

'Death, slavery and unhappiness (for others) are the chief ends pursued by states in their external relations. It is the preference of such ends to one's own happiness that constitutes patriotism.'

BERTRAND RUSSELL

In this Issue:

WAY OUT OF THIS WORLD
FRENCH MINERS STILL OUT
APARTHEID AND CAPITALISM
CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

Re-shaping or Eliminating the Railways?

THE British Railways Board's Report on "The Reshaping of British Railways" could not help being an interesting and valuable, as well as a controversial document, when one considers that "there had never before been any systematic assembly of a basis of information upon which planning could be founded, and without which the proper role of the railways in the transport system as a whole could not be determined." The Report does not indicate how many people and computers were involved in this "massive task", but the fact is that the information was collected and "brought to a useful stage in just over a year". The cult of the personality is the inevitable product of the centralised society, and it is not surprising therefore that Dr. Beeching has been given sole credit for the Report and the "revolutionary

proposals" contained therein. One newspaper has already tipped him for elevation to the Peerage, while others seem so hypnotised by the statistics as well as by Dr. Beeching's salary that they have succumbed without an objection to the findings of the B.R. Board and to the radical surgery it proposes.

As a matter of fact all the Report does in the main, is to confirm with figures, what most of us have for a long time observed with our own eyes: thousands of empty wagons rotting in sidings; great waves of passengers being disgorged at urban terminals for limited periods in the mornings and in the evenings with empty platforms and stabling sheds packed with idle trains in the in-between hours; deserted branch-line stations and roads choked with cars, coaches and heavy lorries.

To Pay or Not to Pay?

IN spite of the fact that the Report recognises that while it is "of course, the responsibility of the British Railways Board so to shape and operate the railways as to make them pay . . . it must be clearly stated that the proposals now made are not directed towards achieving that result by the simple and unsatisfactory method of rejecting all those parts of the system which do not pay already or which cannot be made to pay easily the proposed closure of some 2,363 stations out of a total of 4,300, and the complete withdrawal of services from about 5,000 route miles out of a total of 17,000 is determined by purely financial considerations. In Appendix 2 we find them referred to as "clearly uneconomic". We have no doubt that many are, but one's impression is that by making actual station receipts the criterion, the British Railways Board has weighted the dice. They do admit (in Appendix 1, p.65) that

there are marked disparities in the contribution which stations make to passenger traffic. Whilst passenger receipts are not necessarily a true measure of the contribution each station makes, because some receive more traffic than they originate, they can be regarded as a reasonable guide.

By this kind of argument seaside and other holiday resorts with a smallish permanent population but which receive large numbers of

visitors during the summer months and at week-ends and public holidays are as "clearly uneconomic" as the lonely halt with its half-dozen regulars daily.

The British Railways Board will counter this argument by pointing out that "High peak traffics at holiday periods are, however, very unremunerative. They are dying away and provision for them will be reduced" (p.58) and indeed, on the following page among the steps proposed are "(5) Damping down of seasonal peaks of passenger traffic and withdrawal of corridor coaching stock held for the purpose of covering them at present". An example of this "dying away" holiday traffic is Skegness, which according to the *Observer*, collected 340,000 railway tickets last year. Under the BR Board's plan, the three lines to Skegness, from

Grimsby, Lincoln and Boston (in all some 100 miles of railway tracks) will be scrapped altogether.

If the BR Railways Board could have its way, it would undoubtedly scrap the Suburban services as well! After all the peak load measured over half an hour is about ten times the level over the hours from 6 a.m. to midnight and the route and rolling stock capacity provided to deal with the peak is used "to only 10 per cent of its capacity during the hours over which it might normally be expected to carry passengers". But

To a greater or lesser degree, the pattern of life in all these areas is dependent upon continued operation of the suburban rail services, and to the life of London they are essential. It is therefore unthinkable to most people that these services might be closed, but that is no reason why they should be provided below cost.

The conclusion reached is that the only remunerative passenger-carrying function left to the railways is "fast and semi-fast inter-city passenger trains. Competition from air-services and private cars is not as serious as might appear, and the experts are confident that, given speed and comfortable trains, regular travellers will prefer the train to their cars and only on the London-Newcastle, Manchester and Scotland routes will air travel be competitive in any respect.

But obviously without a growth in freight transport there is no future for the railways, and it is not surprising that the major part of the report and appendices deal with this aspect of the railways. But here again the problem, as the experts see it, is similar to that of passenger transport. 3,500 Goods Stations handle 16 per cent (or 11,500,000 tons) whereas the other 1,500 deal with the rest (or nearly 60 million tons).

Victimisation by the ETU

The Catholic-controlled Electrical Trades Union has just announced the expulsion of Charles Doyle, the reason being given was his unofficial activities during the work-to-rule by the power workers at the beginning of this year.

Bro. Doyle, who was referred to as a Communist by the Union, refused to give undertakings to the E.T.U. on three points:—

1. That he would dissociate himself from the national shop stewards' movement in the electricity supply industry.
2. That he would end his connection with the unofficial journal "The Power Worker" which he has been editing
3. That he would not make any statements to the Press which were contrary to the declared policy of the union.

The inquiry was held at the Union's headquarters at Bromley, where several shop stewards and work-mates had gathered to give him support. The frame of mind of the union officials conducting the inquiry was mirrored in their

action in refusing to accept delivery of a telegram expressing support for Bro. Doyle from his work-mates at Battersea power station.

Although Bro. Doyle has lost his union ticket, he will not lose his job (although, no doubt, the E.T.U. would be glad if he did), for the power station at Battersea is not a closed shop. He is also strongly supported by his fellow-workers.

The Catholics controlling the E.T.U. are continuing in the footsteps of their predecessors, the Communists, with their policy of trying their utmost to disband the rank and file organisation of the power workers. Union leaders cannot tolerate an organised rank and file, and will try their utmost to smash it. In this, they are wholly supported by the employers (in this case the State) working hand in glove with them.

These attacks by union officials must be guarded against at all costs, for it is the rank and file movement, within the union, that safeguards the interests of the workers and fights to win their demands. There should be no victimisation by "boss-collaborating" union leaders.

P.T.

So the plan is to establish some 250 Centres for Coal distribution. At present 1,790 stations handle 6 per cent, 2,005 stations handle 74 per cent and another 64 handle 20 per cent. The argument is that since coal from these stations has to be distributed by road anyway, with an average radius of distribution of 2½ miles, the scrapping of the present depots in favour of 250 Centres would allow for the whole country to be covered by a 10-mile radius distribution.

