.

Julie Belmas is an intelligent, talented, creative person who is incapable of any of the allegations of treachery against her former four associates.

It's as fucking simple as that.

B.W.  
Kingston, Ont

... well I could do some  
Research on women's prisons  
in Canada and explore the  
methods used to attack  
the will and sanity of  
our political prisoners  
BUT I've only  
got so  
much space  
and Julie  
DID rat out  
and I'm best  
at attacks

Personally I've been  
overnight several  
times in  
women's  
detention  
centres for  
doing C.D.  
It didn't  
break me-  
I can't see  
why it broke her.  
she even gets a real  
cot to sleep on we had a  
big waffle iron...



## Van 5 - Resistance slammed

Open Road asked *Resistance* to respond to this letter.

To Open Road:

I have been a subscriber to *Open Road* since its inception, but I do not plan to renew my subscription.

As I recall, the original intent of *Open Road* was to be an eclectic periodical, supplying news of anarchist activities globally, as well as providing anarchist analyses of continental and world events. It was also meant to provide a forum for varied discussion of theory and practice. You have strayed so far from your original purpose that *Open Road* no longer appears to be an anarchist paper.

1) You are apparently unable to distinguish anarchism from other movements of the left. This is certainly reflected by the inclusion of that foolish little insert, *Resistance*. (Technically, I suppose, *OR* and *Resistance* are two separate papers. Both, however, come in the same package.)

Please tell me what the Fighting Communist Cells have to do with anarchism. What relationship does the Prairie Fire Organising Committee or Ligne Rouge have to anarchism?

2) You fail to heed lessons of very recent history: besides being almost completely ineffectual, groups (and mentalities) like the above are the crowning pinnacle of elitism and stalinist vanguardism. A very revealing exposition of the elitist mind, for example, can be found in the article 'Julie Rats Out': 'The (police) use of informers ... means that we, as revolutionaries, have to take special care with whom we work, discouraging those we feel haven't reached the political and emotional maturity to engage in this kind of activity (i.e. armed struggle).' What kind of presumptuous shit is this? Presumably, those who engage in armed struggle, or other so-called clandestine activities, are 'mature', while the lowly and unenlightened peons who involve themselves in more mundane projects are not.

3) The fact that you embrace any group that labels itself 'underground' or 'guerrilla' destroys

what little anarchist credibility you have. A 'mature' politic discerns between projects that are effectual and those that are counterproductive or inimical to concrete and substantial social change. The Weather Underground accomplishing nothing of real value; ditto the Vancouver Five. Or remember the Symbionese Liberation Army, and their demand for seventy dollars' worth of free food for every poor family in California? Aside from the sheer asininity of the SLA's demands, one has little difficulty understanding how some people easily concluded that the group had been a CIA trump card.

But my purpose is not to make accusations about who is a cop and who is not. The issue here is the bullheadedly stupid (or naive) position taken by the Fighting Communist Cells (and, by implication, endorsed by *Open Road*) concerning the 'mythology of effects': 'What is fundamental for the anti-war movement is to rid itself of the mythology of effects in order to be able to attack the causes. We cannot fight against war if we cannot put out of commission those who program it and who concretely organize it...'

Any sensible activity, while addressing causes, must necessarily also consider effects. To fail to do so is to fail to understand historical processes and revolutionary dialectics.

I refer again to very recent history. The Vancouver Five succeeded in getting themselves put away for a very long time. Instead of striking a Blow Against The Empire, the V5's actions allowed the apparatus of the state to create a neat little excuse to increase surveillance, political repression, and dirty tricks all across Canada. The SLA succeeded in transforming themselves into steaks, well-done. The state's power consolidated itself a little bit more.

*Open Road* assumes a priori the virtues of a particular leftist rhetoric without even minimally or self-critically examining the theoretical (or lack thereof) bases upon which that rhetoric is predicated. The is rigid dogmatism. This is True Belief in an abstract construct. It is the psychological underpinning of religion and mysticism. I find *Open Road* to be unreasoned, uncritical, and reeking of heroic Che Guevarism. I find it to be not a paper in tune with the activities, hopes, aspirations, struggles, or even traumas of real people in real life;

instead, it has become a narrow mouthpiece of the extraparlamentarians who would seek to become revolutionary specialists and the future representatives of all the

rest of us.

