

FREEDOM

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY -4d.

NOVEMBER 30 1963 Vol 24 No 38

'Political institutions ought to have shown signs of withering away by now. My social feelings are the same as they have always been. I disbelieve profoundly in power and violence.'

BENJAMIN BRITTEN.

Is the Oswald Case Clinched?

BIRD—THE LEGEND

Does it really Matter?

ANYONE who believes what the papers and the priests and the politicians say might think that the assassination of President Kennedy on November 22nd was a major event in the history of the United States, of the West, of all mankind even. The papers and the priests and the politicians have repeated the stale platitudes we hear whenever a famous man dies (just wait until Churchill's long and wicked life ends at last), and some have excelled themselves. From what we have been told during the last week, Kennedy was a world saviour and his death is a world disaster.

Fortunately for our sanity, there have been some good moments in all this nonsense. There was *Pravda* calling Kennedy "an outstanding statesman", and Khrushchev calling his death "a heavy blow to all who want peace." There was the Archbishop of Canterbury calling him "a man of Christian ideals."

calling his death "a loss for all the Christian world of the West" (hear that, Jesus?). There was John Masefield, the Poet Laureate, at his worst—or best—in the *Times*. And there was the poor old *Daily Worker* getting its wires crossed: "President Kennedy's assassination is the result of the vicious hate campaign worked up by the US racist barbarians. In this atmosphere which was also poisoned by the US nuclear maniacs, the assassin's blow was delivered in the traditional cowardly way of US reaction" (hear that, Czolgosz and Zangara, you cowardly reactionaries!).

Now FREEDOM is written by and for people who don't believe what the papers and the priests and the politicians say. We didn't think Kennedy was a major figure, and we don't think his death is a major disaster. Of course there was a tragedy—for his friends and family,

for those who liked or loved him—but this is the human tragedy that recurs when the least of men dies. There is no political tragedy, except the proof that so many people are still slaves to the cult of personality, and still project their emotions on to stars instead of relating them to the real world. Kennedy's death was a "happening", not a real event. As Mr. Macmillan once said about something else, it was all got up by the press. It is only important because so many people make it important, because they prefer fantasy to facts.

Let's look at the facts. Kennedy wasn't a very bad President, but he wasn't a very good one either. About freedom, he talked big and acted small. He was prepared on two occasions to sacrifice our lives to save—that is, to destroy—Cuba, but he wasn't ever prepared to sacrifice his own position to help

downfall of his country, the rest of the world. He talked about free medical care for the aged and civil rights for the Negroes, but after three years the aged are still going without free medical care and the Negroes are still going without civil rights. He made a great noise when the East German Government tried to stop its subjects going to West Berlin, but he made no noise at all when the American State Department tried to stop his own subjects going to Cuba. He sent as much help as he could to the oppressors in southern Vietnam, and as little as he could to the oppressed in the southern States of his own country. He loved to open his mouth about the free world, but he kept it shut about old Joe McCarthy. He was a real phoney. We owe him nothing.

These facts become clearer if we consider a man who died in the same country and on the same day

as Kennedy. Aldous Huxley was a writer who meant what he said. When he believed that something was right, he said so and did it. He decided that it was more important to warn than to amuse, so he began writing serious books. When he believed that something was wrong, he said so and stopped doing it. He decided that it was better to be conquered than to fight, so he became a pacifist. He was a real hero. We owe him much. Two hundred years ago, Henry Fielding said that "greatness consists in bringing all manner of mischief on mankind, and goodness in removing it from them." Huxley, who was a good man, will be remembered when Kennedy, who was a great man, is forgotten.

Perhaps it is easy for us, who were never taken in by Kennedy's life, not to be taken in by his death.

We can't just say we aren't sorry he died that way. In the past, anarchists have assassinated many rulers—such as President Carnot of France, Prime Minister Canovas of Spain, Empress Elizabeth of Austria, King Umberto of Italy, and President McKinley of the United States—and, though most anarchists have always condemned the technique of terrorism, few have ever

condemned an individual terrorist. We think that anyone who tries to rise above his fellow men deserves to be pulled down again, and we know that rulers have been responsible for more violence than all the assassins there ever were.

