

'Truth is the daughter of time not of authority.'

BERTOLT BRECHT
(Galileo)

In this Issue:

THE DAY WE INVADED CUBA
WE ARE EXAMINED
OUT OF THIS WORLD
CORRESPONDENCE

AUGUST 3 1963 Vol 24 No 24

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

LESS than two months ago important sections of the Press were busily writing off Mr. Macmillan as a has-been, an embarrassment to the Tory Party and a liability in a general election. They did everything they could to destroy him, short of actually publishing an obituary. At the time, FREEDOM pointed out in an editorial on "Politics of the Affair" (June 22):

Macmillan may well be down, but he is not yet out. In the game of politics he is more adept, tougher and more cunning than the cartoonists portray him and the Press leads us to believe... Macmillan will not be ousted by the Parliamentary machine.

Well there it is. Last Saturday, Macmillan addressing a cheering Conservative Party rally at Chilham, Kent, got headline treatment from his most bitter critic, the *Sunday Telegraph*: "Mr. Macmillan Reasserts his Authority—Critics ignored", and their political correspondent reported that:

A confident Mr. Macmillan reasserted his authority as Prime Minister in a major speech... yesterday. He ignored almost contemptuously mention of the controversy over his future, thus confirming the growing impression that he

Mac Rides Again!

now feels confident that the party crises over his leadership has passed its peak...

By brilliant tactics, and lack of any decisive revolt against him in the Cabinet, Mr. Macmillan now seems to have won through to the respite of the summer recess in face of a bitter campaign against him.

Not only has there been no "decisive revolt" in the Cabinet but the fact is that the full force of mass communications has not succeeded in producing a ripple of visible public protest, even symbolic, such as mass demonstrations calling for his resignation, token strikes... or sit downs. Does one have to ask to who leads it? Or that the as to who leads them? Or that the politically conscious section feels impotent to express its opinion because of its own legalistic approach and because the so called democratic channels available to it are useless?

vested interests can surely only be explained by the fact that both these giants are divided among themselves. The monopolistic appetite of capitalism which results in a ruthless war of attrition or take-over; the sectional rivalries of the Trades Unions, and the economic differentials which undermine any possible hope of unity—these are the loopholes, the weaknesses, which the able politicians exploit for somebody's advantage.

In theory it is possible to argue that a government's policy could be directed to serve the interests of the people in general. In practice this is not possible so long as economic power is not in the hands of the people. Can any legally elected government effect the transfer of economic power from the monopolists to the people by legislation? Again, in theory they can; in practice

the "democratic" machinery is so designed not so much to permit of radical change in the name of the people, as to hamper change *per se*. Thus it took the Conservatives probably as long to de-nationalise road transport as it did for the Labour government to nationalise it. Now while it can be argued that this complicated machinery of legislation has its advantages in avoiding hasty retrogressive legislation, the fact is that in practice it has served to retain the *status quo* while at the same time encouraging well-meaning people to engage in reformist agitation in the belief that a revolution of values, human and economic, could in time, be achieved by the ballot box.

Even if it could be shown that a particular government was inspired by the most revolutionary intentions, the fact remains that in the first

place, when it assumes office it takes over a well-oiled, an established, a permanent organisation of government which has a vested interest in everything but change, whatever the direction. No government Minister however forceful his personality can bend this machine to his will. Secondly, because the legislative process is so cumbersome—and it is often forgotten that the old boys' club the House of Lords, without having the power to veto legislation nevertheless possesses the necessary powers to considerably delay its passage—any radical measures a government attempted to take, say against financial or other monopolist interests, could be neutralised by counter-measures within the law to such effect that the government would be dissuaded from proceeding further. To attempt to legislate for the abolition of capitalism is rather like trying to destroy a rabbit warren by blocking up one hole a year.

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE BOMB TEST BAN

THE rank and file of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) are an example of the "well-meaning" reformists we refer to. Last Sunday demonstrators carrying banners "garlanded with flowers" (the poetic prose appeared in Monday's *Daily Worker*) celebrated in Trafalgar Square the initialling of the test-ban "treaty". Their chairman, Canon Collins in his sermon at St. Paul's "honoured" the three political leaders; the two K's for their "initiative" and Mac for "his effective response". He honoured their negotiators who contributed to making "agreement possible". But declared the Canon:

the CND also deserves a pat on the back. We have been pooh-poohed, we have been written off and spoken of as

Continued on page 3

WORKSHOP FOR SKOPJE?