My money is better spent elsewhere.

B.K.  
New York, NY

## Resistance replies

In response to your letter, there are several points that should be made clear. Up to this issue, *Open Road* and *Resistance* have been totally distinct in terms of editorial policy. The *OR* collective has had no say in the contents of *Resistance*; it has only helped out on the production and distribution of the paper. The underlying concept of *Resistance* was to provide communiques and analysis of the armed struggle to people who would otherwise be incapable of acquiring this information. While supporting the idea of armed struggle is a necessary element in the revolutionary transformation of society, *Resistance* stated that it did not support all of the positions taken by the groups that had their writings included, especially in the matter of the party and marxism-leninism. PFOC and Ligne Rouge obviously have nothing to do with anarchism, no one ever said they did.

Regarding the CCC, it is important to recognize that they are a very recent guerrilla organization, and that without the communiques printed in *Resistance*, people like yourself would be forced to rely on the description of them from the capitalist papers to get an idea of where they are at. Whether you disagree with them or not, the reproduction of their statement has served a valuable service.

Putting aside your disparaging comments about the usefulness of armed struggle (a worthwhile topic, but that would take too long to get into here), what needs to be addressed are the comments about the article 'Julie Rats Out'. *Resistance* has never claimed that armed struggle is the only or most important struggle; 'political and emotional maturity' is meant to describe a condition of being in which a person has the depth of experience, political understanding and self-knowledge that when confronted with a crisis is not suddenly shaken to the core. It could describe anyone, whether they be the most extreme pacifist of guerrilla. The reality of the guerrilla experience—the ever present danger of capture, imprison-

ment, death—demands that those who engage in it know themselves and what they are doing.

Julie was a very courageous person to become involved in the activities of Direct Action and the Wimmen's Fire Brigade. But, being placed suddenly in a threatening situation where a lengthy prison sentence was all too likely, that courage was not enough. It is quite understandable that she broke down—she was involved in something over her head, and the state has had many years of practice breaking people. She is not solely to fault; with greater insight from others perhaps she never would have gotten involved.

Yet the fact remains that she was involved, and by signing a confession implicating Brent, testifying at the appeal on the activities of her former comrades, and telling the most outrageous lies about the structure of the group (the whole leader/soldier concept pushed by the prosecution) she has acted in the interests of the state.

With her successful attempt to get a lighter sentence she has hurt her former comrades, as well as the militant movement as a whole. For anyone who shares the politics which the other members of Direct Action attempted to develop here in Canada, it is clear that it is no longer possible to have anything to do with her.

For those that oppose this politics, for those that thought the work of Direct Action must have been the cops' because it was too 'professional' (and everybody knows how anarchists are so incompetent), for those who like to see the cops before a demonstration to make sure everything goes according to plan, for those who think it is ok to turn on your friends and to denounce what you've been working on together in the front pages of the daily newspaper, for those people no doubt Julie is a godsend, a tool to be used to discredit and divide support for militant resistance. But there will always be those who play into the hands of counter-insurgency.

Tom Ross  
for Resistance

Friends,

...I greatly enjoyed reading issue #18 of *Open Road*; as always, it was crammed with well-written, hard-hitting items and engaging photos. I was particularly pleased by your coverage of some of the direct actions accomplished by revolutionaries in Europe, and the updates on the Butlers, Leonard Peltier, and the Vancouver Five. As you noted, Julie Belmas' sycophant fawning before the court is another classic example of how the System extends its controlling tentacles by squeezing 'cooperation' out of those who fall into its grasp.

...The review on Emma Goldman was very entertaining, and whetted my interest in the book, which I'm going to read for sure. You mentioned a book called *The Outlaw's Bible: How to Evade the System Using Constitutional Strategy* in your 'Books Received' column.

Sounds interesting...I'd like to see a review on that one!

...Looking forward to your next issue.

M.T.  
Detroit, MI, USA