Today we see assassination as a crude and clumsy way of removing a ruler who isn't actually a dictator—as Castro said, "we shouldn't consider this method a correct form of battle." It is different for dictators. When David Pratt tried to assassinate Dr. Verwoerd, we said it was "too bad he missed" and we expressed the hope that no dictator would sleep in peace. We don't welcome Kennedy's death as we would have welcomed—and would still welcome—Verwoerd's. He wasn't a bad ruler, as rulers go, and he certainly wasn't a dictator. He was just a figurehead like Khrushchev, with a lot less power than he and everyone else thought

and a little more prestige than he had. It was his pretension that made him so unbearable. But his assassination seems rather irrelevant.

Not quite irrelevant, though. We can't help drawing some sort of lesson from the sudden downfall of one of our enemies. We can't help noticing how all the king's horses and all the king's men couldn't put Humpty together again. The re-

sources of modern science and security couldn't save Kennedy from his assassin nor he from Kennedy's "avenger". The bombs and bullets our rulers threaten us with threaten them too. They're only human, just like us. They're only there because we all put them there and keep them there. If we really wanted to, we could take away all their lives. But there's no need to do that—we could take away all their power, if we really wanted to.

If assassination is a crude and clumsy way of removing rulers, we must work out a better way. If we don't consider it a correct form of battle, we must use the correct form. Until then, we can't condemn someone who goes out and does what we just talk about. We shouldn't cry for Kennedy or crow over him. We should consider why Johnson is there in his place. Adenauer to Erhard, Macmillan to Home, Kennedy to Johnson—will it never end? People will go on believing what the papers and the priests and the politicians say until they are persuaded to believe the truth. Who shall persuade them? Next year there will be a general election in this

country. Will the millions and vote new rulers. What, short of assassination, are we going to do to stop this happening next year and in the years to come? How do we propose to get rid of rulers? The assassination of President Kennedy doesn't really matter, unless it becomes an excuse for more McCarthyism. What does matter is the survival of all the other rulers of the world. N.W.

WHO KILLED KENNEDY?

LAST Friday Mr. Kennedy was struck down by an assassin's gun. As well as being President of the United States he was a husband and a father of two children. The world is moved by their tragedy, as if it were their own. Two days later 24-year-old Lee Oswald charged with the assassination, is struck down by a bullet fired at point-blank range by a worthy citizen of Dallas. As well as being a warehouseman he too was a husband and a father of two children. Nobody apparently, has a tear for them in their tragedy. Indeed, the shooting of Lee Oswald was welcomed in Dallas with "cheers" from the crowd. Someone shouted—according to the *Herald's* on the spot reporter—of Lee Oswald's assassin, "They ought to give the guy a medal". These may well be understandable reactions, but we should not be afraid to recognise that they are also the unhealthy, impulsive reactions of brain-washed, unbalanced people who have been deprived of the powers to think for themselves, victims of the daily onslaught on their faculties by mass-media.

(We suggest that those who would take us to task reserve their attacks until three months have passed, when we will scour the Press and report what is left of the Kennedy super-image. If they cannot wait so long, then perhaps they can tell us what, according to the Press,

Macmillan and Gaitskell had that Sir Alec and Mr. Wilson haven't already!

OUR guess is that Lee Oswald will be on the public conscience for a much longer time than the late President Kennedy. For whereas the office of President of the United States has always carried with it the occupational hazard of assassination, which all candidates accept (and, judging by the role they play, their wives, too) the ordinary citizen, without pretensions of changing the course of history, or of having the power to press a button which could result in the annihilation of mankind, or the powers to uproot millions of people from their daily lives, imagines that his way of life is guaranteed by the Law, the Constitution, and by those who administer it.

The assassination of Kennedy will very shortly be a date and an entry in all American school history books, immortality which he will be obliged to share for ever with his assassin, and which can only be guaranteed so long as more presidents suffer the same fate in the future. The circumstances of Lee Oswald's assassination will not only be a burning topic for some time to come, but may well be debated and quoted, by future generations, just as Americans are still discussing the Sacco and Vanzetti case but have long forgotten President Cool-

idge and his entourage. Even more important than discussion of the "case" is the discovery by future generations that ordinary, unpretentious and unambitious citizens could in adversity rise to heights of nobility and greatness which inevitably eludes those whose personal significance depends on the office of power, which they occupy.