It is ironically true that natural disasters call forth a huge fund of spontaneous social solidarity and constructive effort which it is hard to find in ordinary circumstances.

While the August issue of ANARCHY, discusses from several angles the idea of Do-It-Yourself Community Workshops was being printed, we were discussing the application of these suggestions in different countries—England, Latin-America, Africa—the news came of the earthquakes at Skopje, and it occurred to us that here was a case where some of the flood of sympathy and aid which the disaster has brought forth, might be devoted to a project to obtain concrete-block-making machinery in Italy, ship it to Skopje, and form the basis of a workshop where people can make for themselves the material for rebuilding their homes.

We are making enquiries about the feasibility of this project in Belgrade, Milan and London, but would like anyone with further suggestions and especially with IVS experience in Yugoslavia to write to Community Workshop c/o Freedom Press, so that they can be kept informed of any developments.

London. BOSCO NEDELCOVIC.

ANARCHY 30:

IS ON
Community
Workshop

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

GOVERNMENT: THEORY AND PRACTICE

In our editorial we suggested that those who would decide Macmillan's future were the real rulers of this country "who have no seats in the House of Commons but who are in control of the financial destinies of the nation." These same people will decide the fate of any future Labour Prime Minister. So long as governments control the armed forces but not the economy of their countries they are permanently obliged to submit their policies for approval to those who hold the reins of economic power: the FBI on the one hand and the TUC on the other. That governments can function at all, poised between these two huge

AFTER ALL WE ARE ALL WESTERNERS NOW!



SKITZ

1s 6d per hour increase and 40-hr week!

WORKERS in the building industry are now planning strike action to back the claim for a 1/6d. per hour pay rise and a 40-hour week. Negotiations between union leaders and the representatives of the employers have been going on for months now but all offers so far have fallen very short of our demands. The latest offer or rather insult from the employers has been an 8d. an hour increase for craftsmen spread over the next three years and for labourers, a worse insult of 4d. an hour spread over the same period.

A further meeting between the unions and employers is arranged for Tuesday, July 30th, and if no reasonable offers are forthcoming industrial action is planned. This will take the form of a general ban on overtime and withdrawal from bonus and incentive schemes. With this, men working on certain building sites where union organisation is strong, will come out on strike.

So much for the union's plans, but what does the National Joint Council for the building industry consider a reasonable offer? Some of the building trades union leaders, Mr. Smith for one, of my own union, the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers, has spoken of accepting a 40-hour week with the bosses present pay offer. The union leaders are always searching for a way out in

order to avoid a head-on clash with the employers. Tuesday is the deadline. Then we shall see how far the union leaders are willing to go in the fight against the employers.

All through these long negotiations, the rank and file union members have put strong pressure on the officials in support of our claims. Meetings, marches and token stoppages have taken place when the unions have met the employers for talks. These demonstrations have been organised by the rank and file membership, who are determined to win the 1/6d. increase plus a 40-hour week.

During recent months, resolutions from A.S.W. branches have been sent to head office showing the large support there is for these claims. The rank and file members of the building trades have had enough of the type of pay increase which has been our lot over the years. These have usually amounted to 1d. an hour each year for the cost of living increase. For years now, no real big pay increase has been achieved on the basic hourly rate. Mind you, big pay packets are taken home, but these include money earned by working a bonus scheme and by overtime payments. Competition for labour is strong at the moment between firms who, in order to attract workers, will pay above the union basic rates.

A decent basic rate of pay is needed, for bonus schemes and overtime can be withdrawn any time. These schemes are in operation now because of the boom in the industry, but they only serve to weaken the position of the worker. Bonus schemes and overtime were brought in during the war. Now a higher basic wage is needed with the abolition of these war-time practices.

