

'Liberty is for everybody—for the individual to make up his own mind and to express his opinions, however much people may dislike them or be shocked by them.'

A. J. P. TAYLOR

In this Issue:

Sit Down or Pay Up!

Page 3

NOVEMBER 3 1962 Vol 23 No 34

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

That's a crisis-that was!

A COOL LOOK AT CUBA

FROM Washington, the *Guardian* correspondent wrote (October 28):

Every report seems to confirm the impression of the Kennedy Administration that the Cuban crisis has ceased to an extent which makes it possible to say that the world has stepped away from the brink of war.

There is no denying, if we believe the utterances of the leading politicians and some organs of mass communications, that there has been a Cuban crisis and the world has been on the brink of war. Even some of our friends in the pacifist movement, were so impressed by Mr. Kennedy's determination, and so affected by the Press fall-out, that they packed their bags and sought the shelter of a bog somewhere in the Irish Republic. And Bertrand Russell, bless him, in a gallant attempt to prevent the impending holocaust appointed himself mediator between the chief actors in the crisis. Kennedy snubbed him, Khrushchev encouraged him (if Russell had intervened over the 1956 crisis in Hungary he would have found that Khrushchev would have snubbed him and Eisenhower praised him!).

We believe the demonstrations that have taken place against the brinkmanship of the past fortnight are a healthy manifestation, and even though *per se* they can have very little influence on the course of power politics, they serve in the long and slow process of building up a movement of the people the aim of which should be to free themselves from the shackles and

the blackmail of power-hungry politicians. But for this reason it is this writer's view that demonstrations which play up the "crises", instead of exposing the hypocrisy of politicians, the artificiality of the "crises" they deliberately provoke, not to mention the cost in terms of anxiety for millions of ordinary people, in sterile preparations (deployment of troops, and weapons and defence preparations), and the upsetting of people's lives (call-up of reserves, etc.), result in a feeling of frustration and sterility for those participating in them.

★
THE latest Cuban crisis—after all, Cuban liberation from American tutelage has provoked one crisis after another, so far as American interests are concerned—had the distinguishing feature that the villain of the piece was not Castro but Khrushchev. In his "Address to the Nation" (October 23), Kennedy ended by addressing himself direct to the Cuban people:

"Now your leaders are no longer Cuban leaders inspired by Cuban ideals. [Was Mr. Kennedy thinking of the 'good old days' under Batista?]. They are puppets and agents of an international conspiracy which has turned Cuba against your friends and neighbours in the Americas. . . . We know your lives and land are being used as pawns by those who deny your freedom. [Were they anything but pawns when they, and their land, was exploited by American Sugar Barons?]."

The United States having attempted to starve Cuba into submission, as well as mounting an invasion of the island, is now bristling with indignation because Castro turned to the Eastern bloc both as an outlet for Cuban sugar and as a guarantee against further invasion attempts! If Castro had been an anarchist and the revolution he led; libertarian, we could criticise him and his friends for not having attempted a third, more imaginative and anarchistic alternative, of making his appeal to the ordinary people of the world, direct. But neither Castro nor his revolution were libertarian, though even his most ruthless critics of the Left cannot deny that had there been a large active libertarian movement Castro would not have been the obstacle to a libertarian revolution in Cuba that say, Trotsky and Lenin obviously were in Russia. Indeed, had the people outside Cuba done more than demonstrate and chant pro-Cuba slogans; that is, had they been able to offer practical solutions to Cuba's economic problems as well as slogans, the course of the revolution could have been deeply influenced by the people from outside. In seeking Russian "aid" Castro's government was the victim of circumstances as was, to a lesser degree however, Caballero's government, in Spain in 1936. There is no evidence that he has become either a Communist or a pawn of Russia. What is clear is that Cuba has become a pawn in the sordid game of power politics, between Russia and the United States.

★
THE present Cuban "crisis", then, has little to do with Cuba, but a lot to do with the power-game which has been going on for at least 15 years between the two major power-blocs. The "Cuban crisis" has been mounted by both sides, deliberately and with the intention of shaking people out of their general apathy. Needless to say it's not with political apathy that the ruling class is concerned! The purpose of political "crises" is to close the ranks, nationalistically speaking, and an effective way of smothering awareness of the economic and social inequalities and injustices, especially when elections are in the offing. But apart from these considerations, "crises" are, as we



were pointing out in these columns a fortnight ago (before the Kennedy "bombshell"), a justification for the political industry. Kennedy and Khrushchev down to the least significant government or para-government employee have about as much interest in launching a war of annihilation as you or this writer. But just as the road sweeper depends for a living on litter-louts and horses, and the policeman on criminals and sit-downers, so the politician depends on the crises and classes, to keep his job and his privileged status.

★
THE Cuban crisis was no crisis at all, in the true sense of the word. It was made into a crisis and exploited as such by Mr. Kennedy just and when it suited the domestic political and financial interests he represents and serves. In his Oct.

23rd broadcast for instance, he admitted "receiving the first preliminary hard information" of the Russian missile build-up in Cuba a whole week before, at 9 a.m. to be precise. According to last Sunday's *Observer* "Daylight on Cuba" diary of events, this only "confirmed the President's worst suspicions". And the fact that no attempt was made by the Russians to conceal the missile sites from the air, would indicate that the President had been living with the confirmation of his suspicions for some time—unless one is prepared to believe that the bases have appeared on the Cuban landscape overnight.

Again according to the *Observer*, during the eventful week preceding his broadcast, Kennedy saw the Russian astronaut Schirra with his wife and two children ("and took

Continued from page 3

WALL STREET HAPPY

IN the financial columns of the *Guardian* last Monday, their New York correspondent wrote that the Cuban crisis "evokes the ghost of the Korean war".

A short or long one it is out to cause more repercussions on Wall Street than any international incident since then including Hungary, Suez and Berlin.

This is partly because of timing—the US economy was on the threshold of a new recession. Just as President Kennedy's veto of a steel price increase early this year triggered off the market's down turn so may his latest move to be a boon to business and morale. The fact that the US has taken the initiative in the cold war and has apparently drawn a line from which it will not back down is expected to rally public opinion and foster greater confidence in the future.

Possible increased defence expenditures could help fill some idle manufacturing capacity and provide additional jobs but no great spending spree is anticipated. . . .

