

# FREEDOM

'The only human relations that have value are those that are rooted in mutual freedom.'

BERTRAND RUSSELL

**In this Issue:**  
**Controversy on 'the People in the Streets' - P2**

MAY 18 1963 Vol 24 No 16

**THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.**

THE Committee of 100 demonstration which began on 11th May, 1963 has not yet ended, so this report is only an introduction.

The Marham demonstration was organised by the East Anglian Committee of 100 as a sort of sequel to the Honington demonstration last October. On that occasion, we went to plough up an RAF V-bomber base and bring the land back into cultivation; on this occasion, we went to auction an RAF V-bomber base and claim its contents for scrap. The same part-symbolic, part-satirical, part-serious intention lay behind both demonstrations.

We arrived at Swaffham, a small town in west Norfolk about 80 miles north of London, at about 2.0 on Saturday afternoon. The auction of RAF Marham was held in the recreation ground by Ken Browning, a member of the East Anglian Committee. We made bids for the base, item by item, and paid a few shillings or a few pounds for each lot. The proceeds of the auction went to famine relief, and we went to claim our purchases.

## BACK TO MARHAM!

We travelled by coach and car to the village of Marham, passing the base on the way. The Valiant bombers and Bloodhound missiles were clearly visible. The police sabotaged our assembly at Marham by diverting our vehicles, and the East Anglian Committee failed to give us any clear initiative. But we formed up somehow, and walked round through the village and up a hill to the houses where the RAF personnel and their families live. A large number of RSG pamphlets were distributed to anyone who would take them.

When we got to the RAF houses we broke up into several groups and made our own way towards the base itself. There were hundreds of civil police and airmen of all ranks both inside and outside the base, but it is such a huge area that they couldn't possibly defend

it properly. They had put up some barbed wire near the main gate, and dozens of notices warning us that the base was a prohibited area under the Official Secrets Act.

The direct action began at about 4.0, when about three hundred people tried to enter RAF Marham to reclaim it for peaceful purposes prejudicial to the safety and interests of the Warfare State. We crossed the low plain wire boundary fence, and walked slowly towards the Valiant bombers at the end of the runway. For the first time in the history of the Committee of 100, we were entering a military base—what we had failed to do at Wethersfield, and Greenham Common, and Honington.

A few larks rose up into the sky and sang their heads off. A few RAF officers ran about with loud-hailers and shouted their heads off. We walked on until we were all stopped by the RAF. There were about a hundred people up to about two hundred yards inside the base. We stood there or sat there and waited until they decided what to do with us.

After about half an hour, more airmen were brought up to deal with us. There were some dogs, but they weren't used at all. If they had been used, we had aniseed buns for them. The airmen dragged or carried us back to the fence and dropped or threw us over. When we had all been forced back out of the base without any arrests being made, we spread for about a quarter of a mile along the fence. A few of us managed to get back over it in various places at various times, but we were soon heavily outnumbered.

By 5.30 we had clearly been checked, and we began to move back to the RAF houses. The last dozen people who got over the fence were arrested and taken away in a furniture van. We held a meeting by the wire, and at about 6.0 we decided to leave. We walked

back past the main gate, which was heavily guarded, had a short token sit-down, and then went on down the hill to our coaches in the village.

We had thought of paying a visit to the court on the way home. But by the time we reached our coaches we were told that the dozen who had been arrested had been charged under the Official Secrets Act, so our visit turned out to be a very angry one. They had set up a temporary magistrates' court in a school at Shouldham, a village about three miles west of Marham, and the prisoners were being held in a barn across the road. About two hundred of us occupied the road, arguing about what to do, trying to get our comrades released on bail, and stopping the police taking them away. The authorities were as unpleasant and unco-operative as they could be, and there was nearly a real riot on several occasions. The East Anglian Committee again failed to give us any clear initiative, and we began to drift away as the coaches had to leave.

Later on in the evening, more than fifty people decided to return to the base that night. They travelled by coach round to the side of the base, and walked up an almost undefended path towards the main runway. When they had entered the base without resistance, they spread out across the runway and walked up it for several hundred yards. At about 10.0 they were finally brought to a

halt by the RAF, and they sat down right on the runway for more than an hour.

The civil police were brought up to warn them individually, and then arrested them all. They were taken to Shouldham, and 56 more people were charged under the Official Secrets Act by the time the courts rose. A few more were charged with obstruction or assault for their activity outside the court. All those charged under the Official Secrets Act were remanded to appear at Downham Market, a small town about fifteen miles west of Swaffham, on Thursday, 16th May. Most of them were given very high bail with very high sureties as well, and a few of them refused or were refused bail.

The situation is critical. The Committee of 100 has been in this position twice before—at the time of the Trafalgar Square demonstration in September 1961, and at the time of the Wethersfield demonstration in December 1961. On the first occasion the Committee of 100 rightly went ahead with the demonstration; but on the second occasion the Committee of 100 wrongly refused to go back to Wethersfield after the trial of the Six. This time it is not six—it is 68 who face the risk of several years' imprisonment. The East Anglian Committee has done all it can be expected to do. The London Committee will probably be returning to Marham and re-entering the base in the immediate future. This could be the biggest challenge to the Warfare State since the end of the last war.

It is up to us. Now is the time for every anarchist and every pacifist and every unilateralist to decide where he stands. When we asked the airmen who had prohibited Marham, they said: "We did." When we are asked who has refused to accept this prohibition, let us say: "We do." The demonstration which began on 11th May, 1963, has not yet ended. . . . N.W.

### INDUSTRIAL NOTEBOOK

## Strike Off. What Next.?

Once again an official strike has been called off and this time (and it is not the first), it is the turn of the National Union of Railwaymen.

The terms of the settlement are as follows:—

1. The Board accepts the principle that a man who transfers to a lower grade will keep his old pay rate indefinitely, instead of for only five years.
2. It agrees to allow men who transfer travelling facilities for an unlimited period instead of five years.
3. Lodging allowances for men working a long way from home are to be raised. The union has asked for the present rate of £3. 10s. per week to be increased to £5, and believes it may be offered a compromise of about £4. 10s.
4. Men who want to keep their old homes and travel a distance each day to the new job are to receive half the lodging allowance for an indefinite period, instead of only five years.

This has been the sum total gained by the leadership of the N.U.R., a mere "coffin club" arrangement. Mr. Green, the Union's General Secretary, thinks that he has achieved this settlement because of the strike threat and he seems pleased with it.

The Railway Board must be having a good laugh at such an easy settlement. The N.U.R. has more or less agreed that any industrial action is out as far as the line closures are concerned. This will be left to Wilson & Co. in the political arena at Westminster. This also means that as far as the Railway Board is concerned, the N.U.R. is willing to

accept sackings. These have been estimated at 2,000 during the peak year ending September next year.