The recent pay offers of the employers have attempted to widen the wage gap between craftsmen and labourer. The aim of rank and file members should be to close these differences. With the new methods of construction in the industry, labourers are now doing a larger range of jobs including fixing of ceilings and partitions, and for this they should be getting higher rates. The old craft barriers must be done away with as they only divide workers in the industry to the employers' advantage.

United action of all workers in the building industry is needed if we are to win our demands. Our union leaders have always shown reluctance to take the necessary action and by their very nature as leaders are always willing to accept compromise. In their positions of power, they will not consult the rank and file member, but will go ahead with what they think is best and what suits their interests. Union leaders did not

consult the members about the tea-break dual which led to some men having to pay for their own mid-morning and afternoon breaks. Then it was left to men on the sites to fight for the best terms they could get with the bosses for the union leaders just didn't want to know.

A token strike is planned on some sites for Tuesday. This is unofficial, and has been decided on by the men on the job. Talks have been going on for eight months now. Union leaders have delayed too long, and industrial action is needed now.

We must be prepared to take this action for ourselves for we shall get nowhere with more delays. The union leaders have arranged talks after talks and all of no avail. Rank and file action is needed now to win our demands with ordinary union members running the show. Site strike committees must be elected, each linked up with those on other jobs for this must be our strike and we must run and control it. The decisions and terms must be made at job level by us and not dictated by the union bureaucrats. Our demands for 1/6d. per hour rise and a 40-hour week are just and through our own organisation and strength we can gain them. P.T.

FREEDOM

August 3 1963 Vol 24 No 24

WHY THE TEST BAN?

Continued from page 1

mistaken, as sentimentalists, as crackpots, as Communist dupes, sensationalists, ignoramuses and even liars.

But it has been largely through our persistence and the consequent pressure of public opinion that agreement has now been reached in Moscow.

This is pure moonshine, and must be exposed as such not because we underestimate the CND's work of informing the public about the consequences of nuclear war—we think it has been considerable—but to destroy the illusion that existing public channels of expression influence or change government policy. The immediate success of the Committee of 100's civil disobedience demonstrations two years ago was proof that some CNDers had no illusions on this score, and one can only hope that the reported invitation to Lord Hailsham (the British representative at the Moscow talks) to accept honorary membership of the Committee of 100 was meant as a joke—albeit, in our opinion, in bad taste.

★

WHY the Test ban? Because there is no way of knowing the truth, emphasises the political freemasonry that holds sway in every country. We have never had a satisfactory explanation why if the Law were clear and without loopholes and politics were above board there should exist an army of lawyers to interpret the former and regiments of political expert to "unravel the significance" of the politicians' utterances.

The *Sunday Times* emphasises

that the "splendid achievement" owes much to "persistent British diplomacy and in particular to Mr. Macmillan who has pressed steadily over the years . . ." while the *Daily Herald* echoes the *Times*' reference to Britain as the "third man" in Moscow and attacks Macmillan for being in a hurry to grab "electioneering capital" and gives credit to K (Moscow) for "his invitation" and K (Washington) for seizing the big chance". The *Sunday Citizen* talks of the Ks' "genuine desire to lift some of the burden of terror", and refers to a "moral breakthrough", while the *Observer* with cartoonist Abu knighting the sit-downers: "Arise Sir Agitator", suggests that America and Russia "have at last faced the facts of the nuclear age and decided that security is more important than ideology", and that the former "depends on some degree of organised co-operation between them". We do not profess to know the real reasons; what we do know is that all these interpretations are sheer poppycock because they all presuppose that the future of mankind hinges on a handful of "personalities" and their ability to see the light . . . and reason. To our minds there is no evidence to support this view. If the Moscow Treaty is something more than a mere face-saving "success" by the political freemasonry, worth no more than the paper it's written on, then we must seek the causes elsewhere than among the "personalities", and their domestic problems (as the *Sunday Telegraph* would have us believe). Least of these causes is the militancy of public opinion!

Please Don't Deform the Debate!

FRANCIS ELLINGHAM'S three points, far from examining our arguments, simply serve, in our opinion, to illustrate our contention that much of the debate on violence/non-violence has been sterile because of the dogmatism of the advocates of non-violence. In examining Ellingham's three points we will try to state our position beyond any misunderstanding.