Within an hour of President Kennedy's death, a new president was being sworn in; within a day we saw photographs in the press showing the late president's favourite armchair being moved out from the White House with his other effects in order to make way for his successor. Thousands of people whose jobs stem from the President's office are expected to, and will, switch their allegiance from one "great man" to another. When Sacco and Vanzetti died in the electric chair, they were aware that the jolt that destroyed life for two men "of no public consequence" could not also destroy the ideas of which they had been the living symbol during those seven years of incarceration.

LEE OSWALD was not given the opportunity to reveal what he was capable of. He was prevented from even attempting to defend himself against the charges in open court because a citizen of Dallas took it upon himself to be both judge and executioner. All we

Continued on page 3

FREEDOM & ANARCHY

PRICE 'ADJUSTMENTS'

With the publication of the December issue of ANARCHY that journal will have completed the first three years of what we hope will be a long and fruitful "life". FREEDOM will complete its thirteenth year as a weekly. Both publications are produced on a very tight budget—as readers who follow our financial statements must be aware. The effect of this is to leave us no margin to expand our activities. Furthermore, in the past three years production costs have been increasing: paper and typesetting costs have risen, printing costs are up, binding charges are going up again next January and some postages have increased by a third. We therefore expect to find that our estimated production costs and postages of £70 a week will not in fact cover the real costs when we come to close our books at the end of the year. Reluctantly therefore we have to announce some changes in the prices of our publications and the subscription rates for the coming

year. Unexpired subscriptions will of course be honoured at the old rates.

The price of ANARCHY will be increased to 2/- (U.S. 30c.) and the annual subscription to 25/- (U.S. \$3.50) post free. Air Mail Subscription 47/- (U.S. \$7).

The price of FREEDOM will remain unchanged at 4d. and the annual subscription stays at 20/- (U.S. \$3). Air Mail subscription 45/- (U.S. \$7).

The combined annual subscription to FREEDOM & ANARCHY goes up to 40/- (U.S. \$6).

A number of readers have still not yet renewed their subscriptions for 1963. They will greatly assist us and avoid possible confusion and misunderstandings if they post their renewals (at the old rate of course!) without further delay. Apart from administrative considerations, we badly need the money to meet our commitments for this year.

Radical Action needed by Busmen

The ban on overtime and rest day working by bus crews in London and the Home Counties, has fully illustrated the need for the London Transport Board to attract more staff. This type of action has shown just how much the L.T.B. rely on the busmen's willingness to work overtime even to provide the already inadequate service that passengers have had in past years.

Busmen have laid the blame on the L.T.B., where it truly belongs. If they are to continue to get low wages, then this job will never attract enough staff for even though men and women do take jobs, they do not stay very long and leave at the first opportunity. Pay and conditions are the reasons, and with the present state of congestion on the London roads, who can blame anyone for thinking twice before taking a job on the buses.

This week, the Government has appointed a committee of inquiry to look into the pay and conditions of busmen. Although Government spokesmen deny that this step has been taken as a result of the unofficial ban, it is obvious that it has. For some years now, busmen have asked for an inquiry to be set up, but it has needed the present prolonged ban to bring this about. If the Government thought, that by appointing this board of inquiry the bus crews would discontinue the unofficial ban, they were wrong. The busmen will continue their "no-overtime" working.

Mr. Ray Gunter, a Labour Member of Parliament, also thought that this would get the men back to "normal working". This to me is a very strange term in the circumstances, when what the men were previously working, were long hours of overtime. He said, "I am sure the House will welcome the step". The London busmen will respond, even though they have suffered injustices for far too long, in the hope that justice is going to be done at long last.

Busmen, who "have suffered injustices for far too long" are not being bought

off by the promise of this inquiry. Sam Henderson, National Secretary of the Transport & General Workers' Union bus group, has welcomed the Government's move. He has said "It opens up an avenue which may bring about the desired results for London Busmen." The busmen say that they want an "interim settlement" and a delegate conference has instructed their national secretary to see Government Ministers.

The Government Inquiry will also consider the problem of traffic congestion and it will be some time before it makes its final report. The busmen are fully justified in continuing their ban and demanding an "interim settlement" in the meantime.

To back the demand, and to put further pressure on the Transport Board and the Government, Dalston Garage have voted in favour of a "work-to-rule" to take effect from 2nd December. Delegates from 27 central garages attended the meeting at which Bill Jones, Chairman of Dalston Branch of the T.G.W.U., proposed the work-to-rule. Already one garage, at Garston, has followed this lead, deciding to bring it into effect from this week-end. At Garston, they are about 50 men understaffed.