So far as freight sundries are concerned the British Railways Board's proposals are clearly designed to drive as much of it as they can away from the railways! Instead of stations (those that are left, that is) handling freight, this will be concentrated in 100 depots dotted over the country. The whole of the

area south of London will boast of 14 depots; there will be but 3 for the whole of Wales (Swansea, Cardiff, Newport—that is all in the South), 12 in Scotland; Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex will make do with 6, and Cornwall and Devon with 2.

Behind this "rationalisation" of freight traffic is the idea that goods can only be moved economically by rail in train- and not wagon-loads. Siding to siding, depot to depot, Centre to Centre, transport is competitive with other forms of transport; station to station, with all the collection, loading and unloading, administrative and other work involved is not. On the other hand there is much traffic not carried by rail which the Board consider could be handled by the streamlined railways. A survey carried out in 1960 showed that of the 305m tons of mineral and merchandise traffic carried other than by rail, 82m tons conveyed by road and 11m tons by sea, inland waterways and "other methods", was "potentially suitable for rail transport".

In whose Interests?

THE determining arguments for the BR Board's case are, we think, contained in the following paragraphs of the Report:

(1) Throughout these investigations and the preparation of this report the British Railways Board has had in mind that its duty is to employ the assets vested in it, and develop or modify them, to the best advantage of the nation. Also, because the ultimate choice of what is considered most advantageous must be made by the nation, it is a basic responsibility of the Board to provide, as objectively and comprehensively as possible, information which makes clear the range and nature of the choice (p.1).

(2) Railways are distinguished by the provision and maintenance of a specialised route system for their own exclusive use. This gives rise to high fixed costs. On the other hand, the benefits which can be derived from possession of this high cost route system are very great.

Firstly, it permits the running of high capacity trains, which themselves have

very low movement costs per unit carried. Secondly, it permits dense flow of traffic and provided the flows are dense, the fixed costs per unit moved are also low. Thirdly, it permits safe, reliable, scheduled movements at high speed.

Now, this writer as an anarchist can find little to disagree with the arguments put forward. In (1) taking "nation" literally and not to mean the government or the ruling class and in (2) substituting "manpower" or some such term for "fixed costs", it seems to us that such would be the criteria in a free society for constantly examining the function of railways in that society.

THE reasons why we are suspicious of, and hostile to, the BR Board's plans are many. Firstly and principally because the emphasis of the report is on making the railways

Continued on page 3

French Miners Still Out

The French coal miners are still solidly out on strike against the Government and they have the support of the French people in their demands for higher wages.

Workers in the other nationalised industries have struck in support as well as for their own demands. Those in the gas, electricity and railway industries have given their support by organising short but very effective stoppages. The railwaymen have taken part in two-hour strikes which have been spaced out over the whole of the day and these are to continue. Power workers have brought the electric trains and the Paris Metro to a standstill for short periods, whilst Postal workers have added their support by striking for three days. Further action has been planned by the electricity and gas men.

The three-man committee which was set up by de Gaulle to look into these pay claims by the miners, has reported that the wages are 8% below those of workers in private industry. This figure, the miners claim, is incorrect and they state that their wages are 11% lower than those of the others.

M. Peyrefitte, Minister of Information, has said that the miners will get a 6½% rise on April 1st, increasing to 8% by 1st October and 12½% by 1st April, 1964. The miners have replied

that they want at least 8% now followed by the further increase to make up their 11% before the end of this year. They are also claiming a 40-hour week and four weeks holiday pay.

At the moment there is a deadlock between the miners and the Government. There seems to be even more determination on the part of the miners to fight for their full demands and although the strike is now in its fifth week, the support from other workers is still on the increase. The example of the miners has had an effect on the men in other nationalised industries, who are now demanding pay increases, backing these up with strike action.

The miners and their families are beginning to feel the strain of this long strike. Severe cuts in household expenditure are a common feature and meals are being prepared from the very cheapest of foodstuffs. The spirit of the wives is to be admired for they are showing the same determination as their husbands. The average monthly income is in the region of £44 which has meant a hard struggle to make ends meet. These people have suffered the Government's wage restraint policy long enough and are united in their determination to win their just demands.

Continued on page 2

ANARCHY 26

IS ON
Science and
Technology

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

ONE THIRD of Britain's railway-stations are planned to be closed by Dr. Beeching, 5,000 miles of track are to be lopped off and tens of thousands of railwaymen are to be out of work. A station in Norfolk which is used by one passenger twice a year and which employs two porters, two signalmen, two clerks and a stationmaster is remaining open for the "Queen" as the stationmaster said "is the main freight customer". . . .

THE QUEEN'S return from Australia passed practically unnoticed, for the Press were actively engaged in covering the return from Madrid of an ex-witness, ex-model. In Paris, when Miss Christine Keeler arrived blows were exchanged between cameramen and friends escorting Miss Keeler. . . . One American radio correspondent who tried to record an interview with her was knocked to the ground. When she approached the reception lounge from the tarmac and saw the cameramen waiting, she hid her head in the collar of her coat. Friends waiting for her tried to hustle her through the crowd but could not force the way though and blows were exchanged. The Swiss Government announced that photographers who continue to pester Princess Margaret would be expelled from Switzerland. Lord Snowdon, it was said, had been nearly killed by a press protographer. . . . The *Times* in its anarchist-type leader on the Freedom of the Press said, "Neither taste nor ethics can be authoritarionally laid down. The way journalists behave, the spirit in which they go about their business, and the kind of business they go about are what will be decisive". Mr. Paul Johnson in the *New Statesman* defined that spirit in saying Macmillan has no friends in Fleet Street. "Between now and polling-day, political news-reporting will be heavily pro-Labour. . . . At the same time any Tory minister or MP. (or for that matter, judge or barrister) who gets involved in a scandal during the next year or so, must expect —I regret to say—the full treatment" *The Daily Mirror* the following Monday repudiated this charge with an extravaganza on the unlikelihood of any judge being involved in any scandal. "His charge against journalists is tantamount



to accusing a milkman of delivering sour milk to a housewife who forgot his Christmas box". But the ugly step-sister of the *Mirror*, the *Sketch*, on Saturday, under a front-page headline LUCKY JOHN PROFUMO and a sub-heading "What's gone wrong at the war-Office?" goes about its kind of business with an article starting "The spectacle of a Minister of the Crown having to get up in Parliament to explain his acquaintance with a 21-year-old girl who should have given evidence in a shooting case against a coloured man—a man with a conviction for living on immoral earnings—"

Continued from page 1

Because of the Government's unwillingness to grant these claims, there are a number of people who take the view that "black-leg" labour should be used to get production moving again. This despicable scheme has been named "freedom to work" and operates on the basis that strike-pickets should be outlawed.

Feeling is running high amongst the miners on the question of "scabs" and there have already been clashes between the men on the picket line and police when the strikers stopped two busloads of "black-leg" workers. If the Government decides to adopt the scheme suggested by these people, further action from workers in other industries will be needed, for the picket lines must be maintained and strengthened.