Our correspondent reads into our use of the word violence in inverted commas, assumptions, and "implications" which he then scathingly demolishes, "nailing the lie one and for all". In reality we use violence in inverted commas to describe an attitude to the use of violence which cannot be summed up in a sentence such as, "I believe in violence", and to distinguish between our attitude and that of those who declare themselves to be advocates of non-violence. How many anarchists who declare themselves such are in fact non-violent absolutists? A perusal of the correspondence during these past months reveals that most are not. Francis Ellingham may well be an absolutist but for most of us such a position is based on faith not on reason and is impervious, to, unaffected by, human situations and social forces at any particular time in history. To distinguish between the non-violence of Francis Ellingham and that of an Ernie Crosswell ("It is silly to expect oneself to refrain from violence under any situation", June 16) an Arthur Uloth ("there is no inconsistency with anarchism in driving off, or even killing, some bully who is making life a misery" May 4), a Tony Weaver ("non-violent methods can be used coercively", May 18) or an Adam Roberts ("I admit that though I would, in some situations of violent methods, I can imagine circumstances where I would use violence or coercion", June 15)—would perhaps require placing their non-violence in inverted commas too! And we say this not ironically but with the kind of sympathy and understanding which this writer

would expect such advocates of "non-violence" to show in dealing with his kind of "violence".

For the fact is that we are no more advocates of violence than are most non-violent anarchists the kinds of saints who would think twice before doing a violence to a fly that has alighted on their nose. Only a few weeks ago we challenged any reader of this paper to point to anything written editorially or contributed to these columns which even suggested that an anarchist society could be brought about through violence. No-one so far has taken up the challenge because such a thought has never entered our heads, nor been expressed. Even Crosswell who is still wanting to know the composition and progress being made by the violent anarchists' High Command in readiness for THE day (as if we would tell him and the authorities our plans in advance à la Committee of 100—assuming that it were our intention in present circumstances to seek to arm ourselves!) recognised not so long ago (FREEDOM, April 6) that "Anarchists would seem to be agreed that a free society cannot be brought about by force". But he went on to contend that where there was considerable divergence of opinion was between

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 "barricads". In truth, the bulk of anarchists are probably very confused—and in this writer's opinion the FREEDOM editorials which have touched on this subject have only served to add to the confusion.

This writer's editorials have not added to the confusion, since as we will demonstrate, our position, right or wrong, is unequivocal. The confusion arises among those comrades and friends who fail to distinguish between heart and head, who confuse generous impulses with all the realities, as they exist, which can be observed, noted and analysed in the cold light of day.

THANKS, LARGELY, to Mao-Tse-Tung a test-ban treaty to ban all nuclear tests was 'initialled between Russia, Britain and the United States. Mr. Macmillan said that Britain's right to take a lead in the test-ban negotiations was gained "Not alas, by the mere profession of high moral principles, not by demonstration; not by wearing badges or carrying banners; not even by sitting down on the Queen's highway. It is by the right and authority, let us face it, of our own nuclear power. In spite of economic pressures, in face of all the temptations to contract out and abandon our position as a nuclear power. Britain stood fast." This very sensible standpoint that only those who had H-bombs had the right not to test them, was made further sense by not applying the agreement to underground tests and having the saving clause "each party has the right to withdraw if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this treaty, have jeopardised the supreme interests of its country". We shall be given three months' notice.

SEVEN ROAMING families were given an ultimatum to leave Kingsmoor Common, Begelly, Pembrokeshire, however, nine gipsy families on the common are unaffected by the order. Tenants' Associations in St. Stephens Gardens and other places owned by Rachman and his associates told how by co-operation and mutual aid they defeated Rachman's plans to evict statutory tenants. Complaints were made in the U.S. that £1,800 had been spent by the USAF in refurbishing a hospital suite at Otis Base, Massachusetts for the use of Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy at the birth of her third baby. This was denied, as it is said that Mrs. Kennedy plans to have the child at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington. Eleven rooms have been done up at this for the benefit of "transient officers". Along with the furniture installed is a basinette, baby scales, an incubator, supply of oxygen and glucose, together with a hospital bed. Six bedrooms, a nursery, a specially fitted kitchen and a surgery adjoin a tastefully decorated drawing room with a colour television set. The reason for the extra accommodation is that it is for Mrs. Kennedy's secret service bodyguards and two Air Force nurses in addition to her doctors. A 62-year-old Nottingham widow has been roaming the streets in a wheelchair, homeless and