Mr. Green has said, "The improvement in resettlement arrangements will encourage more men to move to rail jobs away from home and will therefore reduce the number of dismissals. However, we must face it that some will not be able to move or will not want to."

Yes Mr. Green, what about these men? They are in a union for their own protection and for job security. These closures will also mean less jobs as stated in the L.F.A. and S.W.F. leaflet—"Marples claims that redundancy will not be so great due to the natural wastage, retirements, etc. Even if this is true, on his own figures there will be thousands fewer jobs available when the "plan" has eventually been implemented." In this the leadership has failed miserably.

What has happened to the campaign against line closures which the N.U.R. was conducting long before Beeching made his report. With assets of £6 million a lot more could have been done to make the public aware of what these line closures will mean not only to the railwaymen but also to themselves. The railwaymen called for strike action to prevent closures and sackings, but as usual time was wasted and enthusiasm waned. While the rank and file rely on their leaders, their lot seems to be strike threats and betrayals.

What can be done now? It is up to the railwaymen themselves, for nothing but betrayal can be expected from official trade union organisations and the Labour Party. These last two only act as stabilisers for the capitalist system and its ruling class and their role is to channel off any real militancy to harmless ends.

The rank and file railwaymen will have to take action if they are to beat the "Beeching Plan". A number of varying methods can be used, each valid in different conditions and circumstances. There are the work-to-rule, refusal to take fares and the taking over of the unprofitable lines by the railwaymen as advocated in FREEDOM's editorial last week.

This sounds O.K. on paper or just as a wish, but something more must be done. These methods of struggle and ideas of workers' control should be made known amongst the railwaymen. How about it comrades?

P.T.

## The Violence of Governments

LAST week's *Observer* contained a review by Harold Nicholson of Herbert Read's recently published autobiographical book, in the course of which the reviewer expressed his surprise that such a gentle person should support an idea which to most people means violence and insecurity.

The implication of that is that the state of society contrary to anarchy, that where government prevails, is distinguished by security and the absence of violence. How true this supposition is, is shown by a glance at the first few pages of *The Observer* itself.

In Birmingham, Alabama, the city and state governments have been employing their police forces to carry out violent attacks on negro demonstrators, who were using illegal, non-violent means in an attempt to win the most elementary freedoms which in this part of the country, the largest, richest, and most powerful of the "free world" have been denied to them for centuries, with the sanction and support of law and government.

There, the legal government, which came into being, it should be remembered in the course of a struggle against British imperialism, is committed to a policy of complete, conscious exploitation of the majority of the population in the interests of the minority which it represents. The minority in this case is armed to the teeth and maintains large military and police forces equipped with arms supplied by co-operative governments in other states. Facing this might the Africans, who for decades have supported the idea of non-violent resistance, to be rewarded by persecution, banings, and imprisonment, are finally being driven to the last resort of terrorist violence.

To some people it was the kind of government that was wrong, and the people's democracies of Eastern Europe were a step forward. In Czechoslovakia a new purge has begun in which Stalinist party leaders, who themselves conducted purges resulting in scores of deaths and the imprisonment of thousands, are being arrested and face jail

in turn. A fortnight ago a report appeared about the Rumanian government's persecution of a minority group merely because their language and culture is Hungarian.

If it were merely the power-bloc line up that perverted government from its otherwise beneficial aims, the neutral countries might show up to advantage. However the Indian government which took power in the course of a largely non-violent liberation struggle, is planning on intense war against the Nagas, who have been resisting the Indian government's attempts to force its benefits on them. In Iraq and Syria, persecution of opposition supporters of the former regime of Kassem, and of Nasser is continuing, over a thousand people having been summarily shot in a few weeks in Iraq. Kassem was supposed to be pro-Communist, while Nasser and the Baath party which now rules Syria and Iraq are called socialist!

The world's attention has also been drawn again to the regimes of police terror in Haiti and Greece, which ap-

Continued on page 4

# ANARCHY 27

NOW ON SALE, IS ON YOUTH

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

MAX MILLER was not a 'great' of the Music Hall world, but he was one of its last artists to survive precariously into our era. The classic Music Hall age was from about 1860 to 1920; after that, you could see splendid veterans in revivals (I heard Gus Ellen, Harry Champion, Vesta Victoria and Kate Carney in the 1930's), but the Music Hall art was really dead. Partly because of technical innovations like film and radio, partly because musical comedy and revue supplanted the old form (Gracie Fields, for instance, though she began in the Halls, made her big name in *Mr. Tower of London*), and mostly because the autonomous working-class world from which the Music Hall emerged was in decline after World War I.

For it was, initially, an authentic creation of the working-classes: the singers, song-writers and audience all spoke the same language, and the songs were about their world. Artistically, I do not think one can make high claims for the quality of the Music Hall songs: as a 'folk art', they are in no way to be compared with contemporary flamenco or Southern American Gospel and Work Songs of the Negro people. The tunes are usually unoriginal—mostly derived from Wesleyan hymns, debased German lieder or Viennese waltz numbers, though there are occasionally echoes of English folk ballads too. The lyrics, though often witty and astringent, are rarely profound: tragedy, for instance, is entirely absent in the Music Hall canon. The favourite themes are sentimental or, more usually, sardonic.

Yet that this was an art of a kind, and that it gave enormous pleasure to millions of urban Englishmen and women in the Victorian and Edwardian eras, cannot be doubted. And until the Music Halls became increasingly commercialised, round about the turn of the century, into monster Palaces of Varieties for a more 'respectable' public, the Halls were a real *vox populo*: a shout of mockery, and of humane self-mockery, by the dispossessed about their world, and the world that was denied them. For when Marie Lloyd sang

*We 'ad to go away*

*Cos the rent we could not pay*

*—The moving-van came round just after dark...*

this was something that she, born in poverty in Peerless Street, Hoxton, and her audiences at the Britannia, the Cosmotheke, the Old Mo, or Gattis-over-the-Road, knew all too well from

# The Praise of Cheeky Chappies

personal experience. The Music Hall songs were popular in that they reflected popular life and ideology; they were not 'pops' in our modern sense which, however well and often brilliantly delivered, are synthetic in emotion and their themes.

Max Miller, who was born in London, reared in Brighton, and first learned his art from the late G. H. Elliott ('The Chocolate-Coloured Coon'), preserved into an age seemingly most unfavourable to his art, a large measure of this antique spirit of subversion. His great period was in the 1930's, when the 'Cheeky Chappie' lorded it—together with the Houston Sisters, who queened

it—at the Holborn Empire, now demolished. Now, before World War I, the English working-classes, though despised and plundered by the mighty, had the vitality and self-assurance of the injured. But in the 1930's, with 3½ million unemployed—and yet with the treacherous promise, from the Macdonald era onwards, that something should and would be done to bring them social justice—this spirit of revolt was weakened. Max Miller, if on a small scale, helped to preserve it.