Few factories have had to close down because of the strike in spite of the fact that coal stocks were exceptionally low after the severe winter. France usually imports about a fifth of the total amount of coal used and during the strike the imports have been increased following a new agreement made with the Saar, where huge stocks of coal are stored for France.

The iron and steel industry has not experienced any great shortage for 45% of the total amount of coke used in the blast furnaces comes from the Ruhr. Imports of anthracite from Wales have also helped.

With more and more industries turning to other forms of power, the effect of the miners' strike action has not been as widely felt as they would have liked and it is only with the support of workers in other industries that they can use the withdrawal of their labour to its full advantage. Now that the natural gas workers at Lacq have reached an agreement and returned to work, the miners have lost an extremely useful ally.

Widespread strike action is needed to help these miners to win their demands, especially from complementary workers in other countries. No coal or other form of fuel should be exported to France from either here or any other country, and every assistance should be given to help the French miners to defeat the cruel wage restraint policy of their authoritarian Government.

Disputes at Fords

At Fords new factory at Halewood, the beginning of March saw the Lord Mayor of Liverpool driving the first car off the production line.

This was the first of many, for very soon cars were being produced at the rate of 200 per day. This, it is anticipated, will be gradually increased until the output reaches 1,000 cars a day. This step-up in production will also lead to an increase in the labour force which at the moment stands at 3,400 people. When the factory is working to capacity, the total number of workers employed is expected to be in the region of 9,000.

At the time of completion of this first car, there was an overtime ban in operation by four of the unions, chief of which was the Amalgamated Engineering Union. This action was taken because eight men from Dagenham, working at Halewood were getting a higher rate of pay than the local men. Union leaders had negotiated lower wages for workers at Halewood but

is, to say the least, unedifying." We were edified by *Paris Match* and *Time* arriving from the outside world with the full story of Mr. Profumo, Christine Keeler, Mr. Eugene Ivanov, an attaché at the Russian embassy; and the "Sensitive Osteopath" (in *Times* deathless prose) Dr. Stephen Ward, cut out. Dr. Stephen Ward had threatened to sue *Time* and W. H. Smith, the periodical's distributors, for libel. . . .

THE PRESS'S dilemmas were increased by having two unhappy Christine's to spread themselves upon The second Christine was the dead and allegedly unfaithful wife of Harvey Holford, a Brighton club-owner, who was found, by an all-male jury (after a three hours retirement) not guilty of the capital murder of his wife, but guilty of manslaughter on the grounds of provocation and diminished responsibility. This and diminished responsibility. This case followed the precedent of *R. v. Fantele* where a courier who shot his wife's lover after an argument, was found guilty of manslaughter, not murder. Ruth Ellis, who shot an unfaithful lover, was, notwithstanding, hanged. In France, things were ordered better for once, for Violette Nozières who was sentenced to death in 1934, for poisoning her father and attempting to poison her mother,

was granted complete civic rehabilitation on the grounds that she had lived for many years "a life without reproach". No plea of diminished responsibility was entered for Elard Chipendale, an African, who was sentenced to death at Blantyre, Nyasaland, for the murder of an African girl. He claimed he changed into a crocodile when hired by the dead girl's grandfather (who was also sentenced to death) to kill her. The case came to light when the crocodile-man sued the grandfather in court for the balance of his fee. . . .

DEATH CAME also (in bed) to General Sir Hubert Gough, G.C.M.G., K.C.B., K.C.V.O., at the age of 92. He commanded a brigade in Ireland in March 1914, and asked for dismissal if he was ordered to march against Northern Ireland (who were trying to prevent Home Rule for the whole of Ireland). He was in charge of cavalry at Mons and on the Marne, but with the advent of trench warfare, he was given command of the Fifth Army, fighting in the Somme. Writing of Passchendaele a campaign, he said: "The Battles of Ypres, 1917, are . . . the most unsatisfactory of the British major operations in France. It is true that they were not popular among the troops which took part in them. This feeling was not

due to the casualties . . . but to the terrible conditions under which the battles were fought." . . . "Was it worth it? It is too early to say. We, as contemporaries, can only pass opinions. It must be left to posterity to pass judgment. It was a temptation for the unfortunate actors to take a superficial view of those days, and even now critics can still follow that easy path. Three months' bitter fighting resulted in the capture of a few square miles of mud and some trifling ridges of no great tactical value, and these at the cost of over 200,000 casualties." In March, 1918, Gough's Fifth Army retreated from its positions at St. Quentin in the face of superior German numbers (due to the Russian defection) and Gough was superseded in command. He wrote, "A retreat is not necessarily a defeat. Some of the greatest victories in military history have been based on retreats." In 1940 he joined the Home Guard under an assumed name (because of his advanced age) and organized the Home Guard in Chelsea. Sir Winston Churchill was officially recognised as an American Indian by the National Congress of American Indians. The executive director of the Indian Group said, "He is a direct descendant of the Iroquois tribe through his mother, Jennie Jerome Churchill".

JOHN QUIXOTE.

French Miners

claimed that Fords had promised to reconsider the differentials after the commencement of production. This ban was later lifted after negotiations had started to bring the rates of pay at the two factories in line.

Then Fords announced that they were closing their plant at Doncaster for economic reasons. This came as a shock to the 2,600 workers there, for even Fords admitted that the labour relations in the factory had been good. However, when it comes to the question of economics and the Ford empire, Doncaster, a plant which has been producing 300 cars per day, is not making enough profit and therefore it is not worth keeping open.

The Management said they were very sorry and that they would do everything they could to get work for these men elsewhere, even to the point of offering financial assistance for the purpose of moving, but they just do not seem to realise what their policy of rationalisation of production means in terms of human feelings. Many of these men and their families will have to move from Doncaster, leaving behind friends and relations. The difficulty of finding

homes today means that the men will have to move first, leaving behind their families and it will be some time before these separated families are united again. All this arises because profits are considered more important than people.

Fords, in an effort to help soften the blow of the closure of the Doncaster plant, announced that they are now willing to pay the Halewood workers the same rates of pay for the same number of hours as they pay the men at Dagenham. This new agreement is to take effect from 1st April. Coupled with this, is the arrangement for a double day shift which was agreed to by the union leaders. Grade 1 workers will now get 8/0½d. and Grade 2 workers 7/4½d. per hour and they will be working a 40 hour week instead of 41½ hours.

The double shift involves working a second day shift which is equivalent to the night shift worked at Dagenham and will be paid at time and a-quarter. The first shift will start at 6.35 a.m. ending at 3 p.m., while the second shift is worked from 3 p.m. to 11.25 p.m., with 25 minutes in, both cases, for dinner.