It is this observation of practical situations as they are as opposed to one's flights of fancy or even one's personal nature which might envisage security, happiness and the Tramp's Utopia for everybody, which obliges this writer to concern himself with the practical problems of revolution, which as we understand it consists not only in the establishment of a non-authoritarian society which will deal with the material and spiritual needs of mankind, but in the breaking down of authoritarian society which we maintain, rightly or wrongly, exists to serve a privileged minority at the expense of the majority.

Our observations lead us to confirm what other anarchists, in the not so distant past, such as Malatesta, whose perspicacity, objectivity and militancy we deeply respect and profit from, themselves observed and took into account, that (to quote from our July 13 Editorial):

However distant may be the anarchist revolution, the fact is that throughout the world revolutionary situations exist now and will arise next year and the year after for which people will have to seek solutions and we contended that unless we anarchists were prepared to "fold our arms and say that we are only interested in the anarchist revolution . . . then indeed we accept the role of saints and permanent protesters".

In spite of the fact that we go on to suggest that we should "seek to influence the world as it is now in an anarchist direction", [our italics], Francis Ellingham declares that our observation "implied" that anarchists "should join forces with any violent revolutionaries anywhere who try to overthrow established governments" which of course leads him to the logical conclusion that anarchists advocate support for the Lenins, Hitlers and Castros, for "anything to get rid of the present regime, etc. . . ." The fact that the anarchists were active in the revolutionary movements in these three countries and were also among the first victims of the dictators means nothing to Ellingham who it seems to us would be a redoubtable opponent in one of those Medieval Disputations but who is just not of this world when it comes to discussing the social, economic—and



hungry, for a month after she lost her lodgings. She has now been offered a job and the possibility of accommodation. Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy has received 1,000 bibs, bonnets, bottles and sweaters from well-wishers. . . .

A MISSISSIPPI NEWSPAPER announced the arrest of Byron De La Beckwith for the murder of NAACP leader Medgar Evers as "Californian is charged with murder of Evers". 67 people were arrested in New York for lying down in protest against the discriminatory practices of city building firms and labour unions in city construction jobs. There have been sit-downs in City Hall and the State Governor's office. *Common Sense* (USA) reprints from Centreville, Alabama press, "The Negro today is the best treated human being in the United States. He is the only person that can live without working. He can have 40 illegitimate children and get by with it. He can have 10 common law wives and nobody seems to care. He can get on the welfare programme when good, honest, hard-working white people are unable to qualify. The government makes the rules for the welfare department, and just about every negro can qualify. The federal government will set him up in a housing project, where he can live in a brick building with steam heat, pay very little rent and go to the mail box once a month and get

SELLERS WANTED FOR FREEDOM & ANARCHY, HYDE PARK, SUNDAYS?

political—facts of life. After all does he not conclude by advising us to read the works of Tolstoy who "exploded all your arguments"—that is of pretty well all our anarchist thinkers from Bakunin to Malatesta whose arguments this writer does no more than repeat in contemporary terms—"seventy years ago"? And the long extract from Tolstoy he quotes, and to which we refer reders, convinces us that Tolstoy, like Ellingham, was not "with us", at least with those who have to work for a wage to keep alive, and who cannot see any escape from such a situation other than death. The climax of this Tolstoyan abstraction is contained in the last sentence: "All that is necessary is a change in public opinion". Comrade readers and fellow anarchists, it's as simple as that!