That the economy increasingly shows

signs of deterioration was brought home last week when Bethlehem Steel Corporation, the second largest steel producer, sharply cut its annual dividend. US Steel directors meet tomorrow and the betting is that it will follow suit. Republic Steel already has cut its dividend and so has Wheeling Steel. Detroit Steel has deferred its quarterly payment. All these signs show the slack in capital goods industries which could not be picked up by a slight increase in military spending. But for a short time at least the psychological impact of President Kennedy's move even more than its economic implication may be most telling. This can be seen from the stock market's actions last week. Clearly, they were an emotional reaction to each turn of events and the trading pressure came chiefly from small investors who were unsure and uncertain. Professionals for the most part sat on the sidelines and waited for things to clear.

Alistair Cooke, writing in the *Guardian* on Tuesday, anticipates that as a result of the "crisis" the subject of Civil Defence will again come to the fore and will result in a "quick return to solvency of the 92 per cent of the Home Shelter companies that went over the hill or went broke since the spring". He adds that:

The first people to recover their phlegm are, as usual, the stockbrokers, the wholesale houses and, in their wake, the supermarkets and the retailers. Both the theoretical economists and the investment houses are convinced today that the economy will receive "an unexpected lift."

Wholesale prices, possibly reacting to the expectation of a shooting war and early rationing, shot up from last Monday on. There was a swift rise in the cost of coffee, sugar, rubber, and cocoa. Wall Street looks for an early and brisk rise on the stock-market. There will almost certainly be a general increase in defence orders.

We have been asked to publish the text of the General Strike for Peace "Boycott Letter". Here it is:

DEAR FRIEND,

November 5th to November 11th, 1962 is the time of the second call for a world wide "general strike for peace" the first to be supported in Britain.

The word "strike" is here used in the wide sense of "act of protest" rather than in the narrow sense of an act of labour against management. One possibility is to stop buying goods made by those who also manufacture weapons. Since this includes every large concern, and most small firms depend on large concerns for part of their supplies, it would be impossible *never* to buy from weapons manufacturers but we can boycott them (almost) for the short duration of the strike.

During the week of November 5th to 11th don't buy anything except essential perishables. Don't buy tinned foods or

The Boycott Letter

anything made of metal. Don't buy fireworks or toys. Don't buy oil products or detergents, or utensils, or foods containing preservatives.

And tell people you are not buying. Although our impression on the national economy may be negligible this time, we could have an enormous propaganda effect.

Mass demonstrations depend for their publicity on what the national press thinks newsworthy. The papers *might* think the aims of the demonstrators worth reporting, or they may think it more important that some of the demonstrators wear beards. But a buying strike is a series of individual demonstrations; people mostly hear about it not through the press but from the individuals taking part. So tell your friends

and neighbours, your suppliers (they are always interested to hear of custom being withdrawn) and the local papers, either by word of mouth or by letter.

Please let us know too, so that the national and international press can be informed of the numbers taking part. And we should like to hear of any other ideas for individual strikes against war.

Yours sincerely,
BRIAN LESLIE
ALAN ROBINSON
MAUREEN ROBINSON
DONALD ROOM
IRENE ROOM
PETER TURNER.

Acting London Committee,
148A Fellows Road,
London, N.W.3.

ANARCHY 21

is on

Secondary Modern

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.

'Libertarian Resistance is the only way to take power away from governments'

AFTER a week of evening demonstrations outside the American and Russian Embassies, the Committee of 100 called for an emergency mass meeting on the afternoon of Saturday, Oct. 27th, in Trafalgar Square.

One idea which had been put forward was that after a meeting in the Square, a march to the Ruislip air base should take place. However, the Committee were refused permission to hold the Trafalgar Square meeting, as they naturally felt unable to assure the Ministry of Works that civil disobedience would not be called for. The plan was therefore changed, and an assembly took place in the Square, at which a number of comrades took turns at speaking from vantage points, or simply from the ground, until each was arrested. At four o'clock the meeting marched down Whitehall, occupying the whole of the road, in the direction of Admiralty House, where the Prime Minister was staying. There, in face of a police cordon, the first sit-down took place, and large numbers of Committee of 100 demonstrators were arrested.

At this point widespread discussions took place as to what was the best

course of action to take, and it was decided that the demonstrators who had not been, or did not intend to be, arrested, should march to the American, Russian and Cuban Embassies.

From then on the march seemed to swell in numbers, until the American Embassy was reached, when the demonstration was brought to a halt by vicious charges of mounted and foot police, using such tactics as driving up fast in their buses at groups of demonstrators who were physically unable to get out of the way.

A much smaller contingent continued the march to the Russian and Cuban Embassies, at the last of which a delegation of three went in to deliver a note.

The protests were the biggest that have taken place in London for some time, and in both its good and bad aspects, the demonstrations were reminiscent of Suez.

The size and wider representativeness were the chief encouraging signs. On the debit side, the seriousness and libertarian ideas in the Committee of 100 were swallowed up by sheer weight of numbers, and the repetitive chanting of slogans struck notes of despair into several people.

Dissension broke out in Whitehall, between those who favoured a mass sit-down and those who preferred to turn and carry out a demonstration at the Embassies. Obviously not all the Committee is in a sitting down mood, and there was clearly no particular point in being arrested half way down Whitehall, when the immediate object of protest were the Russian and American governments. On the other hand, it was a meeting called by the Committee, and it must be remembered that the use of speaking facilities in the Square was refused only, in this case, on the grounds that civil disobedience might be advocated, and the final result of a march that could have taken place before the anti H-bomb movement had even got going, in which shouting of emotionally charged but meaningless slogans, and calls for useless violence such as rushing the American Embassy were made, was not altogether inspiring.