If you didn't see him, let me briefly describe his act. He appeared wearing a tunic and plus-fours apparent made out of curtain material, with a white fedora at a jaunty angle, and carrying a guitar. He didn't play this much, but began telling tales in a casual deadpan manner. All these stories were so loaded with innuendo, usually sexual, that Lennie Bruce would appear, by comparison, a rather obvious practitioner. Max's great—or apparent—assumption was that he saw the world in realistic terms, and his entire audience in those of dirty-minded prurience. The laughter of the public at his devastating observations on human folly and venality seemed to astonish him completely.

He was also, in the great Music Hall tradition, where so many of the artists wrote their own finest songs, a marvellous lyric-writer. I invite any earnest sociologist to visit the Gramophone Library of the B.B.C. They have dozens,

literally, of songs of his, but all save one are marked with an imperious red label 'Banned for Broadcasting'. (The only one that isn't a diluted version of his *Mary from the Dairy*—not the song he sang on the stage).

Sometimes these songs are simply funny—as the one about the two young cyclists, boy and girl, who set off for the country wearing shorts, and returned wearing each others' (if I make myself clear). But many of these songs are if in a not very radical way, those of social revolt. His *Why does the Dustman Get It All?* (which The Alberts have revived recently) is about the lift of the rich seen—with mockery and resentment but not venom—by the man on the outside looking in.

It is hardly possible to write about the Music Halls, and to praise their art, without some grim someone telling you you are a backward-looking old nostalgiac, hating the present because you slavishly adore the past. Myself, I think it possible both to see that the social conditions which produced the Music Hall songs were in almost every respect revolting, and equally that no popular art, since that of the Halls, has been as authentic and effective.

In the past decade or so we have had the whole 'teen thing, with a dozen or so good songs, and acres of commercialised daydream. We have had the ballad-and-blues puritans with their unconvincing ditties about building the M.1—a bit of cultural slumming that

would make Cecil Sharp seem like an angel of light (as indeed in many ways he was). We have had the University contribution in the form of that nihilistic schoolboy programme on the B.B.C., late Saturday nights.

We have also had Mike Sarne, who told a bit of truth. And The Alberts for whom—or Queen Victoria—be praised. A place like Dan Farson's pub where authentic local talents have emerged that please the boys and girls from Bow and Hackney Downs, not the Hampstead lot who come to have a look. Also writers of real jazz songs, like Kenny Graham.

I believe popular song is a thermometer of social health: by what songs they like, you can in most ways judge a people. There are signs, faint as yet, that an anarchist popular art is now emerging—political, funny, tender, realistic—not 'artistic' in the least.

If this should happen, and grow wider, as I hope it will, then we may remember Max Miller as a pathfinder. He fell out of favour in the 1940's—the symbolic moment being when we went on too long at a Royal Variety Performance and displeased Mr. Val Parnell. Big-time commercialised show-biz destroyed him—as it will almost anyone who wants to be a real popular artist now. The answer to this threat is to sing real stuff to real people about real things on a humanly manageable scale. You won't, of course, make quite so much money by it. COLIN MACINNES.

# More on 'The People in the Streets'

DEAR FRIENDS,

I have sympathies with both sides to the argument over the Aldermaston finale and would like to attempt to reconcile both views.

If those who take comfort in the power of the masses to disobey police instructions and take over the streets simply regard this incident as a very slight and temporary indication of what might be done if sufficient people took the same line, well and good. Someone has said that Freedom is never given, it is only taken. In a revolutionary situation where the government was attempting to maintain a thoroughly unpopular policy, so that even its own means of coercion were inclined to stand by and not interfere, or refuse to use force, or even join the demonstrators, it would need some such act of disobedience to spark off a chain reaction.

If they regard it as a salutary education to those who believe we live in a society governed by consent and "democracy" to make the powers that be employ force, and show the ugly facts of machine-guns, tear-gas, tanks, shooting every tenth man, and the rest; to tear away comfortable illusions; they are on shakier ground but still to some extent justified. They need sufficient disorder to prove that the State rests on force rather than on consent, in that the forces it deploys obey orders from above and do not express the will of the people. But they must not irresponsibly provoke those with insufficient caution or imagination to sail blindly on, expecting a rag and ending up a bloody mess in hospital, having given just sufficient provocation to justify the police or military action, or at least to make the sacrifice ineffective in terms of public opinion. Just as it would weaken the strike weapon to use it in conditions where the climate of opinion be turned against the strikers.

The battle is not against the police of the military, the battle is for the minds and sentiments of the population, including the minds of the personnel of the police and military.

A question that arises is whether disorder that resulted in the police turning to high-pressure hoses or tear-gas or even more lethal methods would achieve anything favourable to Anarchist purposes, given the kind of society in which we live. It is customary for Anarchists to harden their own sentiments by pretending that we live in a police-state governed by the naked use of force. This pretence has much in common with the teen-ager who, incensed against his father, asserts that the latter is a bully and a brute, that he hates him and so on. And who, to justify his mood, provokes a father into corresponding conduct. It is true that the father may in some situations become a bully and a brute, but this does not imply that this is how he sees himself.

Ideally, when the police are ordered to use coercion they should, by and large, carry out the order reluctantly and with more than a little sympathy for the spirit of their victims. They should be split as between those who want to bash them up and teach them

a lesson and get home to their Sunday dinners, and those who themselves deplore the strain of living four minutes from annihilation and find themselves respecting the spirit, and the restraint, of the demonstrators. The police themselves need their own image of themselves as the peaceable, dedicated, servants of the public weal; at least many of them do.

And is this image entirely false? I think not. The police do help regulate traffic, they help clear up the mess after road-accidents, they often help people find their way. They do not spend all their time beating people up or extracting confessions. As individuals they suffer from authoritative coercion and redirect their anger against those beneath them in the hierarchy, they do identify with "the establishment" but at the same time they do act humanely and cooperatively in many aspects of their lives. They are, as microcosms, just as divided and confused as in society at large.

What then do our demonstrations and clashes seek to achieve? I suggest that they seek to expose and ridicule the authoritarian elements in our society and assert the co-operative and rational elements. In our existing society they do no more and no less. If they attempt more or work on sentiments imported from Anarchists in countries which do live under naked terror they both lead the unwary into needless and useless sacrifice and blacken their own cause, and tend to restrict their ranks to exhibitionists seeking to dramatize some personal neurosis, who could care not less about the co-operative society.