If the work-to-rule is taken up by the busmen at other garages, it will bring further delays in services and longer queues during rush-hours, due to the fact that the running time on route would be increased by as much as 20%. The rules are open to very wide interpretation and great emphasis and concise adherence can bring about further delays to reinforce their demands.

There are some rules which are the obvious ones to enforce, such as Rule 80, which states that conductors must make sure that passengers are safely on off the bus before ringing the bell. Rule 77 says that before a bus can move from a compulsory stop, the conductor

must "ring off the bus", not from any part of the bus but only from the platform. Another rule, which could cause some difference of opinion between bus crews and the L.T.B., is that which says buses should keep to their scheduled intervals. Busmen say that this will mean that buses will crawl one behind the other if there has been a traffic hold-up. Another section of the same rule says that following buses should overtake if the bus in front is delayed.

The work-to-rule can be very effective method of action against the L.T.B. If carried out, and this seems likely, it will increase the loss of revenue, which at the moment, due to the overtime ban, is about £38,000 per week. All of this is going to affect the public but the busmen's demand for higher wages and improved conditions will eventually lead to improved services as more and more men and women are recruited. However I suspect that most users of buses only take a short term view of things and are unsympathetic to the present tactics of the busmen, which are causing them inconvenience.

Ideally the passengers should fully support the busmen. As this is not the case, their support could be won and the L.T.B. and the Government be forced to meet demands, if the crews took out their buses, but the conductors refused to take any fares. No doubt the L.T.B. could prosecute over this, but if all the crews worked on this basis, the Board would have its work cut out if it tried to prosecute every conductor. The Board could retaliate by refusing to let the buses leave the garage. However, that would lead to a situation, where the Board would be withdrawing or withholding a service, that, under their constitution, they are bound to provide.

United action of this sort by all busmen, in London and in the provinces, both of whom are demanding an increase in wages and cut in hours, would soon lead to the desired settlement.

P.T.

WHO'S TO DO

SEVERAL items of news and controversy during the past fortnight have emphasised that the role of planning in society is one of the most important questions of the day.

It is relevant and in a way satisfying, from a libertarian point of view that on this question the political parties have no real differences at all. The economic correspondent of *The Observer*, Samuel Brittain headed his article "Tweedledum and Tweedledee", two characters who have figured in many anarchist propaganda articles and leaflets.

One of the issues which the conventional press has found difficult to comment on has been the speech by Mr. Joseph, the Housing Minister, in which he announced the possibility that a Conservative government would order the compulsory purchase of land likely to rise in value as a result of urban developments.

Another topic which is likely to acquire increasing importance at election time, but about which the real differences between the parties are negligible, is the nationalisation of the steel industry. In a series of three articles in *The Guardian* Mr. Charles de Payer advocated that it should be nationalised, to which the editorial comment, very sensibly, included the remark that "the ownership of the steel industry is not of the first importance. What matters is its control and management."

At the same time the developments of the plans for science put forward in Mr. Wilson's speech at the Labour Party conference, and the report of the Trend Committee are still being discussed, and it is being assumed all round that there is a great potential of scientific ability in the country which is not being realised because of lack of planning.

However, there is very little evidence that anyone is trying to get to grips with the real social problem, which is who should have the power to put their plans into action, and what should be the general aims to which they should work.

The questions raised here will be discussed more fully in a subsequent issue of FREEDOM. P.H.

BIRD

THE LEGEND

"BIRD". The Legend of Charlie Parker, by R. G. Reisner. (MacGibbon & Kee, 30s.)

This is a fine book. It gives a picture of a great musician and of an era. It describes the birth of a new music in the words of the men who made it and tells the story of one of Jazz's greatest sons. Who came first Parker or Bop? This book says Parker, and it may be right.

It is the story of a genius, an unhappy genius. Apart from the first chapter by R. G. Reisner, it is told by Parker's friends. He appeared not to have any enemies, apart from himself of course. The author probably collected the material by going round to musicians with a tape recorder. Parker was idolized by the people who tell his story, and without exception they forgive him for letting them down on dates, borrowing money and never paying it back, walking out in the middle of a performance, bawling them out, and so on.