A tempting conclusion is that libertarian ideas cannot stay in the forefront in a crisis. Only a week previously the East Anglian Committee had scattered a few seeds on the R.A.F. base at Honington, and the description in *Peace News* spoke confidently of the growth of small groups in all countries, whose social solidarity would make government and superior order unnecessary. Then, when the threat of annihilation pressed down on the movement, the hopes of

RUSSIA EXPLODED a nuclear bomb equal to about 20 million tons of TNT in the atmosphere over the Novaya Zemiva testing ground. It was Russia's 16th test in the present series. Hundreds of seabirds found dead along the East Anglian coast have been found to be unusually radio-active probably as a result of Russian tests in the Arctic. America exploded another rainbow bomb, 20 to 30 miles above Johnston Island, in mid-pacific on Friday, October 26th. With a power of up to a million tons of TNT, it was one of the biggest in the current series. It was the third such test. Another bomb is due to be set off on October 28th. An American suffered eye-burns during the test, a spokesman for Joint Task Force Eight announced. The circumstances of the accident and the airman's name were not disclosed. According to Dr. Ralph Lapp a jettisoned nuclear bomb with a potential power of 24 million tons of TNT nearly exploded in North Carolina. The bomb fell in a field without exploding. The warhead was equipped with six safety mechanisms, five out of six of the devices had been set off by the fall. 1,200 students at sixteen American colleges and universities were questioned as to their views on war and peace (according to the *American Sociological Review*). Not more than 25% could be said to be pacifists. 72% said that the United States must run any risk necessary to prevent the spread of communism; 17% said they were opposed to war on 'moral' grounds, though only six per

slow constructive building of a social revolution gave way to futile panic. But it was in response to a crisis that the libertarian workers of Catalonia answered the fascist rising in July 1936, by an anarchist revolution, which, for the short time before it was crushed between Communist sabotage and fascist military might, demonstrated that free socialism can work, as a way of social organisation and of resistance to the attacks of capitalism, and whose chief failures lay in the compromises which the anarchists felt forced to make to their parliamentary-minded "allies".

Libertarian resistance is the only worth while response to the crises produced by governments, because it is the only way in which power can be taken out of the hands of the governments. Political resistance can only result in a change of masters, and in fact at the centre of the present crisis is a people who after overthrowing one dictator, were misguided or unfortunate enough to let another one take his place.

In order to be effective however, libertarian resistance needs thousands of people prepared to take part in it, for every one that does now. The thousands who turned out on October 27th to protest at a moment of crisis in the power struggle between opposing states, not to mention the millions who were too apathetic for that, must be persuaded that opposition to governments has to be permanent, not confined to crises; that it has to be directed not against individual figures in the Cabinet, but against every expression of authoritarianism in society, against the army, the police and legal system, the lying press and radio services; and that the first enemies are not in America or Russia but here at home. P.H.

OSCAR KOKOSCHKA

IN spite of knowing all the right people and floating in all the right cultural currents Kokoschka is an artist who has spent the whole of his life failing to arrive. If it were merely a matter of good will and the operation of the "old pals act" Kokoschka's name would trip as lightly off the tongue as those other master peddlers of culture for the board-room, the bar-room and the bedroom of our alleged affluent society. But this man who has been described by Bultmann as not only a genius but the greatest living portrait painter of this century, has failed to exert any influence on the painters of this country, so that not for nothing does Gabriel White the director of the Arts Council hedge his bets by stating in a catalogue forword that Kokoschka "ranks abroad as one of the great artists of our time", for in a boundless plain of mediocrity any mound is worth attention if only to break the general monotony. But our acknowledgment of it does not confer on it the status of a mountain. This lack of public recognition does not mean however that Kokoschka has laboured all his life behind a veil of studied indifference; his canvases spatter the walls of the world from the museums of Kansas to the humble dwellings of Charlie Clore—price £30,000 for a single painting, while his list of sitters reads like a roll-call of the neo-great of our

century. Kokoschka began his painting life between 1905 and 1910 but his greatest gift lay in his ability to be his own propagandist and he reached his widest audience not by virtue of his paintings but by his association with the literary movements of the periods, noticeably the Berlin *Der Sturm* group and for the rest of his life he has wandered the world proselytising his limited talents.

Kokoschka is now 76 years of age and one can but congratulate him on the enormous retrospective exhibition of his work now hanging at the Tate but when friends and dealers heap such fulsome praise onto any man one must challenge their right to make such claims. Gombrich in the magnificent and expensive catalogue describes Kokoschka as one of the major masters of our time and chides the English critics for failing to recognize this obvious fact, but the test lies not in the assertions of his friends and those sticky-fingered gentlemen involved in his output but with the posters and the paintings hanging upon the walls of the Tate Gallery, and as paintings they are almost with-

OUT OF THIS WORLD

cent, were unilateralists; 13% said they were prepared to go to war even if it meant the death of the entire American population; and two-thirds of them felt that 25 million American deaths was not too high a price to pay for the American way of life. The same authors found that the students' main magazine reading were *Time*, *Life*, *Newsweek*, *U.S. News and World Report*, *Reader's Digest* and *Saturday Evening Post*. Accordingly, a group of students was given less warlike reading matter (such as C. Wright Mills' *The Causes of World War Three*) and their attitudes tested again: most of them had become markedly more pacifist. . . .

SECRET SERVICE men on a parade route to be used by President Kennedy took an air rifle from a nine-year-old boy waiting to see the President pass. After he had gone the gun was returned. A former FBI agent said that the FBI is the largest single contributor to the American Communist Party. The bureau employed 1,500 informers in a party of 8,500. Payments to informers had been such a severe drain on the budget that no more informers were to infiltrate into the party except at "the highest policy-making levels". William John Vassall a 33-year-old Admiralty clerk was jailed for eighteen years on charges under the Official Secrets Act. He claimed that he was blackmailed by the Russians after a drunken orgy in which compromising photographs of him in homosexual situations were taken. An inquiry is being set up. Bogdan Stashinsky, an Ukrainian, was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment in Federal Germany for murdering two political enemies of the Soviet Union on order of the MVD by spraying them with cyanide gas from a gun. The Court decided that Stashinsky was so much the tool of his masters that he had no will of his own. It was rumoured that Bukharin, Rykov, Piatakov, Radek and Tomsy (purged in the trials of the thirties) have been legally rehabilitated. . . .

A FURNITURE REMOVER was arrested by the Flying Squad and charged with housebreaking on the grounds that his fingerprint was on stolen furniture. He proved an alibi and pointed out that he once worked for the firm where the articles were in storage which explained the print. The case was dismissed. A prisoner in Pentonville was reading the newspaper on Saturday afternoon when he read that the Lord Chief Justice had quashed his three-year sentence on Wednesday. He told a disbelieving prison officer and finally got to see the Governor. He was released after tea (or was it cocoa?). Mrs. Joy Baker who

won a legal battle to educate her children was also freed on appeal against a three month sentence for not disclosing she was an undischarged bankrupt. Her debts had been paid by a supporter in expectation of royalties on her forthcoming book on her legal battle. . . .