There is nothing wrong with a spirit of adventure, but a boy who sets out to cross the Atlantic in a canoe must either be stopped or drowned, or persuaded that he must bide his time until he can set out with a sea-going ship. And surely we want our Anarchists as individuals, to have a strong sense of self-preservation and do well for themselves no matter what social set-up they find themselves in? Provided also that their original Anarchism is so well-grounded that it is not corrupted by success.

Yours fraternally,

London N.2.

TOM BARNES.

COMRADE EDITOR,

Despite the admiration in which you are held by us readers for having produced the paper with regularity and humour over the past twenty years I believe that FREEDOM's tiny circulation is largely due to the unexamined clichés and limited thinking upon which you base your arguments. Your leader *Illusions* revealed what seem to me three false assumptions, which this week's letters have only partly dispelled.

1. The need for an Enemy. You seem to be unaware of the psychological insights offered for example by Flugel (*Man Morals and Society*) into the mechanism of the scapegoat, or by Jung into the "shadow". You project the fantasies of your own aggressive super-ego on to "policemen who behave like policemen, soldiers who do not lay down their arms, business men who won't stop making profits and politicians

who desire power." This is not to say that you want literally to be these people or to deny what in fact they do, but to ask what do you do with your own hate? No wonder your philosophy is destructive and your action violent.

T. Oxtan is correct in pointing out that many examples of co-operation and comradeship flourish in opposition to an external threat. Any reader of that Public-School-anarchist George Orwell can see that it is a policy of dictatorships to whip up fear of a foreign menace in order to weld its people together.

Can we not sometimes recognize this mechanism in ourselves?

2. The Argument from Origins—which proves nothing. It is as stupid to imagine that the workers or the people, on account of their class origin, have a monopoly of virtue, as it is to ridicule a point of view because it is put forward by someone who originated from the middle classes.

Pythagoras is said to have been neurotically obsessed with the study of geometry because of a triangular conflict in his personal relationships. His theorem is nonetheless valid after 2,500 years.

Plato's concept that the state should be composed of three categories of persons, because it is in the original nature of man to be cast in one or other metal, was a more or less unconscious attempt to rig a static authoritarian regime upon his contemporaries and future generations.

The fallacy must be as obvious to you as it was to Marie Louise (*Journey Through Utopia*, p. 15). Why then do you allow comparably rigid assumptions to sway your judgment?

3. Pacifism and non-violence. Who said that the "massive, entrenched, built-in forces of privilege" would be persuaded by "pure reason"? The alternatives however are not between violence and passive waiting, like Boxer, for a change of heart. Part of the power of non-violence lies in the step beyond an appeal to reason which, to use Joan Bondurant's words, "acts as a shock treatment, a dramatisation, which enlarges or alters the opponent's field of vision so that he becomes aware of morality" (*Conquest of Violence*, p. 227).

Most of us have been engaged in some form of non-violent direct action of which the sit-down, the strike and tax refusal are examples. Imprisonment for civil disobedience is a sophisticated and entirely appropriate form of protest in a democracy as an alternative to the O.A.S. type of revolt. None of these imply just waiting. Though non-violent methods can be used coercively (*dura-graha*) this should not make us shrink from learning to use them wisely.

Curiously enough all your criticism of my letter could have come from a Marxist! Yet I entirely agree with your positive explanation that "the only revolution worth having is one which results in the weakening of government power and a corresponding increase in responsibility by the people"—hence my insistence on educating and training ourselves. Universities for non-violence as well as Schools are needed. We are not better or more responsible people simply

because we call ourselves anarchists or come from this or that class background.

We destroy the State when we, the majority, act in a different way. The more violence the less revolution.

TONY WEAVER.

DEAR COMRADES,

The debate on the Easter Monday demonstration has been fascinating, coming as a culmination to the correspondence on anarchism and non-violence.

Before Easter I was able to agree with the 'non-violence' faction completely. It grieved me to have to disagree at last with the gentle Arthur Uloth but it was insupportable for him to claim (April 6) that commitment to political non-violence didn't mean commitment to non-violence in one's personal life.

It is precisely this willingness to accept different standards in private and public life which leads otherwise kindly people to threaten to commit genocide.

In the same letter he said, "I don't see how anarchism could be achieved by violence". Does this mean he doesn't see the need for a personal commitment to anarchism, either?

Middle class I may be, but I can't share your editorial scorn of the advocates of non-violence for "wanting policemen to stop behaving like policemen, soldiers to lay down their arms, business men to stop making profits and politicians to stop desiring power". (May 4).

What sort of revolution would it be if these unfortunate and miserable people were not so changed?

Yet when all this is said, I do not side with those who feel ashamed of the anarchists part in the Easter Monday demonstration. I can't see any point to these interminable marches if there is no confrontation of the authorities, and to occupy the whole street seems a reasonable way of ensuring that this happens.

That this provoked the police to violence on Monday is true, but from all reports their aggressiveness was on the whole parried patiently and with good humour, and this response will form part of their education and ours.

One might as well feel ashamed of the Alabama negroes for the scenes of violence shown on last night's television news as police dogs were set among them.

But the happenings of Easter Monday cannot be interpreted as an indication of the possibility of revolution by the exertion of physical strength. Just to outnumber and possibly outfight the police in the future cannot possibly bring about real change.

The revolution is more likely to come (and I accept the Editors' definition of it as the one which weakens governmental power and increases personal responsibility and direct control of their affairs), through a strengthening of the respect and compassion individuals feel for one another and a rejection of the notion that might is right, which is the basis for non-violent direct action.

It is clear to me that the chief tools to work with are 'education and training' in the widest sense and I have always understood that the Editors of FREEDOM agreed with me, otherwise why should they go on publishing instead of putting up the barricades?

Sevenoaks, May 7. BRIAN RICHARDSON.

## 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 World is a Wedding* Bernard Kops 25/-  
*Antisemitism* James Parkes 22/6  
*Boys and Girls Together* William Saroyan 18/-  
*This Island Now* G. M. Carstairs 10/6  
*Dialectical Materialism—Vol. 3* Maurice Comforth 12/6  
*Militarism and Industry* V. Perlo 30/-  
*Social Dance* A. H. Franks 45/-

#### REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

*The Theory of Economic Growth* W. Arthur Lewis 18/-  
*The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell* (2 vols.) (ed.) P. A. Schilpp (each) 15/-

#### SECOND-HAND

*My Road to Berlin* Willy Brandt 12/6;  
*Journey to the End of Night* Louise-Ferdinand Celine 8/6; *History of the World* (Odhams) ed. W. N. Weech 5/-;  
*Leninism* Joseph Stalin 6/-; *Articles and Pamphlets* Maxim Gorki 5/-; *Secret Forces* F. O. Miksche 6/-; *New Poems, 1956* (ed.) Spender, Jennings, Abse 5/-;  
*The Devils of Loudon* Aldous Huxley 3/6; *The Coming Democracy* (1917) Hermann Fernau 3/-; *Capital Today* Herman Cahn (1918) 3/-; *The Missionaries* G. W. Target 8/-; *The Fifth Amendment Today* (1955) Erwin N. Griswold 6/-; *The Free Society* John Middleton Murry 4/6; *The Growth of Religion* Joseph McCabe 5/-; *Return to Goli* Peter Abrahams 6/-; *On Art and Socialism* William Morris 7/6; *The Problem of China* (1922) Bertrand Russell 6/-.