The result of the new shift system is

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

- The Warfare State Fred J. Cook 25/-
The Pyramid Climbers Vance Packard 25/-
Tropic of Cancer Henry Miller 25/-
Torture: Cancer of Democracy (France and Algeria 1954-62) P. V.-Naquet 3/6
The Challenge of Marxism (ed.) B. Simon 21/-

REPRINTS, CHEAP EDITIONS AND PENGUINS

- The English Constitution Walter Bagehot 7/6
The Tiger and the Horse Robert Bolt 6/-
Social Evolution V. Gordon Childe 6/-
The Colonial Reckoning Marjorie Perham 5/-
The Gnomobile Upton Sinclair 15/-
Spring Song and Other Stories Joyce Cary 5/-
The Rock Pool Cyril Connolly 3/6
The Confidential Agent Graham Greene 3/6
A Gun for Sale Graham Greene 3/6
The Ministry of Fear Graham Greene 3/6
Stamboul Train Graham Greene 3/6
Evolution in Action Julian Huxley 3/6
Last and First Men Olaf Stapledon 3/6
Orlando Virginia Woolf 3/6
A Room of One's Own Virginia Woolf 3/6

SECOND-HAND

- The Truth About Oberlander Committee for German Unity 5/-; Out of the Night Jan Valtin 15/-; 18th Year Book New York State Reformatory at Elmira 1893 6/-; Capitalism and Socialism on Trial Fritz Sternberg 10/-; The Peckham Experiment Innes H. Pearse and Lucy H. Crocker 5/-; Soil and Civilization Edward Hyams 10/6; Laughing Torso Nina Hamnett 4/6; The League of Frightened Philistines James T. Farrell 5/-; Townsman's Food Magnus Pyke 5/-.

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

Kurt Schwitters

PRIVATE view day at the Kurt Schwitters exhibition at the Marlborough Galleries at 39 Old Bond Street, W.1., was a singularly quiet affair with only a handful of the faithful padding in and out of these silent rooms for the once exciting works of this German painter, spawned in the raucous years after the first world war, have received their quietus in this sombre London gallery and we few who have bothered to climb the steep stairs wandered around like relatives of the departed viewing with fond eye the empty husk of one we have known and loved for so many years.

But time the final arbitrator in all things has had the final word and these collages, drained of all contemporary emotive overtones, have sunk into the placid world of the pleasant and the pretty for like the watercolours of the abstractionist Wols they please without demanding any great effort on our part. Time has mellowed and blunted the scissored edges of these scraps of coloured and printed papers and their soft blues and greys have the mother-of-pearl beauty of empty shells.

Yet Schwitters was a master of this minor craft for which he so successfully pioneered the way for lesser artists and in work like the 1930 "Man soll nicht asen mit phrasen" and the 1939 "Recommandée" he showed how with the use of old photographs, postcards and newspaper cuttings intertwined with patches of blue and green paper and highlighted with a couple of red labels he could, and did, produce abstracts of a subtle interplay of colours whose worth extends beyond the adulation of the lunatic fringe of the fashionable world of the twenties and thirties. But the pedants and the historians, to whom this gay and burly Hanoverian so cheerfully cocked a snook, have finally won and by the use of middle-aged photo-

graphs of Schwitters and a clinical analysis of his work they have cast him as the Steptoe of the arts, a morose and elderly German rummaging among the gutters of the world for his materials.

That Schwitters was an obsessional artist is undeniable and he unfortunately carried his obsession beyond the personal and into the public domain in that he turned his apartment in Waldhausenstrasse into a meaningless prison cell of accumulated muck that overflowed from room to room even to the upper two stories, to the distress of the unfortunate tenants whom he callously evicted. And the British co-operated in 1943 by destroying the whole mess within a few seconds in an unsought display of mass bombing during Schwitters' absence in England.

Here was the logical conclusion to so many of the aesthetic theories proclaimed over the rims of their wine glasses by the fashionable Dadists and those followers of whatever fad was then currently amusing, yet when the RAF joined the Dadist school of non-art the art world instead of welcoming them sat in their Californian air-raid shelters and penned their protests at those that took them literally. It was not until 1960 that, under the watchful eye of the New York Fire Department, they thumbed their noses at the gods and sang of the black glory of nihilism.

On that cold March night within the gardens of the Museum of Modern Art Jean Tinguely's huge machine "Homage to New York" exploded into pre-arranged flame and destroyed itself as a player piano beat out its three pathetic notes, drums beat, typed reports were churned out, Coco-Cola bottles broken, and all before an audience of the world's self-elected élite. It was left to the elderly Dadist Huelsenbeck to intone into the ears of the invited press that

that the majority of maintenance work will have to be carried out during the night. The maintenance men have rejected the system and, to counter their refusal to operate it, the Management have postponed the proposed pay increase. They state that the double day-shift scheme cannot be introduced unless it is worked by everyone.

It is quite clear that all Fords care about is maximum production and increased profits, and in order to achieve this they sacrifice the human dignity of their workers by treating them as units. In an attempt to gloss over this inhuman treatment, they try to create an image of a good generous employer. Parties of wives, children, relatives and friends are invited to go on a tour of the new factory at Halewood. They call it the "family touch"! Come and see what amenities and good working conditions there are for the lucky workers and all provided by Fords!!

Of course, these good working conditions and amenities were fought for and won by workers in the Ford plants and haven't been provided just out of the goodness of the bosses' hearts. All the time, while they are attempting to create this "one big happy family" image, Fords are also trying out new means of speeding up production, making men work harder to produce bigger profits for the Ford empire. P.T.

AROUND THE GALLERIES

month's final valediction with the words "It's the end of civilization as we know it", and having posed for their press photographs, the world élite returned to their cars and their comfortable, stable and accepted civilization.

Schwitters began his life as a painter, as a competent though academic hack, too imitative to find a place within the artistic rat race but in 1919 he found his medium in the use of collage "pasting; specifically, pasting paper, cloth, etc. into pictures . . ." and these post-card size works are now the international currency of the art world. His relief-constructs, crudely made and painted over with earthy colours have never won a popular audience while his prose and poetry is but the ephemeral rubbish of his times. The artist with the use of collage deliberately restricts his palette to the arbitrary demands of the manufactured materials he finds, and accepts his own self-imposed chains while with the acceptance of untouched junk the artist has abrogated his position to the poet for only the poet can justify the rusting rubbish that litters the walls of the fashionable galleries of the world. Barred from participating in that infinite world that lies within and beyond the four sides of the canvas the poet is forced to crucify his finite themes upon the bare canvas that men may witness the unrealized substance of his dreams and that which the artist and the poet rejects is hoarded by those without vision or talent to make into their womb-like-hovels.