TEN MEMBERS of the Committee of 100 sat down in the American Embassy in London on Tuesday demanding to see the American Ambassador, Linus Paulin sent a telegram to President Kennedy saying "your horrifying threat of military action places all the American people as well as many people in other countries in great danger". On Tuesday night 124 people were arrested during demonstrations outside the U.S. Embassy. Forty sixth-formers at Midhurst Grammar School went on a two-day strike in protest at American action. On Wednesday 500 people demonstrated at the U.S. Embassy, 10 arrests were made. In Bristol 100 people staged a sit-down in the City centre. In Oslo 1,000 left-wing demonstrators fought with 1,000 right-wing demonstrators, mounted police intervened. On Thursday in Oxford 800 students demonstrated. Sixty girl pupils at the Glanmor Grammar School in Swansea walked out one hour before time. Three demonstrators were arrested outside the American Embassy on Thursday. Eighty demonstrators paraded round Dublin on 23rd October and five of them were arrested by the police who set dogs on the crowd. Several demonstrators were bitten. The arrested were detained for one hour and a half and then released. The London Committee of 100 protested about the 'grossly excessive' costs which have been imposed on some of its supporters at Marlborough Street. The Cuba Crisis Committee of the University of London Union called for a 'strike' of all students throughout the country on Tuesday. Ten students at Southampton University staged a 24-hour hunger strike. At Leicester University a student fasted for more than 40 hours. Thousands of 'peace pickets' in Washington demanded an end to the blockade. About 150 people were arrested in Central London on Saturday at a protest organized by the Committee of 100. Seated demonstrators were yanked from the ground by their hair and thrown by the police onto the ground face downwards. 38 people were arrested at a sit-down in Manchester, and 66 at Bristol. . . .

A BRITISH-TRAINED psychiatrist in Nigeria prescribes for mentally disturbed natives dances, rituals and animal sacrifices. The native understands this medicine and it cures him; an analyst's couch would only puzzle him. Henry Nolan, a 60-year-old tramp was jailed at Bedford for six months for a half-hearted attempt to break into a toy shop. The recorder asked "How is it you always come before me in the autumn?" Nolan replied: "On one side of the wall I feed on crusts and sleep in a ditch. On the other side there is steak and chips and a warm bed. Can you blame me for choosing that for the winter?" Lord Snowdon was admitted for observation to the National Hospital for Nervous Disorders. Professor Bart Bok, Director of Mount Stromio Observatory said in Canberra that life as known on earth—or better—had probably evolved in other planetary systems.

JON QUIXOTE.

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

Parisian Sketches J. K. Huysmans 16/-
The Guntz Frank Norman 21/-
Ship of Fools Katherine Anne Porter 30/-
Outlines of Philosophy Will Durrant 30/-
I, Flook "Trog" 5/-
Paid Servant E. R. Braithwaite 15/-
Two Cultures? F. R. Leavis and M. Yudkin 8/6
The Private Ear and the Public Eye Peter Shaffer 12/6
A Morning to Remember Herbert Smith 15/-
Selected Essays 1934-43 Simone Weil 30/-
First Years of Revolution, 1918-21 Ilya Ehrenburg 25/-
Aneurin Bevan: A Biography, Vol. 1 Michael Foot 45/-
The Russian Revolution David Footman 9/6

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

The Structure of Literature Paul Goodman 12/6
Dostoevsky E. H. Carr 8/6
Man, Morals and Society J. C. Flugel 9/6
Marx on Economics R. Freedman 4/6
Two Short Accounts of Psycho-Analysis Sigmund Freud 3/6
I Believe 7/6
The Rise of European Liberalism H. J. Laski 6/-
A Pictorial History of Nazi Germany Erwin Leiser 3/6
The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism Bertrand Russell 5/-
Weekend in Dinlock Clancy Sigal 3/6

SECOND-HAND

The Improper Bohemians Allen Churchill 8/6; Ideal Birth Th. H. Van de Velde 5/-; Medicine and the State Sir Arthur Newsholme 4/-; Selected Speeches and Articles Georgi Dimitrov 3/-; The Sickness of an Acquisitive Society (damaged) R. H. Tawney 5/-; The Annihilation of Man Leslie Paul 3/-; "They Always Come Back" Cicely McCall 3/6; A Heretics' Answer to Communism C. E. Cookson 2/6; The World Jasper H. Stemberge (1956) 10/-; The Career of a Nihilist Stepaniak 5/6; Mr. Belloc Objects H. G. Wells 3/-.

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily; 10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays; 10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

The major work on show in the Tate

ARTHUR MOYSE.

FREEDOM

November 3 1962 Vol 23 No 34

PLAYING UP THE CRISIS

Continued from page 1

them to see Caroline's ponies"). On Thursday he saw Mr. Gromyko who "had told me in my office that he was instructed to make it clear once again, as he said his Government had already done, that Soviet assistance to Cuba 'pursued solely the purpose of contributing to the defence capabilities of Cuba', that 'training by Soviet specialists of Cuban nationals in handling defensive armaments was by no means offensive' and that 'if it were otherwise, the Soviet Government would never become involved in rendering such assistance."

And on the following Tuesday Mr. Kennedy's comment was: "That statement was false". But did he tell Mr. Gromyko at the time that he knew him to be a bloody liar? Of course not! He was reserving that for a more politically advantageous occasion. On the Friday he engaged in electioneering addresses. According to the *Observer* he appeared to be "rather restrained in his remarks about Republicans. Otherwise he seemed to be in good electioneering form". On Saturday morning he curtailed his campaign and returned to the White House. His Press secretary like Mr. Gromyko made a false statement to the effect that the President was suffering from "an infection of the upper respiratory tract", whereas in fact he withdrew from the election circus in order to consult with his advisers on the course he should pursue.

It seems clear to us from the President's actions during the week preceding his broadcast that it was considered that Russian activity in Cuba could be allowed to proceed unhampered while he laid the political stage. Indeed, as the *Observer* diplomatic staff points out:

Having decided to enforce a blockade, Kennedy and his advisers clearly felt it necessary to play up the crisis and to

Nothing Proved

LET'S examine the results of the "crisis". Political commentators have decided that the outcome is a victory for Kennedy. He took a "tough line", not only in words but "deeds"—that is everything short of invasion or bombardment of Cuba or active interference with Russian ships! Max Freedman describes the Kennedy sabre rattling in these terms (29/10/62):

It is impossible to be more precise on this point, but the highest officials of the Kennedy Administration have given assurances that these military preparations must have been known through Communist intelligence sources by Mr. Khrushchev and the other leaders of the Russian Government. Thus Russia knew that the US was coming "very close to the wire" in making the final military dispositions and decisions.