### 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

## There is a tide in the affairs of men

THE growing interest in anarchist ideas which has been manifest during the past two years, not only in this country but in most other countries with which it is possible to maintain contact, should be, and indeed for many of us, is, a source of encouragement and an incitement to redouble our activities as anarchist propagandists.

Everything is relative, we know that; and readers need have no fear that "success" will go to our heads,

### The need for propagandists

WE must confess to a feeling of impatience with those anarchist writers who are for ever putting forward complicated political and philosophical explanations as to "why anarchism progresses so slowly" and completely ignore the much more obvious and "simplest" arguments (1) that the anarchist movement (to its credit surely?) has always been a financially poor movement compared with the minority Left in general (the Kropotkins, Bakunins and Malatestas gave away their inheritances as a matter of principle, and while we think it was a tactical mistake to give it to the poor peasants—for the same reason as advanced by old man Ford: that if he distributed his private fortune among all his workers their lot would remain unchanged—rather than to propaganda, who will deny that there is no comparison between the impact made on people and ideas by this revolutionary trio and the protestations of our latter-day "millionaire-socialists": the Bernsteins, Samuels and Strauss' who dream of the socialist utopia, but in the meantime live off the fat of the land!). (2) Equally important is the fact that anarchists do not belong to the self-sacrificing do-gooding species of humanity (that is in the, now generally understood, masochistic sense of the word). This "do-it-yourself" anarchism, this living—this by example— anarchism is, to our minds, vital both for the people concerned as well as for the ideas they propagate. Unlike George Woodcock (not the TUC GW, but our ex-editorial colleague and author of the forthcoming Penguin

### Expand our horizons

THE smugness we refer to consists in the belief that it is obvious where the people's interest lies and they have only to look and they will find it. In the first place there is the presumption that the enlightened ones have discovered all they know by their unaided efforts. This attitude depends not on the concept that in the long term "reason will prevail" but that reason is fundamental to human thought, once people start thinking; or when the cobwebs of prejudice have been swept away from human thought. We are not so immodest nor unobservant as to believe that once people start thinking for themselves their thoughts will lead them to anarchist conclusions or that reason—that is logical argument—will determine their actions in the direction we would wish!

Who would deny that a Nehru, a Russell a Schweitzer or a Silone have spent a large part of their lives thinking? Have they embraced the anarchist idea as a result? At the other intellectual extreme you have illiterate Spanish peasants who also spent a large part of their lives

and lead us to call for our gallant banner-bearers of Easter Monday, and the people of Britain, to gather in Trafalgar Square next Monday and declare the anarchist revolution! What we are calling for, however, is an intensification of anarchist propaganda activities by all our comrades who declare themselves as something more than simply "philosophical anarchists", so that our ideas and movement may go forward and grow.

history of Anarchism), this writer's experience of fellow anarchists over many years would lead him to describe them not as "millenarians" or dreamers of the "millenium"—words which abound in Woodcock's history and blind his judgment—but as unsentimental, sometimes cynical, sometimes just "tough" realists, impractical, in so far as they do not conform to the values which are today, in the event, surely wrongly, considered to be the passport to happiness and success, but practical in that they manage to enjoy life without having to pawn their future to the "persuaders" and the finance companies, and are impervious to the manufactured "crises" which are the stock-in-trade of the organs of mass communications, yet without being apathetic to the real, permanent, crises virtually built-in to our existing society.

Where we would introduce a critical note to this "profile" of "anarchists-I-have-met"—and there are a lot more of them than the denigrators, and even some anarchists, imagine—is of the anarchists as propagandists and proselytizers. To a large extent their virtues as human beings, and practitioners as well as believers (unlike so many authoritarians who alleged to be but are not!) in the freedom of speech, assembly and the written word, inhibit them. They are, in our experience, reluctant, inefficient propagandists partly because of a smug attitude to their "unenlightened" fellow beings. We propose to substantiate these "criticisms" which are made with objectivity as our goal and without rancour.

thinking . . . or at least, dreaming and wanting, the "comunismo libertario" to which the itinerant anarchist propagandists have introduced them by word of mouth, and the promise of work and liberty. In 1936 Franco's military *coup d'état* was resisted and halted by millions of simple, unambitious, uncomplicated (in the Freudian sense, if not for Freud!) for whom utopia was more food and down with the boss. The privileged class plus the Spanish Army and the crack troops and armament of Italy and Germany took two and a half years to physically reduce this "rabble" and so insecure has been its victory that 24 years later the regime cannot relax its "security" measures. What comparable example can we cite of the *thinking élite*? What did they do in 1939? What did they do when Hitler was replaced by the cold war? How long were they prepared to suffer the inconvenience of "sitting in puddles" before they found all kinds of philosophical and other wordy rationalisations to explain why their bottoms were more comfortable in a Club's upholstery?

120 DEMONSTRATORS marched through Dover to hold a public meeting near a Regional Seat of Government located in the Castle. When stopped some sat down in the road and others distributed reprints of the Spies for Peace pamphlets. A smaller group scaled the castle walls where police were in their usual repulsive position. The *Mirror's* account of fights and of a blonde girl who said she belonged to the London Anarchist movement and who tried to scramble into the moat were totally fictitious. Thousands of negroes (adults and children) were jailed for breaking a city ordinance against parades in Birmingham, Alabama. The democratically unelected police chief Bull Connor is reported as saying, "We ain't gonna segregate no niggers and whites together in this town." White business-men, with experience of a six-week boycott of their stores by coloured, agreed on three points.— Desegregation of down-town stores, including their luncheon counters, rest rooms, etc.; improved employment opportunities for negroes; establishment of a bi-racial commission which will consider a time-table for desegregating public schools, and opening the city's parks, golf courses, and swimming pools to both races. 'Bull' Connor said this agreement was the most dishonest face-saving statement that was ever issued. Two bombs were tossed, one into the motel headquarters of the integration movement, and one into the house of Martin Luther King's brother. This sparked off fighting with the police and at the time of going to press President Kennedy has sent Federal troops to bases near Birmingham. Fifty boys from a North Paddington comprehensive school marched to the American Embassy in London to protest about the racial disturbance in Birmingham, Alabama. . . .