Bop for me is not simpatico. It is very introverted. The musician appears to be playing for himself and himself alone. This is especially so with Parker. His playing, though brilliant, is very neurotic; full of very fast twisted sounding runs. He plays the blues beautifully though. Parker's Mood is one of the best records I have heard of a blues.

While reading this book I couldn't help thinking of Sidney Bechet, the high priest of another kind of Jazz. His playing is the very opposite of Parker's; extrovert in the extreme. His life was the opposite of Parker's too. Both were coloured, both played the saxophone. One man became almost a national hero in the country where he lived. When Bechet died, the French named streets after him and set up a statue. Parker has never had such honours and those who are against society, those with a chip on their shoulder.

Parker was "born under a bad star". He never really had a chance (though Louis Armstrong learned cornet in a waifs' home). His father was killed in a knife fight when he was quite young.

He got himself hooked on heroin when he was only fifteen. When he first started to play in the new way people thought he was too wild, or nuts. He was also a victim of Jim Crow of course. There is a tale in the book of how he left a concert where he had been cheered, then he went into a bar and the bartender said: "What do you want nigger?" This sort of thing isn't easy to live with. He got to a position where he was worshipped as a God by musicians. But he never made it with the public. The story of Parker's life is a sad one, full of heroin, whisky and unreliability, but it has its light moments too. Teddy Charles tells of a conversation in a hotel room, when he says "Bird was on a metaphysical kick". Charlie on certain occasions could talk up a storm, but he was a bit tedious this time. "I always sit facing East," he said, "I get my inspiration from Mecca". "I always sit facing East". The person he was talking to chimed in: "Stop bullshitting us Bird. You're facing South West."

Bird was hopeless to get along with in many ways. One person in the book tells how a musician who was standing in the spotlight as he finished his solo, pointed into the darkness. "The greatest thing in Jazz, Charlie Parker", he cried. The spotlight moved over to find Bird slumped in his chair, asleep. Parker would take on an engagement and then when he got there, refuse to play, pick a fight with the management, then walk out, taking the band with him, leaving his fans waiting in vain. If someone asked him to play a blues, he would turn to the piano player. "White Christmas", he would say. From reading this book, one would say that Parker had, not a chip on his shoulder, but a beam. He was, at the same time, however, in some ways, a nice bloke. He would help other musicians, especially the young ones. When he had money he would treat everyone, until he was broke. One of his friends said that if he earned \$1,000 a week, he would spend it all in a day.

Charlie Parker could have been the greatest thing that ever stood on two legs, and he certainly is an inspiration to musicians, but he couldn't survive in our unjust society. He killed himself, sure as Billie Holiday killed herself. His sidemen went on to become world famous and to enjoy their success. Dizzie Gillespie and Miles Davis are two examples. Bird, too, became world famous but he is dead.

JACK STEVENSON.

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

Prostitutes and their Parasites J.-G. Mancini 18/-
The Reichstag Fire F. Tobias 45/-
Weymouth Sands J. C. Powys 25/-
The Making of the English Working Class Edward Thompson 73/6

REPRINTS

Political Economy: a Marxist Textbook John Eaton 21/-

SECOND-HAND

The Devil's Pool George Sand 4/-; Word from Nowhere Fred E. Beal 4/-; Shadow of the Gallows Justin Atholl 6/-; Selected Works, Vol. 2 only: Childhood, Mother, The Artamonovs Maxim Gorky 3/6; Made for Millions (ed.) Frederick Laws 4/-; The Many and the Few Paul Bloomfield 3/6; Why England Slept (1940) John F. Kennedy 6/-; Poems Newly Selected Siegfried Sasson 3/6; The Professor Rex Warner 3/-; At Grips With War Guy Aldred 3/-; Six Weeks in Russia in 1919 Arthur Ransome 5/-; A History of English Socialism George Benson 4/-; Leaves of Grass Walt Whitman 3/-; Human Nature in Politics Graham Wallas 4/-; Liberty! Lucien Allina 3/-; Head-Hunters Alfred C. Haddon 2/6; Selected Works of Voltaire 2/6; Huckleberry Finn Mark Twain 2/6; The U.S.S.R. Our Ally (1941) D. N. Pritt 2/6; An Unsoucial Socialist G. B. Shaw 3/-; The Science of Wealth J. A. Hobson 3/-; Heroes and Hero-Worship Thomas Carlyle 2/6; The Crown of Wild Olive John Ruskin 2/6.