What did Mr. Khrushchev gain by making his new offer? [of unconditional withdrawal of missiles from Cuba]. He avoided war, perhaps nuclear war. These grim words summarise the result of many anxious days of policy-making by senior officials in the Kennedy Administration.

If military people in the Kremlin, or political rivals of Mr. Khrushchev, thought that they could engage in a military venture in the Western Hemisphere with impunity, they knew from the far-flung American response that their calculations were dangerously wrong and carried imminent hazards to the Soviet Union itself.

The fact that Russia has capitulated to American demands does not prove that she would not reject such demands in other circumstances. Equally it has not been proved that had the Russians re-

generate an atmosphere of "maximum peril". The speech that was prepared for delivery on Monday made no attempt to calm world fears.

On the contrary. Public opinion had to be mobilised into believing that the United States government meant business; that in fact it was not "brinkmanship", which is, in the last analysis, only bluff which can be called at the eleventh hour.

What was America ready to do when it provoked the "crisis"? The *Guardian* (Oct. 29) refers to the "gravity of the crisis" when it was "reliably reported from Washington that the United States was even prepared to consider nuclear bombing of the missile sites in Cuba". But how reliable are these sources in fact? So-called diplomacy is a gigantic blind man's bluff in which the politicians engage but from which the people of the respective countries derive very little advantage.

Take for instance the present, or should it, in view of the magnanimity of the Chairman and the President, be referred to as the "very recent crisis"? What in concrete terms is the outcome of a fortnight of "crisis" and its human repercussions? The *Guardian* which is the least paranoid member of the national Press, carries the headline "Cold War Balance Tilts Towards the West" followed by the sub-headline "Biggest Shift Since Sputnik". To our minds the net result of the "crisis" so far as the people are concerned is NIL. Politically what does it reveal?

There are so many imponderables that so far as the power blocs are concerned the situation is unchanged. It seems to us that after the dirty linen has been rinsed, it will be discovered that the sole beneficiary will be the Castro régime.

used to withdraw their missiles from Cuba, the United States would have taken action which might have led to world war and the elimination of mankind. America's threats were not put to the test, so whatever the experts, the political commentators and the actors in the drama themselves may now say, it is all sheer conjecture.

To begin with nobody knows for certain why the Russians decided to build missile-launching sites in Cuba. All kinds of "reasons" have been put forward. (1) At Castro's request (a) to defend himself from American aggression; (b) to attack America; (c) to dominate Latin America. (2) By Russian initiative (a) to add to Russia's defensive/offensive armament; (b) for the day when the "confrontation" between East and West would be a reality; (c) to protect Cuba from invasion; (d) as a bargaining pawn in the game of power politics; (e) as a provocation, in the hope that America would in fact invade Cuba or bomb it from the air; (f) simply to test American reactions.

We could think of more examples if we felt that the argument as it stands unconvincing. Similarly we can think of all kinds of reasons why the Kennedy Administration chose to make Cuba the excuse for an outward show of strength, none of which, however, strong enough to lead us to believe that Kennedy would have plunged America into nuclear war if his bluff had been called by the Russians.

The Diggers at Honington

THE direct action at Honington on October 10th was one of the most imaginative and interesting demonstrations ever organised by the Committee of 100, though the Cuban emergency has blunted the impact it might have made. The demonstration was planned by the East Anglian Committee of 100, whose members deliberately refused to seek quantity rather than quality or to cause pointless obstruction or to lay down any detailed programme beforehand.

We were to have begun with a rally in Bury St. Edmunds, the country town of West Suffolk, about 70 miles from London, but this was banned, so we just formed up at 3.0 and marched through and out of the town. There were a couple of hundred of us, armed with picks and forks and spades, furnished with polythene bags of seed, and accompanied by a supporting contingent from CND.

When we got outside Bury we had a short meeting and then piled into cars and coaches which drove us on to Honington. This is a V-bomber base about 8 miles north of Bury, one of the dozens of British and American nuclear bases in East Anglia, which was chosen by the East Anglian Committee because it was both British and operational. We gathered there on a patch of grass between the airfield and the married quarters—meeting our friends, buying refreshments from the Welfare Group van and getting advice from the Legal Action Group van while we stood between the beautiful white aircraft on the runways and the ugly red fhouses of the people who keep them there.

The actual demonstration began at 4.0. Our East Anglian comrades had managed to get a real plough, and this led us slowly down the middle of the road to the main entrance of the camp, while press photographers and servicemen's children buzzed round us like flies, cheering and jeering indiscriminately. The plough stopped at the main entrance, which was guarded by a double police cordon. Peter Cadogan, our spokesman, asked to speak to the officer in charge. This was the orderly officer, who was standing rather unhappily in front of the main gate behind the police cordon, and Peter was allowed to pass through to give him our message to the Officer Commanding RAF Honington.

This message, which had been prepared by the East Anglian Committee, had already been approved by us at our meeting outside Bury. It reminded the C.O. that he was "in command of a V-bomber base designed for the purposes of nuclear war" and that we were convinced that "the use of weapons of mass destruction constitutes both the grossest of crimes against humanity and a breach of international law." After a brief discussion of the Nuremberg Trials and the U.N. Charter, it stated:

"We have come to Honington prepared to turn the place from the negative purposes of war to the constructive uses of peace. We well appreciate that for the moment we shall probably not achieve our main design. One day we shall. We intend our present action to signify not only that the purposes of the land at Honington should be transformed but that all the wasteful employment in war preparations everywhere be brought to an end, and the whole creative genius of man turned to the great task of ending hunger, poverty, suffering and oppression.

"We urge this approach not only in Britain but throughout the world. We have no faith in existing governments. We see the hope of the future in the common people of America, Russia and elsewhere taking the same kind of initiative against their own administrations as we take against ours. We join hands with them against nuclear weapons, military alliances and war itself.

"The real defence of this country, as of others, is not in weapons of any kind but in the assertion of common humanity and in a determination to solve out-

standing problems by peaceful means. We are sure that this can and must be done. The alternative is a third world war infinitely worse than the first two put together. In the name of all these considerations we ask to be admitted to your base so that we might start to reclaim it for peaceful purposes."