## Mutual Aid Wanted

AS A RESULT of the action at Marham many of our comrades have been charged under the Official Secrets Act. Many more will no doubt join them this Saturday. Heavy fines must be expected. Money will be needed. Please send more than you can spare to Jack Stephenson, c/o Freedom Press. Let no activist be let down for want of money!

The anarchist case is at the same time universal and uncompromising. Every individual has an inalienable right of access to the means of production, freedom of expression in its broadest sense, but no right to exploit the labour of a fellow being, or seek to coerce others by reason of his superior knowledge. This simple but all-embracing concept which to us anarchists is so basic and so obvious that it is almost a cliché, for millions of people would be a revelation, a new ideal, a bolt from the blue to which they could react favourably or unfavourably.

We would be intrigued to carry out a straightforward survey among the "do-it-yourself", individualist school of anarchists to find out how they came to embrace anarchist ideas. It would, we are sure, enlighten them no less than those of us who Sid Parker from his lonely pinnacle referred to (FREEDOM May 4) as the advocates of "a gregarious and indiscriminate communism" (of his two qualifying adjectives we accept the former and reject the latter). Because we have recognised, in retrospect, that the "discoveries" we made in the realm of ideas had been, in fact, suggested, insinuated or simply expressed to us by others, we believe in the value and the importance of communication, and unlike those anarchists who resent having come into this wicked world without their prior consent (a situation they will have to put up with even in an anarchist society, since there seems to be no way round this problem!), we are prepared to accept our parents as they are, grateful of the opportunity they have given us, not only of life but of being able to rebel against them at some stage or other in our development

One has only to read the letters we receives which are not intended for publication from people who



THE BRISTOL Bus Company on instructions from its London office which controls the purse-strings, decided on a policy of racial tolerance. The Railway unions decided on guidance from above on a policy of collaboration with Dr. Beeching. Dr. Heenan, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool denied that Pope John was collaborating with Communists; but Italian communists got one out of four votes probably upon this party line. . . .

IT IS NOW thought possible that Greville Wynne, a British business man, sentenced in Moscow to eight years' for spying, may be exchanged for a Russian spy, Gordon Lonsdale, sentenced in London to twenty-five years. Mr. Khrushchev received a British trade mission and told them that Russia would buy more British machinery and equipment if Britain would buy more in exchange. . . .

MR. REGINALD FORSTER was released from jail to take part in the vital maintenance of a free press. Its vital function this week was the full reporting of the judge's summing-up in the Argyll divorce case. The freedom of the press to fully report these anthropological studies of sex-rites was infringed some years ago. However, a Catholic Socialist judge gave a waiting world the full details in a summing-up that lasted four-and-a-half-hours. He said of the Duchess, "There is enough in her own admissions to establish that, by 1960 she was a completely promiscuous woman whose sexual appetite could only be satisfied by a number of men, and whose attitude to the sanctity of marriage was what moderns would call 'enlightened', but in plain language could only be described as wholly immoral."

have been introduced to anarchism for the first time—that is who are receptive to these ideas but who had never heard of or, please note, discovered, anarchism for themselves—to appreciate the positive value of propaganda. And to this end street and meeting-selling, and the administrative tasks without which not even an anarchist journal could survive, as well as the anarchist presence at meetings and demonstrations, are in fact, the principle means for introducing the general public to our ideas.

There are periods when the public seems to be more receptive or if you like, less hostile, to radical ideas. These are the moments when the anarchists should intensify their activities as propagandists. We should aim at making our presence felt at all political and other meetings which are concerned with problems in which we have something to contribute. And this is something which we do half-heartedly at present, and thereby miss golden opportunities.

One correspondent in FREEDOM suggested recently that the Anarchists, and we assumed that the FREEDOM group were included, wanted to keep the movement small and exclusive. This is so far from the truth, and the palpable evidence in our columns, that it hardly seemed necessary to refute the charge. Perhaps this is an occasion to repeat that the function of our journal is to propagate anarchist ideas, to encourage anarchist activity and the growth of anarchist groups throughout the world. While we have no intention of being an open forum for every minority "ism" we do intend to continue to reflect all the aspects of anarchist thought in our columns, certainly until such time as the movement has grown to the point where a need will be felt for other

The Duchess it was claimed by the Duke, kept a diary in which the initials of men with whom she had intercourse were entered. One of her four men friends wrote of her, "I never knew that such a short acquaintance could keep a hot flame burning so high." The Duke phoned his ancestral home to get a bonfire ready for a celebration on the night of the divorce decree. Another of the four men said to the *Mirror*, "If I had anything to say at all, it would be full of four-letter words—and you wouldn't print them." The *Daily Herald* (founded by George Lansbury) says of the Duchess, "She has day dresses worth £200 or £300. After wearing them a few times she sells them. Her gloves are bought in Paris, her shoes hand-made in Florence. She does not knit, is not a great reader, does not watch TV, or drive a car. . . . The Duchess has a tiny appetite, but seldom says no to caviare or buttered shrimps. Her favourite shop—Tiffany's, the New York jewellers. She is not very extravagant with her Christmas presents. And like most women . . . she never, never stops talking. After the case, the Duchess said, "Lawyers are looking into it. I may be appealing."

JON QUIXOTE.

### WORKERS' COURTS IN SWEDEN

(From our Correspondent)

Göteborg, 7/5/63.

The Swedish Trade Union movement have always bamboozled the workers into believing that they are weak because they are not members of a Trade Union. They have more or less persuaded their workers that although they produce the wealth it is not theirs to dispose of. The Swedish Trade Union movement gives its support to the Social Democratic government and frowns on strikes which are "illegal" as being against the "national interest". Workers who don't join the Union are sent to Coventry or sacked from their jobs.

A so-called "workers' court" in Göteborg fined 43 Swedish workers the sum of 8,600 kroner (about 60 Pounds) for taking part in an illegal strike. Strikes outside the official trade union movement are considered against the law. The Trade Union leadership play their "game" according to the rules of the welfare state. The rules are that the economic cake though it is made by the Swedish workers is owned by the employers. H.

anarchist publications, and then perhaps the different anarchist schools of thought will each be able to have their organs of expression. For our part we have been engaged in the publication of an anarchist journal for enough years to have learned that the differences between anarchists are far less important than the ideas they hold in common, and it is perhaps a measure of the success of our journal in keeping alive all these years, that those of us closely connected with it each has his own particular "brand" of anarchism which he expresses without fear of offending the "party line". We have no anarchist "party line", all anarchist ideas are "respectable" so far as we are concerned and it is up to those who hold them to express them. In recent weeks many comrades and sympathisers have contributed to our columns; the resulting product has been a lively FREEDOM and a sample, we think of what an anarchist journal should be. Let us now expand our horizons; wherever there are anarchists let there be local groups seeking to relate their ideas to local problems, and thereby providing an *entré* for introducing anarchist ideas to large numbers of people whose thinking has made them receptive, but who without this introduction would remain unaware of our ideas.