The critics have given them their inevitable manifesto and named their play, Environments or Happenings and there, within some fashionable gallery, these poor clowns perform within their literally stinking cells of rotting debris, there to publically pose to amuse the passing crowd, provide a simper for the riff-raff of the world of fashion, profit a toady dealer, and debase themselves.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

RE-SHAPING OR ELIMINATING?

Continued from page 1

pay their way. Scant attention is paid to human needs and problems. In effect what Dr. Beeching and his friends are proposing is that the public must adjust itself to his plan rather than that the railways should be adjusted to satisfy needs as they are. Let us cite an example. For a whole page of the Report we are told what an expensive nuisance it is to have to put on extra trains for the summer and the public holiday week-ends. Something like 2,000 additional coaches were required for regular summer service and a further 8,900 available for "high peak service" in 1959. 6,000 of these were required only on an average of 14 occasions during the year, and the annual cost of providing them was £3.4m. "Against this it was estimated that they only earned £0.5m after allowing for all other costs of the movements concerned". And the report concludes:

Since the beginning of 1959 the number of passenger-carrying gangway coaches has been reduced by 5,584 [from 18,500] and by the end of 1965 stock will not be available for use at high peak periods. Efforts will be made to control these peaks by seat reservation schemes and by fares policy, as is the custom with airline services (our italics).

The conclusion we must draw is that Dr. Beeching and his Board think that everybody who wants to go to a seaside resort for a holiday to be sure of getting there must either be able to afford a car or walk, for what reason is there to suppose that coach operators who are in the business to make money are more likely to invest in thousands of extra motor coaches which will remain idle most of the year?

Secondly the Report makes light of the hardships that will be caused by widespread closure of stopping train services, on the assumption that where traffic displaced is over 1,000 passengers a week "it provides the basis for an economical bus service of about eight buses each way", and where it is less, well, existing bus services already operate on all but 122 miles of these routes, and the bus owners will welcome the additional business. Conclusion: "In most areas of the countryside therefore, it appears that hardship will arise on a very limited scale". If this were so certain, it is difficult to understand why the bus services did not long ago capture this business! There is surely a snag somewhere which the report does not disclose.

Thirdly the effect of closures on railway workers. In spite of its declaration that it is "very conscious of the human problems which this will cause", yet its shuffling with numbers and casual reference to "extensive re-deployment of people" indicates that what concerns the Board is the Plan, not People. True it has evolved a scheme with the Trades Unions to compensate long-term employees who will become redundant, and will make "resettlement payments" to those who agree to move. The Report is vague as to the number of redundancies that will result from its cut-down. So far as passenger services are concerned, if the whole plan is put into force 16,200 workers will become redundant. Subsequent complete closure of lines will affect a further 10,900; a further 8,600 will be sacked when the "freight sundries plan" gets under way, and 4,900 train-working and maintenance staff will be axed as a result of "a longer term saving". And there will be

all kinds of further cuts in labour power: "Preliminary examination in some areas leads to the conclusion that the figures given for direct savings from line closures will be no more than one half of those which will ultimately be achieved". In other words the grand total will be something like 80,000 men. What the Report does not appear to hazard even a guess at is the extent of the redeployment of workers which the plan would involve. For it must not be forgotten that centralising coal distribution in 250 Centres when 74 per cent of it is now being handled at 2,005 depots dotted all over the country, does not only involve a redeployment of railway staff, but of the coal merchants' staff as well. And as serious as the redeployment itself is the fact that the Centres and the 100 proposed freight sundries depots will be located in the already choked urban areas, thus adding to their already overwhelming housing and traffic problems.

★

ANY merits the Plan may have are nullified by the obvious consideration that it is not possible to "employ the assets" of the Railways "and develop or modify them to the best advantage of the nation" without also taking into account the potentialities and problems of all other forms of transport. Because road transport is almost entirely in the hands of private operators there cannot be, even in theory, a transport system which will be used "to the best advantage of the nation". What the Beeching Report proposes is to use the Railways to the best advantage but the success of the plan depends on (a) road transport taking over the services the Board propose to stop handling and (b) the railways taking over from the roads those services which the railways could handle more easily and economically.

There is not a shred of evidence that the road transport operators will take over the services discarded by the Railways other than those which they can operate profitably; nor is there any reason to suppose that they will hand over to the railways on a plate some 84m tons of freight which they are now profitably handling, even though they and everyone knows, such a move would remove overnight a large part of the congestion on our roads and save "the nation" millions of pounds in road expansion programmes.

It is because private and commercial road transport is Big Business with every possibility of it becoming even more profitable (it is estimated that private motorists in this country spend £1,000 millions a year) that the railways are being axed, or at least, are being reduced to inter-city and suburban services, and coal. By instructing the British Railways Board to produce a plan to make the railways pay their way the Government was speaking not on behalf of the public but for the car industry, the petrol interests and the civil engineering contractors. That they should call on the former chairman of ICI to produce the plan was, in the circumstances, a happy choice! Dr. Beeching has dealt the railways a mortal blow. By 1970 his Report estimates that the deficit should be eliminated. Our impression is that if his plan goes through it's the railways that will be eliminated by 1970, and transport on our choked roads will be at a standstill!

Apartheid & Capitalism

MR. HAROLD WILSON, the leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, has become quite outspoken in recent weeks. Firstly we have his pledge to end the arms traffic to South Africa and Portuguese territories and now we have his comments concerning "high-powered, highly-paid and largely anonymous groups" which bring more pressure to bear on the Government than does Parliament.

Anarchists notice these groups, who bring pressure to bear on the government, but they label these groups with their name-tag—the State—and there is no beating about the bush, for it is realised that the government is merely the tool of the ruling class. Harold (the Wilson one) will no doubt be acquainted with these facts before long, and he will likewise learn that—how shall I put it—the rulers are not going to take his kind of smart talk lying down.

For, the true interests of the British ruling class were revealed to the British public by courtesy of the Department of Information, South African Embassy in advertisements in the daily press on Monday, 18th March. "Britain derives more profit from trade and investment in South Africa", reads the advertisement, "than any other country. During the years 1960 and 1961 this profit amounted to more than £176,000,000." Other interesting facts followed this heading, they are casually left to speak for themselves: "Last year Britain exported £148,000,000 worth of goods to South Africa and had a total favourable balance of trade of £33,000,000. This made South Africa her second best trading partner." or "South Africa accounts for two-thirds of the free world's gold production. Last year this gold output was worth £316,000,000. As usual, most of this was sent to London for sale."