★

WHAT have the anarchists in every corner of the globe—what has FREEDOM these past 77 years—been doing if not trying to change public opinion in an anarchist direction? But the question of violence arises at the very stage where "public opinion" knows what it wants and Authority resists its demands. Indeed, it occurs more often than not long before such a situation is reached with government seeking to halt public opinion, by intimidation, by making an example of ring-leaders (think of the Wethersfield "six", or the police action last month in connection with the Greek Royal tour as examples nearer home), by lock-outs in the industrial field. If and when these tactics prove useless either the army is called out, or, as in Spain, the army decides to take over from the legal government. When those situations arise either the people capitulate or they resist. And they will resist using those methods which they consider most effective. If by so-called non-violent tactics they can achieve their ends so much the better. If the government uses the army, and the people can defeat it only by having recourse to force, then this writer, for one, advocates the use of violence against those who seek by violence to maintain the status quo against the wishes of the people. If they cannot, then we

his welfare cheque. Who's being mistreated?" The jobless rate among coloured workers, states *Newsweek* is double that for whites but also their pay is lower when working. Players cigarettes have withdrawn a sign in New Guinea on public relations grounds that says: "Discriminating smokers smoke Players". . . .

COMMITTEE OF 100 members have been refused permission to enter Greece to commemorate Hiroshima Day (August 6th). Fifty members of the Irish Political Prisoners Release Committee picketed the Home Office and the Northern Ireland Government office for six hours, calling for the release of the ten remaining political prisoners in Belfast gaol. 41 were arrested when students demonstrated outside the Iraqi Embassy in Kensington against "atrocities by the government of Iraq". The Christian group of the Committee of 100 fasted outside Lambeth Palace to protest against the refusal of the Archbishop of Canterbury to meet them for discussions about a Christian lead against all weapons of mass-destruction. Protestors sat down outside a chicken-farm to protest against battery chicken production. French farmers stopped motorists and presented them with wine, fruit, eggs and leaflets to explain their price war with the government. 11,000 miners have gone on strike in North-Western Spain. Ten students are planning to picket the major bull-fighting areas in Spain in a campaign against bull-fighting. The behaviour of a CND man at Bromley Conservative fete was said not to be insulting. He had a banner which the stewards seized which said: "We do not care who you sleep with, but stop preparing for mass murder." Dr. Stephen Ward plans, if at liberty, a lecture tour of America on the subject "Britain Today, her morals and her Politics". . . .

A CHEETAH reported seen in Shooters Hill, London, vanished. Army bomb-disposal squads failed to solve the riddle of saucer-shaped depressions. Giant rabbits with Roman noses and ginger and black streaks through their fur have been discovered in Australia which are "savagely destructive" and immune to myxomatosis. They can stand up on their hind legs and reach up more than two feet to snap small limbs off trees. JON QUIXOTE.

must recognise the fact and rescue any potential victims from political reprisals and at the same time seek to secure what material and political concessions we can from the authorities by reason of our power as producers.

As this writer sees it, anarchist violence has never been a means to an end—that is if one assumes the ends to be anarchism. The anarchists who sought by assassination to rid their countries of the tyrant disonido T H countries of the tyrant did so not because they imagined this would lead to anarchy, but because they hated tyrants. Francis Ellingham and others are entitled to place the violence of the tyrant and his would-be assassin, on a par. This writer is equally entitled to dismiss such a judgment as philosophical nonsense. When the Spanish workers sought to defeat the attempted military *coup d'etat* in 1936, they were all united in wanting to defeat the military but for different reasons. The anarchists hoped to destroy the State machine and bring about where possible the libertarian communist revolution; the socialists hoped to bring in a socialist government that would introduce socialist measures; the POUmists thought of revolution in the Marxist sense, the Catalan autonomists dreamed of an independent Catalonia, the Basque nationalists of their autonomy and so on. It was clear from the start that even if Franco were defeated, the people of Spain would be faced with a whole series of new problems. All but the anarchists would be prepared to impose their solutions by force—with or without the veneer of legality. All the anarchists felt morally entitled to do was to defend their way of life against the would-be new rulers who might attempt to impose a uniform pattern throughout the country. Francis Ellingham and others are entitled to say that both the violence of the anarchists and of the others is on a par. We are equally entitled to distinguish between violence which is defensive and libertarian and that which is aggressive and authoritarian.

This writer does not expect his critics to agree with his position, but have we expressed it sufficiently clearly to expect them not to deform it in debate in the future?—EDITORS.