Now is a good time to start. With elections in the air, there is a growing political consciousness, which as we know from past experience, lasts only for a limited period—until everybody has safely made his cross on the ballot paper. We must use the occasion to introduce anarchist ideas. And by the participation of all convinced anarchists FREEDOM can be the spearhead of such activity. But we must start right now!

**Bowler Hats**

DEAR SIR,  
Without wishing to turn into another marathon "productivity" correspondence, may I have the space to briefly reply to the points raised by Arthur Moyses's last letter?

Of course "the fly boys at the Establishment . . . hired Lenny Bruce as a bawdy freak", and any idea that the situation was otherwise was not implied or stated in any of the pieces I have written. The whole point of my pieces was that whatever the reasons for Bruce being hired, and whatever the reasons of the attending audience, the result was that several hundred people heard a brilliant comedian show them the world and themselves in a new light, and from a moral standpoint closely akin to anarchism. This was important. The rights of human beings to "paddle in the gutter without pretending to look for roses" is not in dispute and Arthur Moyses has used that poetic phrase to disguise the fact that he has shifted his ground.

His original letter attacked my contention that Bruce was a moralist, although he had heard neither Bruce's act nor Bruce's records. Now Mr. Moyses tries to convince us the the controversy is on the right "to communicate with each other without the pretended justification or moral or aesthetic highmindedness". I agree with Arthur's viewpoint in that we certainly should be able to do so. The fact remains though that Bruce IS a moralist and no one who has heard him work would accuse him of using moral red herrings to disguise the fact that he was a child who liked swearing in front of the grown-ups, which is the other implication of the letter.

Finally, the theme I outlined might or might not be used by Bunuel but if Moyses had read the book in question I don't think somehow that he would continue to drag in Shakespeare and Webster. That book, and its readership, are products of a sick and sexually repressed society in exactly the same way as are the gentlemen masturbating under their bowler hats in the strip joints and "nature film" cinemas. That theme might well have been used for a valid

**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**

piece of art. In fact it wasn't and in any case the use of books as a substitute for sexual fulfilment is not particularly desirable however necessary it might be in a society that is basically anti-sex and anti-life. And of Arthur Moyses wishes to join T. S. Eliot in yearning after an Elizabethan golden age, he's welcome. He might read a little history first though.  
London, May 15. JOHN PILGRIM.

**Outmoded**

DEAR EDITORS,  
Some time ago I suggested that Mr. Parker was creating an Aunt Sally in his fear that the reluctant individualist would be forced against his will to share in the benefits of common ownership. Obviously I was not convincing, as he is still concerned with this "threat" to liberty. I do not like to think that he should be troubled in this way, particularly as I am sure that the threat exists only in his own imagination. If Anarchist Communism has any meaning at all, coercion will not exist other than the coercion of those natural forces which, as yet, we cannot control. If it does exist, then obviously it is not Anarchist Communism. If coercion does not exist, then Mr. Parker's fears are groundless and no-one will be compelled to participate in anything against his will. This is not to say that ploughing the lonely furrow is necessarily practicable or for that matter sensible. Individual craftsmanship will, I am sure, persist in any system of Society, but individual production, as a means of sustaining life, becomes more and more outmoded as Society develops, and, with the practical annihilation of space, unthinkable. We cannot revert to earlier ways of living, even if we wished to, and to think today in terms of mediaeval production is just not realism, although it is worthy of note that more than six hundred years ago John Ball was telling people that any Society which did not accept common ownership would always be a sick Society.

I fully appreciate Sidney Parker's passion for individual liberty. I wish he could realise that this will be possible only when the economic foundation of Society is such that individual interests are not antagonistic. The only freedom which will not exist under a system of common ownership (other than the restrictions to which I have already referred, arising from forces beyond our control) is the freedom to exploit the labour of others and this will not be possible because exploitation will be meaningless where everything is free for all to use. Common ownership, in other words Anarchist Communism (I do not believe that common ownership can or ever will be attained through political action or other forcible method), will I believe develop naturally as the logical alternative to the waste and inefficiency of private ownership. Economic pressure is intensifying altogether beyond our appreciation and to think of anarchism as something belonging to the distant future may be very wide of the mark. However this may be, it is surely obvious that a reasoned case for satisfying the needs of the people is more likely to lead to the absolute equality of all and consequent complete freedom than a vague and nebulous theory of lone individuals always adopting a negative attitude of "permanent protest". I appreciate that Mr. Parker denies that he is opposed to association. I welcome this and I hope he will take this to the logical conclusion that for mankind association is life and that only when the conflict of interests between people has ended will the characteristics and capabilities of the individual be free to develop and Mr. Parker's ideal of the Sovereignty of the Individual be possible of attainment.  
Yours sincerely,  
Surrey, May 8. F.B.

**B. de Casseres**

DEAR EDITORS,  
I am interested in the life and ideas of the American writer Benjamin de Casseres and would be pleased to hear from anyone who knew him, or could sell or lend me his works. Will they please write to me: 202, Broomwood Road, London, S.W.11, England.  
S. E. PARKER

**Against Finality**

DEAR EDITORS,  
I should like to comment on K.M.'s article "Against Finality" (FREEDOM 20/4/63), which is a reply to my article "Anarchist Principles" (FREEDOM 15/1/63). K.M. makes six major points, all of which, however, seem to stem from misunderstanding either what I was trying to do, or what I said.

What I tried to do was, to give an answer to the questions one is often asked, "But what is anarchism? What do you aim at, and what do you do? I did not try to say what might be or ought to be done, nor even necessarily to state my own opinions; rather to give a consensus of anarchist aims and actions. I made no suggestion of finality.