One learns also that "In South Africa alone, American investment increased from 86.6 million dollars in 1953 to 600 million dollars in 1960" ["Neo-colonialism" by Jack Woodis & Leon Szur in "Spearhead", Jan. 1963, P.O. Box 807, Dar-es-Salaam]. It is also worthy of note that another country of the "free world"—West Germany—"from January to November 1962, established 18 new foreign enterprises in Portugal" and that "the Government of West Germany has made a loan of 150 million marks to the Portuguese Government." [Portuguese and Colonial Bulletin, Jan.-Feb. 1963].

The truth is that Portugal and her colonies, together with South Africa and

the Rhodesias are vitally important to the functioning of the capitalist "free world", and that Harold Wilson is opposing the true interests of the "anonymous groups" who rule Britain.

These economic groups are not simply pressure groups, they are ruling interests in society—it is thus understandable that the *Sunday Times* (24.3.63) should write editorially that Mr. Butler's task in Central Africa is "essentially of clearing the way for the burial of the Central African Federation and its replacement by a new form of economic link between Northern and

Southern Rhodesia and perhaps Nyasaland as well."

Of course Mr. Wilson's words are very different from actions by a Labour Government, and any actions the Labour leader can take when in office will be slight. It is always a pity that the obvious, though hard path is not indicated by those who oppose apartheid—that path leads to the working people who have the power NOW to destroy apartheid, and who—in doing so—would weaken the capitalist system and further the interests of the workers throughout the world.

Political Threats and Economic Facts

Sir Roy Welensky has charged the British Government with reaching decisions in connection with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland "under threat from men who seek power". Whether Sir Roy is the man to make such charges—having used many ambiguous threats himself in the past—is beside the point. What is at issue is whether the Coalition Government of Northern Rhodesia led by Kenneth Kaunda and Nkumbula obtained the right to secession from the Federation by using threats.

It would seem that they did—the threat in question was that Mr. Kaunda had suggested that if Northern Rhodesia were not allowed to secede from the Federation his party would follow a policy of non-co-operation with the Federal Government. He threatened direct action and implied that it might not remain entirely non-violent.

One suspects that Mr. Kaunda will not forget this useful weapon in the discussions due to start soon concerning the future of the Rhodesias. The Government statement issued by Mr. Butler states that having recognised the Federation as being unacceptable they "have therefore sought in the recent discussions with the Governments concerned to evolve a basis for a Conference at which a new relationship could be worked out."

Thus the crucial question that remains, now that the imposed and unwanted Federation has been destroyed, is the form of relationship which will be built to take its place. The *Daily Telegraph* correspondent R. H. C. Steed, echoes the usual view when he writes (30.3.62) that "the future depends on getting them (the territorial governments) to accept economic association."

Economic power in the Rhodesias is seemingly held by vested interests controlled by finance-capitalists represented

in this country by Lord Salisbury (a director of the British South Africa Company) and his friends, yet where direct action threats might well have attained secession from the Federation for Northern Rhodesia they can be used and implemented in order to demonstrate just who produces the wealth in the Rhodesias. In this way economic links of fraternity as made manifest in strike action might prove vitally important to the relationships that are coming to the Rhodesias.

It is noteworthy that the demand for independence made by Mr. Winston Field, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, on behalf of the settlers has received support from the right-wing Conservative balancing group to the Bow Group called the Monday Club, for this Club is under the patronage of the Marquis of Salisbury and Viscount Boyd.

The demand raises warrior cries from the Catholic Minister of Mines and Industrial Development in Southern Rhodesia, Mr. John Gaunt. He claims that "nothing less than force or arms" would stop the territory getting independence. I once had the misfortune to meet Mr. Gaunt whilst I was working with his son-in-law in Northern Rhodesia. He was visiting his daughter and son-in-law at Isoka and I remember this arrogant, racially prejudiced man informing me that the British Press censored a great deal of news that might be thought to discredit Africans.

If it is to men like this that the fate of Southern Rhodesia is to be entrusted, the prospect is forbidding—that the right-wing Conservatives, under the patronage of the man who appointed Mr. Macmillan as Prime Minister, can support such characters as Mr. Gaunt shows just how low these right-wing Conservatives will crawl. J.W.

LETTERS

Practicability?

DEAR EDITORS,

In the controversies over both non-violence or violence and high productivity or simplicity there is one thing which the supporters of the latter viewpoints ought to bear in mind. This is practicability, which is the first thing which should be considered in any questions of ends or means.

Firstly the willingness to use force. Leaving aside the ethics of the matter, do advocates of violence consider that (a) a modern movement which is prepared to use force would ever get more than negligible support, (b) even if they did stage some sort of uprising, it could never succeed, bearing in mind the vast power of modern weapons which governments have an abundance of. I should be interested to hear of any social revolution by armed citizens, not supported by foreign governments, which has been successful in a modern, industrialised country.

Secondly the vision of an anarchist society based on small, independent, self-supporting communities. Whatever intrinsic merits such a society may have over one with advanced technology (and I believe there are many) the cold fact remains that the world is moving away from that sort of thing at an accelerating rate and to expect people to about-turn is wishful thinking. There will be room left over in anarchist societies for small self-sufficient communities for those who want them and indeed they are practicable now if people are prepared to make the necessary effort.

Anarchism is regarded as woolly-headed by plenty of intelligent people. Perhaps this attitude would be less prevalent if it ceased to be considered feasible to (a) use the methods of 1936, and (b) create a free society in the environment of 1236.

Society hasn't caught up with anar-

chism yet. It will do so more quickly if the ideas of the movement are reasonably relevant to current realities.

Yours faithfully,
Watford, Mar. 23. JEFF ROBINSON.

Technocrats?

DEAR EDITORS,

Brian Leslie puts forward a peculiar argument for individual autonomy in his letter on "Productivity" (FREEDOM, March 23) when he states that the best guarantee for it is "an 'automated' society, in which the basic physical needs of the whole community could be met by complex, efficient machines whose care would be the pride of a few, highly skilled workers."

I would not like to think that my autonomy was dependent upon the good graces of a small minority whose 'know-how' enabled them to control the machinery which supplied my basic physical needs. It seems to me that we have here a new ruling class in embryo whose authority would come from a monopoly of knowledge instead of a monopoly of political power, divine grace, or property, as is the case with present ruling classes. In my view individual autonomy would be best served by "that social life in which each individual, alone or in co-operation with others, shall be enabled to provide for himself whatever he deems necessary." (A. J. Maryson). Such a life is impossible in any kind of directed economy, whether the direction is in the hands of capitalists, state boards, or proud technicians. Whether or not machinery would be employed in a pluralist system I would like to see would depend on the "subjective balancing" of factors which Brian Leslie mentions, but which would have no scope in his 'automated' utopia.