After a few minutes we were told that the C.O. had refused to admit us. It is a fundamental rule of the East Anglian Committee that a demonstration planned by them belongs not to them but to the demonstrators themselves; so Peter Cadogan threw back at us the responsibility for deciding what to do next. The recommendation of the East Anglian Committee was that we should take the plough to a suitable patch of grass by the boundary fence, plough it up, and sow our seed there on Air Ministry property. This recommendation was accepted at once, and the plough led us again down the middle of the road, past the police cordon, and on for a few hundred yards.

When we reached a good place, the plough turned on to the grass verge and began to plough a single furrow in front of us between the road and the wire. Those of us who had picks and forks and spades began to dig up the grass by the fence, some of us used our bare hands to tear the grass up, and the rest of us sowed our seed in the earth that was turned up, planting winter wheat and beans and artichokes here and there for about 200 yards along the wire.

The forces of the state were divided. On our side of the fence were the police, on the other were the RAF. The police, who are used to us now, made little effort to deter us from digging or planting, though they soon stopped the plough and also stopped us damaging the fence. The RAF, who were represented by security guards and dog handlers, stopped us digging up their side of the fence by setting their Alsatians on any hands that rashly strayed through the wire. The police were quite willing to talk to us, but the servicemen refused to talk or even to listen to us, though they watched us curiously. Some of us called out and tried to persuade them to follow us: there was no need to stop us, because none of them listened.

After about half an hour the demonstration was taking two forms. There were the diggers along the fence, and an informal meeting up at the front by the plough trying to decide what to do next. There were four alternatives—go on ploughing, go on digging, go over the fence, or go back to the main entrance for a vigil or a sit-down. The long discussion was interrupted by the arrest of a few of the more determined diggers, who refused to do what they were told. They were carried into a furniture van which was brought out from the camp and was promptly blockaded by other demonstrators. The blockaders were arrested and carried into a second furniture van, which was also promptly blockaded—and so on until there were three loaded vans all trying to drive past the meeting by the plough. The meeting quickly spread across the road and forced the vans to turn back. After this small triumph we finally decided to return to the main entrance. There we formed up and stood in silence for 4½ minutes. Then Peter Cadogan made a short speech, explaining that the vigil was to symbolise the warning this country would have if Russian rockets were launched and promising that one day we would come back and dig the whole bloody airfield up. Then the demonstration dispersed, after lasting about two hours. About 45 people were arrested, and tried at a makeshift court in a school at Ixworth.

The *Peace News* reporter has already said: "There was no success or failure at Honington. There was resistance creatively carried out by the individuals present. The rest is secondary." This is true, but "the rest" should neverthe-

less be stated. It should be placed on record that the East Anglian Committee of 100 is far more healthy and reliable than the London Committee (which mishandled the Cuban demonstration in Trafalgar Square a week later in a disastrous way), and that the libertarian leadership of Peter Cadogan and his friends is the sort of thing we need far more of in this sort of action. It should also be stated that no one could see or take part in the demonstration without feeling more deeply involved in the struggle. But the other side must also be stated. The numbers were pitiful, if we remember that the first demonstration by the Direct Action Committee at North Pickenham took place nearly four years ago and that the Committee of 100 was formed nearly two years ago. Has all our work been in vain? And there is always the thing which I shall carry in my mind for the rest of my life—that we were bent double digging and planting when on the other side of a flimsy little wire fence the horrible aircraft were waiting on the runways, and we could stay bent double digging and planting for a hundred years and the horrible aircraft would still be there, waiting on the other side of a flimsy little wire fence that we didn't have the guts to climb over, until the day when the orders come and they fly away and stop everyone digging and planting and doing anything at all. Has all our work been in vain? N.W.

AS I SEE IT

WHILST writing this article on Friday evening (26/10/62), the world looks very sick. As one can only go by reports from press and TV, the ordinary-man-in-the-street's reaction to the Cuba crisis is very mixed: from hopelessness to nationalism.

All the week charges and counter-charges have been thrown from left and right, the word 'justification' has taken top priority; many cheeks must be sore from having tongues stuck in them for such a lengthy period of time. One is frightened sick by the statements made by our so-called 'leaders'.

What is the real score? It is power politics in all its horrible nakedness. I do not profess to have the knowledge of current events at my fingertips, but one thing I do know is this: I am a natural-born coward and have no ambition to die, not even to help mad crazy political bastards get their names in the history book.

If ever the policy of unilateral disarmament was justified its case is proven now. The fingers are a few inches short of the button, and there is no need to call for volunteers to press it. American and Russian Governments do not really have to justify their case to the world or even to their own people; the enemy has been constantly kept before the Russian and American people and the build-up has been a gradual process of indoctrination. America has consistently supported reactionary right wing S. American governments, and Russia their various left wing supporters, the workers or the devil they don't know. Which ever way it goes they never come out on top.

When are we "Joe Soap's" going to wake up? We are pushed around from pillar to post, cheated and robbed every day of our lives and condemn our kids to the same conditions.

On Tuesday I attended the demonstration outside the American and Russian Embassies and have never felt so helpless in my life. Supposing the crowd had gained entry to the American Embassy and took the building apart, brick by brick, 'so what'? Maybe a certain satisfaction, but not important. So alright, sit-down, you can sit till you have piles and again, 'so what'? I am not saying that this type of action is not good propaganda but isn't it too late for this now?

Shouldn't we, as workers, say to the Government now "we are not having any part in war", and as an illustration of our determination, 'down tools' to deliver the message personally with an addendum to the effect, that if the Government has any crazy ambitions in its future policy, 'down tools' will be permanent? Wars are only fought by the permission of ordinary people. For Pete's sake let's wake up, regain our self-confidence and take control.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

Sit-Down or Pay Up!

Several of our comrades have been arrested during the demonstrations of last week. The least that those who did nothing can do now is to help pay their fines. Please give generously and quickly. Send to Jack Stephenson c/o Freedom Press.

ANARCHIST BALL: JANUARY 25th

4
Advisors to the Establishment?

DEAR FRIEND,
Given that Capitalism is likely to be with us until the debate on the Common Market has long been settled, the issue of entry or otherwise is one between rival groups of Capitalists. So as one who believes that the only revolutionary position on the issue is one of neutrality, I should be interested to know by what tortuous piece of logic-chopping or Hegelian dialectic you justify your position.