I will now comment on each of K.M.'s points:

1. *Happiness.* It is specifically anarchist to want the greatest possible happiness for every individual; communists, capitalists, and representative democrats, to name three large bodies of opinion, do not share this view, believing rather in "the greatest good of the greatest number". Also, K.M. asks, "Isn't there an assumption that most people agree in general terms on what happiness means. The subject has puzzled philosophers for many centuries, and a lengthy discussion would have been out of place.
2. *Freedom.* By the use of the word "amount" I am supposed to imply that freedom can be quantified: what I meant was, that it can be compared—it seems reasonable to say that a man outside prison has a greater amount of (or greater degree of, or more) freedom than a prisoner.
3. *Futurism.* K.M.'s points here are (a) that I mention both the present and the future; (b) that I do not state how the future society will come about; and (c) that the actions I mention anarchists carrying out now will not bring about a free society. On (a) that is what I set out to do; on (b), I do not know, and can find no general agreement; on (c), I didn't say they would (although I do think they tend in that direction, e.g. not voting, actively opposing particularly restrictive actions of authority, fostering a freer education, etc.).
4. *Latent authoritarianism.* "Despite the scattering about of terms like 'freedom' and 'free society', there does seem to be the notion of some controlling others". I cannot see where this notion comes from, and it appears to be diffi-

cult to avoid the accusation: thus if A tries to suppress B's religious beliefs, he is authoritarian; but if he does not, this is "latent authoritarianism". The words to which K.M. particularly objects are: possible; organized; allow; tolerated. This suggests that he visualises a free society as one that is impossible, disorganised, restrictive and intolerant.

5. *Solidarism.* "By this I mean the notion of a common good, or public or general interest, to which all other interests can be subordinated". I can see nothing in my article to suggest this, and K.M. makes no specific reference under this heading. Indeed I tried to avoid any such implication by the use of the phrases "equal benefit of all members" and "happiness for every individual".

6. *Utopianism.* Do I really think the future society will be ideal? Of course, I don't know what it will be like. This is what I think most anarchists hope it will be like, and there is nothing logically incompatible in the ideals mentioned. Nor is there anything wrong in utopianism, which is simply the description of a state of affairs better than what is the case now.

K.M.'s concluding wish is "that there should be an anarchism which is consciously non-futurist, non-authoritarian, non-solidarist, non-utopian, non-salvationist and non-moralist". Perhaps he will now give us this.  
London, W.C.1. J.K.R.

**Statement from Oxford**

We have received the following statement from Gabrielle Charing on behalf of the Oxford anarchists.  
The Oxford anarchists wish to state their belief that

- a free society must necessarily be a non-violent society;
  - a non-violent society can only be achieved by non-violent means;
  - violence is by its very nature authoritarian;
  - actions such as pushing through police cordons cannot succeed in bringing home to anyone, and especially not to the police, that violence is unnecessary. They can only strengthen those who at present see themselves as our opponents in their belief that police violence is justifiable.
- Oxford, May 8.

**The Violence of Governments**

Continued from page 1  
parently now feel themselves safe from overthrow, and continue to murder and imprison political opponents.

Finally, in Britain and Russia, the misnamed "Security" forces have been having a busy time exposing spies and initiating attacks on personal freedom

in the name of their need to defend freedom against the other side.

However, it may be objected that the facts referred to above (and others referring to other states throughout the world, which would fill the paper many times), are nevertheless exceptions, examples of bad or insufficient government, and do not in themselves condemn it.

While this is undoubtedly a safe view to take, and the person who holds it usually regards either his "own" government or the one he hopes to replace it with as being free from criticism, it is a very superficial one.

It is unfortunate that the state, and the groups whose privileged positions it defends at the expense of the rest of us, has managed to indoctrinate the mass of the population into thinking that their safety depends on it. Thus the reviewer who is surprised by Read's anarchism, wrote the previous week on a book describing the massacre at Dresden by British and American bombers. While such acts are being perpetrated and planned, and their weapons defended by ranks of uniformed hirelings, when the world lives under the fear of H-bomb warfare, the states waste the wealth of the people on armaments, and stockpile not only these but surplus food while half the world is starving; when money is wasted on espionage to the detriment of all peoples, yet the economies are so distorted that a reorganisation of production throws hundreds of thousands out of work; in this society it is still possible for people to believe the supreme lie that government protects the people and gives them peace and order, and that they themselves are incapable of living in a society of free individuals and making their own decisions.

Our freedom and security in the future depend on the extent to which we can subvert these lies and convince people that they are too important to be used and exploited by a powerful minority, that they would enjoy a life of freedom and anarchy and that if we become strong enough we can get rid of the governments and have it.  
P.H.

**SLIPPING!**

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT MAY 10th 1963

Weeks 1-17	£ 435
Weeks 18 & 19	70
<b>INCOME:</b>	<b>505</b>
Sales & Sub. Renewals:	£
Weeks 1-17 (141)	152
Weeks 18 & 19 (22)	22
<b>DEFICIT</b>	<b>£651</b>

DEFICIT FUND

Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Kirup: C.K. 13/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 3/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; N. Malden: J.H.T. 5/-; New York: N.McD. £1/15/6; Chicago: J.A.C. 14/-; Rickmansworth: P.J. 10/-; Surrey: F.B.* 10/-; Peterborough: A.W. 8/-; E. Rutherford: A.S.* 7/-; Saffron Walden: O.R.W. 5/-; Edmonton: W.G.* 7/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Somerville: E.H. 3/6; Seaford: D.T. 5/-; Hesse: G.T. 5/6; London: N.D. 4/-; Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; London: L.A. 5/8; London: E.B. 8/-; London: H.R. £1; Southend: P.O.* 2/6; "Victoria" 10/-; Stockholm: O.H. 4/-; Chicago: J.A.C. £1/15/6; Belfast: W.G. 6/-; Berkeley: B.C. 10/6.	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12 14 1</b>
Previously acknowledged	316 2 9
<b>1963 TOTAL TO DATE</b>	<b>£328 16 10</b>

**DURHAM AREA**

**DURHAM ANARCHISTS.**  
Will anarchists in and around Durham interested in forming a discussion group please contact Owen Wells, St. Cuthbert's Society, University of Durham, Durham?

**REDHILL-DORKING-CRAWLEY**

Readers in Redhill, Dorking, Crawley district interested in forming anarchist discussion group, please get into touch with Richard Fish, 3 Hillfield Road, Redhill, Surrey.

**WATCH FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS IN CENTRAL LONDON**

**NEW MEETINGS**

- Informal Meetings: Soho**  
Finch's "One Tun",  
60 Goodge Street, W.1.  
Saturdays from 6 p.m.
- Bristol Federation of Anarchists Meeting**  
MAY 8. 7.30 p.m.  
38 Canynge Square, Clifton, Bristol 8.
- OXFORD ANARCHIST MEETINGS**  
For details please contact:—  
Wynford Hicks,  
Christ Church, Oxford.

**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.
- First Thursday** of each month, Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).
- Last Thursday** of each month at 8 p.m. at George Hayes', 174 Mcleod Road, Abbey Wood, S.E.2.
- 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.
- Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group)**  
**Last Friday** of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbroke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11.

**Why not subscribe to FREEDOM and ANARCHY**

**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.