His argument that at least the means exist to satisfy the physical needs of mankind is nothing new. The socialists

and anarchists of a hundred years ago or more were arguing the same thing. It is a nice, convincing-sounding assertion, which has had no more effect in rousing the slavery-loving multitude to a desire for self-liberation than any other "the future will be wonderful" rhetoric. In any case, the menace of overpopulation and the accelerated depletion of natural resources by the demands of "our" industrial vampire (vide Aldous Huxley *et al.*) rather rubs the shine off such optimistic prophecies. London, Mar. 23. S. E. PARKER.

Last Word?

COMRADES,

Isn't it time Brian Leslie and Francis Ellingham thought about hiring a country cottage for a weekend so that they can discuss their ideas at length, uninhibited by weekly time lags and lack of space. To start with the correspondence was interesting and entertaining but it seems to have gone on long enough, and now we are reduced to sheer repetitiveness.

As I see it the controversy is insoluble since Brian Leslie is convinced (rightly, I feel) that we must make the best of a bad lot and cannot revert to primitive society and still call ourselves (let alone BE) progressives, radicals or whatever it is. Francis Ellingham thinks that high productivity is irreconcilable with anarchism (it could be, but if it is, we might as well go home and stop calling ourselves anarchists). Obviously there is no agreement at all between these two viewpoints, and, as I see it, there is never likely to be.

Needless to say I don't suggest guillotining the discussion and coercing the exponents of the two viewpoints out of the columns of FREEDOM, but surely in the long run, what with postage costs and so on, my initial suggestion might be worth their consideration.

Yours fraternally,
London, Mar. 23. CHARLES RADCLIFFE.

Anarchists and Violence

Anarchists would seem to be agreed that a free society cannot be brought about by force. From this standpoint there is, for some reason, unknown, a considerable divergence of opinion. On one flank stand a few pacifists, who so they say, would not defend themselves or anyone else with force under any provocation; at the other extreme stand the few who still see some relevance in the "barricades". In truth, the bulk of anarchists are probably very confused—and in this writer's opinion the FREEDOM editorials which have touched upon this subject have only served to add to the confusion.

To deal with the extreme pacifists first (a condition favourable to those who have come from a strong Christian background or those who have just realised what they were really doing when they rained down bombs upon defenceless civilians during the war), the fact they must realise is that human beings are born with a strong tendency to defend themselves against their persons and their essentials: (*) there is nothing to be ashamed of in this and, indeed it is a necessary attribute, otherwise the human race would not be here today. It is foolhardy to attempt to train oneself to keep one's dukes down no matter what the situation.

The fact the "barricade" boys have to face is that a policy of violence is useless under any conditions now. The saturation point has been reached. What then?

In this country at this present time pacifism is very relevant. So is it in other "civilised" countries like the USA and Russia. The Blacks in South Africa and other peoples in similar situations may be excused if pacifism means little to them in their brutal surroundings (they are in a hopeless position; their only hope is that people in the "civilised" parts of the world can get rid of the governments which supply their oppressors with the means of oppressing them) but in our situation it is theoretically possible to bring about a bloodless revolution. Love and Reason, used in

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol 2 1952: Postscript to Posterity
Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial
Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano
Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists
Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa
Vol 11 1961: The People in the Street
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/6 post free.

BAKUNIN
Marxism, Freedom and the State 5/-

PAUL ELTZBACHER
Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN
Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

JOHN HEWETSON
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

HERBERT READ
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

TONY GIBSON
Youth for Freedom 2/-
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
Food Production & Population 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND
The Expanding Environment (illustrated) boards 8/6

PETER KROPOTKIN
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6
Neither East Nor West paper 7/6

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

a determined fashion can and must do the job because there is no other way. If men cannot be persuaded by reason at this state there is no point in printing another issue of FREEDOM or ANARCHY. It must be stressed that Determination is a necessary qualification to this policy. Hard reason—not "sweet reason"—is necessary to combat the stupidity of the authorities and their scared hangers-on.

FREEDOM editorials have told us that when the day of reckoning with the State comes they must be overthrown by a "superior force": also that the power of the State can only be destroyed by a greater power. This would be acceptable if it had been stressed that this "force" and "power" must be of a different kind than that employed by the State. We must confront the State and its paid protectors (armed forces, police, etc.) with NON-VIOLENT force and power. If they can be convinced of our refusal to resort to violence it is quite possible that they would come over to our side in sufficient numbers to cause their leaders to throw in their hands. If they cannot be thus assured they will fire at us through sheer fear, in which case the cause will suffer defeat for the simple reason that they have an overwhelming advantage when it comes to violence. No doubt some violence is bound to occur when the State and its scared adherents face final defeat. But it is not the job of anarchists to anticipate the worst when it is so obvious that success depends entirely upon those of us who can stay our hands the longest. We cannot win by their methods. Weapons in our hands will mean defeat. Those of us who are provoked unbearably will gain nothing by the possession of a weapon except perhaps the posthumous satisfaction of having killed one of the bastards—and it could be a brother or a son that we would be killing.

Slough, Mar. 23. ERNIE CROSSWELL.

'Freedom' and Violence

COMRADES,

The trend towards non-violence in recent times is surely to be encouraged. The anarchist movement has received a new lease of life from the non-violent anti-bomb movement. I wonder however whether a good deal of this discussion does not stem from a confusion. That there are situations where non-violence is hardly applicable I do not doubt; what puzzles me about FREEDOM's editorial attitude is exactly what sort of violence it is proposed to use, and when and where.

In personal life one may lash out at a tormentor. It is often the most effective method. Violence has as its concomitant concealment. One does not have to inform one's enemy where one is. One can run away. So fight and flight go together. Both can be effective. But I don't see that this can be used as an argument for bombing cities and murdering large masses of people. This is an argument favoured by national patriots, who appeal to a natural desire for the individual to defend himself in order to justify their wars.

"If somebody had a gun, and was going to shoot you, and you had a gun, wouldn't you shoot him first?" is a stock question. My answer would be, "Probably I would shoot him. But I wouldn't then go on to murder his wife and children, and all the people living in his street."

This subject is bedevilled by the idea that you can argue from personal violence to war, whereas in fact the difference in degree is so great as to be a difference in kind.

I favour non-violence for several reasons. The first is humanitarian. It prevents destruction to a large extent, and produces less pain and suffering than violence. Secondly it is a more practical method, at least in North-West Europe, where we are trying to use it.

Whether it would work in South Africa or Angola is another matter. In this part of the world we are up against an efficiently organised state machine, which enjoys a large measure of public support. Any violent attempt against an air base, or any other military installation, would be speedily crushed. Thirdly, I do not know of any examples of a violent struggle carried on in an anarchist way. Spain, Mexico, the Ukraine . . . really we know practically nothing of these struggles, but what little we know suggests peasant guerrillas rather than anarchists. I don't say that a violent struggle could not be waged anarchistically. All I say is that I don't think it has ever been tried, and I find it difficult to imagine.