Apparently (to judge by your current second editorial), to campaign for the Common Market is to engage in Capitalist politics in company with Macmillan, Butler, Jenkins, Grimmond, Gunter, and Edwards; while to campaign against it in terms of immediate advantage—which means in effect to campaign for the continued independence of British capitalism, for the preservation of the Commonwealth and Earl Attlee's Monarchy—is to avoid such murky alliances with Beaverbrook, Hinchinbrooke, Smedley, Mayhew, Pollitt, Gaitskell and Cousins. Could it be that it is only part of the Freemasonry to which FREEDOM objects?—a rival order perhaps?

It is surely no part of a revolutionary's job, to advise the Establishment on the best way of preserving Capitalism, or to campaign for marginal meliorations. It is open to a Socialist to have views as to whether it is easier to achieve a revolution if the Capitalists take us into Europe or stay out. To their credit most socialists who have come out in favour of entry have argued at this level. (See for instance Levy and Rowe in *Socialist Current*). One can only wish that FREEDOM and other journals who have come out against entry had also so done.

As it is, instead of putting arguments as to why FREEDOM considers it would be easier to achieve Anarchism outside the Market than in, you have argued as if advising voters. Stressing that the British worker would find Europe more oppressive you make no mention of the European worker and so eager are you to tail-end *Tribune* that you follow its lead in ignoring the unhealthy economic

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

position of Capitalist Britain and like Foot forgo to mention that the choice will soon be between being sweated in Europe and hungry outside. Then to cap the lot, while finding all your arguments in *Tribune*, and usually publishing them about a month later, and while rightly saying that Foot is no radical you claim this title for yourself.

Yours faithfully,
LAURENS OTTER.
Whitney, Oxon, Oct. 20.

Quiet Revolution

A FEW years ago the anti-war movement in this country consisted largely of people who thought they could stop war by influencing the government. Now these seem to be a minority; the new majority seems to recognise that the struggle against war is a struggle against government.

Of course world events, and the failure of various ideas assuming that statesmen were reasonable, largely account for the swing in pacifist thought. But would it have been such a definite swing if anarchists had stood aside, refusing to join in healthy activities because they were associated with silly ideas?

The Aldermaston March is a vote with the feet—intended to turn the government against the bomb by showing that many thoughtful pious people oppose it! The C. of 100 Sit-Down is an act of Civil Disobedience—intended to turn the government against the bomb by showing that people are prepared to go to gaol!

The so-called World Wide General Strike for Peace is a series of individual acts by ordinary people acting as individuals. The literature of the New York committee talks of "convincing the governments that people want peace . . .", but I am still happy to join their enterprise.

Anarchist propaganda is important, but we must not insist that only the Anarchist is qualified to participate in the quiet revolution. The right road is the one that leads where you want to travel. If it is well signposted so much the better; but it is still the right road whatever balls is written on the signpost.
DONALD ROOM.

The Price of Productivity

THE EDITORS,
I would like to comment on your readers' letter by Francis Ellingham which I read with interest.

It is interesting to recall that the industrial revolution was preceded by an agricultural one which enabled a large surplus to be produced, i.e., production for profit, instead of for immediate use. This was then followed by application in certain areas, notably the middle west of America and Canada of industrial methods in agriculture. The technical results of the original agricultural revolution were on the whole sound in that they increased production and maintained and even increased fertility. The general aim of the large scale operations in the American Continent was to produce grain as quickly and as cheaply as possible, in fact, to reverse progress in agricultural production and to repeat the methods of our forefathers on such a large scale that the recuperative processes of nature were unable to catch up with the damage.

Agriculture not tied to political and financial expediency is, as long as the sun shines, the rain rains, and while that product, *par excellence*, of industrial society the H-bomb is not used, an inexhaustible source of real wealth.

As generally speaking agricultural production in Britain in the last century was not readily amenable to industrialisation the effect was to depress corn production, reduce the agricultural population and reduce the rest to penury. It was in fact cheaper to feed animals on corn grown abroad; here started the specialisation on which mass production is based. From a fertility point of view, however, there was a steady build up of

fertility that stood us in good stead when the ships bringing the foreign corn were sunk in the first and second world wars.

I do not think that there is any special merit in unremitting toil on a low diet. We are in the position to produce a sufficiency, the application of misdirected scientific and financial and political methods is resulting in the lowering of production in this field. Present methods of intensive livestock production result in a lowering of the quality of food produced and dangerous situation in animal and human health analogous to the political situation in the arms race. There is battle going on between the bug and the bugologist aided by the shareholders of the chemical combines, the bug is winning because it is tougher than animals and people. If people think that this is an exaggeration they should read "Our Daily Poison", which is a scientific statement of fact by a chemist Leonard Wickenden.

It has always been a firm conviction of mine that to think only in terms of political authority is to ignore the interrelation that is the essence of life as we know it.

Obviously the one must derive satisfaction from the activity of living, to do this one must have enough to eat and adequate protection from the weather and sound physical and mental health.

This is obviously not at the moment the purpose of agricultural or industrial production. In spite of the enormous potentiality of production and scientific knowledge, man as your correspondent says is neither happy nor healthy. Specialisation has developed hand in hand with industrialisation and tied to particular interests have been an obstacle to the balanced growth of man and society.

ALAN ALBON.
Hailsham, Sussex, Oct. 22.

Are machines wicked?

DEAR COMRADES,
I am afraid I find Francis Ellingham's letter in *FREEDOM* 20/10/62 full of the usual Anarchist-type clichés; the yearning for the good old days when the peasants were free to sweat their guts out 16 hours a day in order to produce a meagre amount of food and make their own beautiful (?) clothes, furniture, etc. . . .
"The mass-produced object has replaced the artefact of beauty". Why should mass-production preclude beauty in an object? In fact it doesn't, even now, and in an anarchist society things could be designed for maximum efficiency and beauty, rather than for what is cheapest to make. (And I have seen some not-so-beautiful objects produced by the do-it-yourself craftsmen among our comrades!)