It is at this point that I part company with the editorials in FREEDOM. It may well be that the rulers of society will not give up without a struggle, but what sort of struggle is then to take place? Are we to assume that the vast mass of the population are with us? If so I do not understand how the ruling groups could continue to resist. But if the two parties are more evenly matched, as seems more likely, with possibly a large number of indifferents in between, how then are we to fight? With rifles, germ warfare, tactical nuclear weapons . . . ? If the rulers are as ruthless as the FREEDOM editorials maintain, and I do not doubt it, they will use any weapon. Do we retaliate with even more deadly weapons? Or give in (and be massacred)? Or what . . . ?

Faced with this dilemma I can see no alternative to non-violence. This is compatible with anarchism. I believe it has its limitations. It depends on several things. Both sides must have

Landslide!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT
MARCH 30th 1963

Weeks 12 & 13

EXPENSES: 13 weeks at £70	£	910
INCOME:		
Sales & Sub. Renewals:	£	
Weeks 1-11	295	
Weeks 12 & 13	46	
		341
New Subscriptions:		
Weeks 1-11 (91)	95	
Weeks 12 & 13 (6)	8	
		103
		444
	DEFICIT	£466

DEFICIT FUND

New York: J.J.M. £1; Nuneaton: D.H. 2/4; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; S. Monica: N.P. 2/5; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Burnley: G.W.T. 8/-; London: E.M. 6/-; Birmingham: J.B. 1/-; London: P.S. 1/-; Los Gatos: S.R. (per O.M.) £1/15/-; S. Francisco: p. proceeds social 9/3/63 (per 'Incaricato') £17/10/-; E. Rutherford: A.S.* 14/-; Bordighera: K.W. £1/7/-; Shoreham: M. & D. 2/6; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Hollywood: A.G. 14/-; Rensselaer: G.T. £1/15/-; New York: S.G. £1/12/6; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Lincoln: A.B. 10/-; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-.

TOTAL 34 17 4
Previously acknowledged 238 6 7

1963 TOTAL TO DATE £273 3 11

*Denotes regular contributors

and a windfall

From our old comrade Jules Scarceriaux of Los Angeles, who we are sorry to say is in hospital, we have just received \$2,000 (£712) which is part of a legacy from an old friend, to whom our comrade had been of help and comfort many years ago. It is not often that FREEDOM PRESS receives such windfalls; this one has arrived just at the right time, for it will allow us to wipe out all the accumulated debts of 1961 and we hope of 1962 as well. Unfortunately we have still not been able to complete the balance sheet for 1962. If any money is left over we propose to use it to replenish our depleted stock of anarchist literature.

To our old comrade, Jules Scarceriaux, who is in his 90th year, the warmest thanks of FREEDOM PRESS and all the comrades engaged in anarchist propaganda here!

some mutual respect. I don't believe the Jews could have used it against the Nazis. They had come to be regarded as sub-human. The Scandinavians, who used it successfully, were "Aryans" according to Nazi philosophy, and I am sure this made a difference.

It also requires the aid of public opinion. No one can know what goes on in Angola for instance, except in a vague and general way. Consequently the Portuguese can do as they like there. If the public do not know what goes on, and cannot be aroused to protest, non-violence is likely to be much less effective. India, after all, was in the public eye. It was the centre-piece of one of the world's biggest empires. It was not like Siberia, parts of Africa, or Latin America, where all sorts of horrors can be perpetrated, and nobody knows. How many people know, for instance, that the slave trade still goes on in parts of Africa and Arabia? How many care about the status of Afghan women?

It seems to me that where non-violence cannot be employed anarchism cannot be brought about either. Is this too pessimistic? I can understand relatively simple things, like national independence, being brought about by violence, but not something complex, like a free society, with all the changes in human attitudes that that implies.

I think the Angolans, Kurds, Nagas, South African Negroes, etc. do right to fight. There seems nothing else they can do. But then they are not fighting to achieve freedom, only a mitigated form of slavery. Freedom as an anarchist understands it is something much more than legal equality, national independence, and all the rest of it, though no doubt these are preferable to living under apartheid or Fascism. I don't see how anarchism could be achieved by violence.

If those anarchists who believe that violence will be necessary ultimately could only be persuaded to give us some rough idea, not a blueprint of course, of how such a struggle is to be waged without either the anarchists developing into authoritarians, or the fighting causing the deaths of thousands of people, not necessarily revolutionaries or reactionaries, one might find that one had more common ground with them than one had supposed.

Being committed to non-violence in the political field does not necessarily commit one to non-violence in one's personal life. In fact I know that very few believers in non-violence practise it consistently in their daily lives. But in the sphere of politics non-violence seems to be the only possible road to anarchism.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

London, March 24.

Pool wage packets!

DEAR EDITORS,

I read the contributions from P.T. with great interest and greet his comments with much satisfaction. I nevertheless sometimes get a feeling that the Workers v. Bosses and/or Workers v. Unions aspect is emphasised overmuch—to the exclusion of the Worker v. Worker war which is just as distressing even though they play for smaller stakes. I think it will be agreed that workers (I use the term invidiously since some of the management may work harder than those under them who directly produce the goods; maybe I should employ the phrase "direct producers") must needs put their own house in order before hoping to gain sympathisers to the idea of sharing the fruits of their labours equally with their managers and Union representatives. Therefore, I would suggest that the first step for shop stewards on any shop floor is to get all of the men to agree to the principle of pooling their differential wage packets and sharing it out on some agreed basis of equality (taking into account number of dependants and other important needs). One hears much about the "divide and rule" system of managements—but this can be defeated by the workers if they have real feelings of solidarity. If workers cannot be persuaded to do this then, alas, the Workers v. Bosses rift will never be healed (yes I know this means virtually getting rid of such a concept as "boss")—not by all the strikes in the world.

Slough, Mar. 23. ERNIE CROSSWELL.

MORE READERS WOULD HELP OUR PERENNIAL DEFICIT PROBLEM!

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.
(until April 7th).

APR 7 Peter Lumsden:
The Catholic Worker

APR 14 No meeting:
Constitutional Exercise—Aldermaston.

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

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 Leslie's,
242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham
Hill, Nr. Station).

Third Wednesday of the month, at 8 p.m.
at Albert Portch's, 11 Courcy Road (off
Wood Green High Road), N.8.

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 (Dis-
cussion Group)

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

OXFORD ANARCHIST DISCUSSION GROUP (gown, town and district)

Meets Wednesdays, 5.30 usually.
Christ Church, Packwater Quad: 2, 6.
Special meetings at 8 p.m.

ANARCHY Nos 1-25

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 (1/9 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 8/6 (\$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.