MONEY!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT OCTOBER 27 1962

Week 43		
EXPENSES: 43 weeks at £70	£3,010	
INCOME:		
Sales & Sub. Renewals	£	£
Weeks 1-41	1,346	
Weeks 42 & 43	89	
	—	1,435
New Subscriptions:		
Weeks 1-41 (327)	353	
Weeks 42 & 43 (21)	21	
	—	374
	—	1,809
DEFICIT £1,201		

DEFICIT FUND

Hartford: M.G.A.* £2/4/6; London: P.W.H. 18/-; Shepton Mallet: E.H.S. 10/-; Rainham: D.R.W.J. 3/-; London: B.S. 1/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Peterborough: F. W. 2/6; New York: R.T. 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Merriott: M.A.W. 8/-; Bath: J.C. 9/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* £4; Newcastle: R.N. 1/5; Nottingham: H.D. 11/6; Solihull: I.M.I.C. 1/3; Germiston, S.A.: V.D. 3/1; Pittston: A.R. £5/3/4; Finland: J.R. 2/6; University City: N.E.M. £1/8/-; Hongkong: M.S. £1; Leeds: G.L. 2/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Belfast: "Liam" 5/-; Avey: S.J.L. 3/-; E. Rutherford: A.S.* 14/-; London: J.A.N.* 10/6; Wellington, N.Z.: Anarchist Association 10/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Hailsham: L.S. 2/7; Doncaster: E.N. 3/10; Bromley: M.F.D. 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; London: J.A.P. 8/-; Uppminster: C.R. 5/-; Shoreham: M. & D.* 2/6; Glasgow: J.H.* 3/6; London: C.G. 1/2; London: B.B. 10/-; London: T.R. 2/6; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-.

TOTAL	23 15 8
Previously acknowledged	1,012 11 5
1962 TOTAL TO DATE £1,036 7 1	

*Denotes regular contributors.

"Without centralization and regimentation you cannot have high production". Why not? It is not *only* the drive for production that has formed the giant monopolies. And the largest organizations are not necessarily the most efficient. Leaving aside the human issues (greater involvement, pride in work, etc., in a small firm) if one takes into account all the bureaucratic staff in a large organization, it probably produces less goods per man than the small one.

I expect it was necessary to concentrate centres of production at the beginning of the industrial revolution, but with the advent of automation this is no longer true. A very few people can form an efficient production unit, and instead of producing enough merely for their own needs, they can produce enough for a whole neighbourhood, town, or whatever.

Anarchists often talk as if machines, automation, etc., were in themselves *Wicked*, producing all sorts of social wrongs. This is looking at things in a very topsy-turvy way. (Really you can't blame high production for causing crime, mental illness, etc., just because they exist in the same society). Machines are only advanced tools after all, besides they are *here* (so is atomic power and it is up to us to use them to our best advantage. I think the Tao line is ridiculous, I doubt if mankind would be in existence now if our forebears had refused to use tools, wheels, etc. It is after all in this very desire to control the environment for his own ends that man differs from lesser animals.

Comrade Ellingham seems to think that high production, and all that, is making Anarchism less likely. To me it makes it *more*. Man is not free (or dignified) when he is at the mercy of nature, working long and hard to produce mere necessities, and with never enough to go round. Man can be free when the necessities for all are produced with very little labour, and he can (for example) sit back with a full belly in his (mass-produced) armchair, place a (mass-produced) record on his (mass-produced) hi-fi radiogram, and listen to whatever musical glories of the past or present he chooses to.

Another point, even now greater production is causing greater leisure for the worker, existence is no longer a desperate struggle. Soon he may even have the time and energy to THINK and then what might happen?

The point I would like to stress is that (to me at any rate!) anarchism is not something which might have been possible in the past, it is something which has only become possible now, because we at last have the *means* to produce for the needs of all.

JACQUETTA BENJAMIN.
London, S.W.2., Oct. 10.

Are wars arranged deliberately?

DEAR FRIENDS,
According to today's *Guardian*, the government is preparing plans for the evacuation of large centres of population in the event of an emergency.

This can only mean that they expect another big war in the next year to two. In 1954 Montgomery said there would not be another war for ten years, so till then we could 'carry on with our games'.

Also, in 1920 the British War Office is said to have advised the Government that there would not be another major war for 20 years, so they could safely disarm. Which they did, partly, and with a great air of virtue. The estimate was only about 12 months out.

Now, how did the War Office in 1920, and Montgomery in 1954, know the date of the next conflict?

The clear inference is that all these things are deliberately arranged behind the scenes, and that 'surprise attacks', unprecedented treacheries and outrages, etc., are so much propaganda eyewash. Wars are a put up job.

The idea that they are deliberately arranged seems almost inescapable.

This sordid theory has two implications. First, that 'war by accident' won't happen. It will be no accident whatsoever.

Secondly, if wars can be deliberately started, they can, and will be, deliberately stopped or turned off. This means that World War III will not be the end of 'civilisation'. That is to say, as soon as things become too bad, the supply of champagne runs low and the people at the top begin to feel uncomfortable, there will be a 'victory' or whatever you call it, the 'peace' will break out again.

However, recent scientific events suggest that the controls of the people at the top are not too reliable, and another war might easily lead to a general collapse, even though this is not 'in the plan'.

Anyway, it's a nice situation, whatever happens.

Yours truly,
Cambridge, Oct. 19. J. EASTMAN.

LONDON FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at The Two Brewers, 40 Monmouth Street, WC2 (Leicester Square Tube) Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

- NOV 4 Marx and Bakunin
- NOV 11 S.F. : The Ridiculous to the Sublime
- NOV 18 Alan Albon: From the Peckham Experiment to the Haughey Experiment
- NOV 25 Ted Kavanagh.
- DEC 2 Philip Holgate: Subject to be announced
- DEC 9 Arthur Uloth: Subject to be announced
- DEC 16 Max Patrick: The Far East Situation

Hyde Park Meetings

Sundays at 4 p.m. onwards (Anarchist time) (Weather permitting)

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Tuesday at Brian and Doris Lelie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald & Irene Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Please note that the meetings at Fellows Road, N.W.3 are now on the third Friday, not the third Wednesday as hitherto.

Last Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at George Hayes', 174 McLeod Road, Abbey Wood, S.E.2.

Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group)

Last Friday of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbrooke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11.

ANARCHY Nos 1-20

Still Available 1/9 Post Free

Freedom The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month. *ANARCHY* (1/8 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 16/- (2.50)
3 months 8/4 (\$1.25)
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)

12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

1 year (40 issues) 20/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 10/- (\$1.50)
3 months (10 issues) 5/- (\$0.75)

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

Cheques, P.O.s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

FREEDOM PRESS

17a MAXWELL ROAD LONDON, S.W.6, ENGLAND Tel: RENOWN 3736.