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

Better Labour?

DEAR EDITORS,

Anarchist suggestions concerning the boycotting of elections or the spoiling of ballot papers, while constituting a fine, if somewhat *mouton enragé* gesture against the "democratic" system, are fraught with dangers. Firstly, if spoiling the ballot papers is designed as a show of numbers, it may in the event demonstrate only weakness, and members of the non-anarchist public are regrettably inclined to judge movements by numbers rather than intentions. It would do the cause no service to expose it to ridicule.

Secondly, and more importantly, I would remind comrades that anarchist abstentions in Spain put in the government of Gil Robles and I for one would rather vote Labour (and I am under no illusions about the Labour Party) than by abstention help return a Conservative Government. Scottish and Welsh nationalists would, of course, be far more worthy of support, but I fear that they do not contest English seats.

I do not think that voting compromises one's anarchism as long as one does not lose sight of one's anarchist aims. After all, whether we like it or not, we are going to live under a government for some time to come, and the thought that it should be a Tory one appalls me far more than the thought of losing a sort of extra-political virginity by voting at all.

Agreed rather no government at all, but surely any government rather than a Tory one?

Oxford, Nov. 13 DAVID ROSE.

Student Conference

DEAR COMRADES,

As we stated in *Anarchist Youth* 3, we are organising a conference to discuss the formation of a federation of anarchist students. The conference will be held on Sunday, December 8, from 11 a.m. onwards at 139, Woodstock Road, Oxford. Floor-space available December 7. All anarchist students and observers welcome.

Adrian Cunningham,
Trinity College, Cambridge.
Wynford Hicks,
Christ Church, Oxford.

Surrey, Nov. 24. JOHN THORPE.

FREEDOM

November 30 1963 Vol 24 No 38

IS THE OSWALD CASE CLOSED?

Continued from page 1

know is that before he appeared in front of a magistrate Lee Oswald had been questioned for ten hours and had "stolidly maintained his innocence". And after being charged he was subjected to "intensive interrogation at Dallas police headquarters by F.B.I. detectives and White House security officers and continued to deny his guilt. And according to the *Sunday Telegraph's* correspondent in Dallas

So far the only thing to which Oswald has admitted to the police is that he is a "Marxist and pro-Castroite". His interrogators say he is "a cool customer" and "arrogant".

Mr. Jesse Currie, the city's police chief, observed: "Apparently he is proud of being a Communist".

Imagine yourself being questioned by the police for ten hours on suspicion of having assassinated the Queen or the Prime Minister. Could you easily maintain your innocence, or avoid implicating yourself if you were guilty? Lee Oswald was only 24 years old, not a particularly strong character to judge by press biographies, yet he protested his innocence throughout. Had he been intent on killing the President would he have denied his responsibility in the moment of his triumph? Name the political assassin or would-be assassin who has refused to accept the responsibility for his act. And in the case of Lee Oswald with the possibility of justifying his act to the world at large—the Press and the TV cameras were there to record every word he said—what did he say? "and I didn't have legal representation or anything" and "No sir, I did not kill the President".

★

AS we write (Monday) the Dallas police Chief is reported by the BBC as saying that he has all the evidence to prove Lee Oswald's guilt, adding "I have sent men to the electric chair on less evidence".

The circumstantial evidence against Lee Oswald, as presented by the Dallas police, is undoubtedly very strong, and that much stronger now that the defendant is safely out of the way. If we understand the confused "evidence" suspicion fell on Lee Oswald because he was the only person "missing" when the police surrounded and searched the book warehouse from which the fatal shots were fired. According to the *Sunday Telegraph* on-the-spot report

It was nearly an hour later that he was linked with the killing. Even then he was sought as an eye-witness rather than as the assassin.

The same reporter also refers to the way Lee Oswald "got away" from the warehouse after it had been surrounded by the police.

The warehouse manager had explained to an officer who saw Oswald strolling out of a back door that he was employed in the place. Upon that he was allowed to go.

A number of questions come to mind which so far no on-the-spot reports, or police hand-outs, have answered. How long after the fatal shots were fired did the police decide that they came from the warehouse and actually surrounded the premises? Lee Oswald was actually seen by the warehouse manager "strolling out of a back door". If such actions were unusual surely the manager would have told the police who were holding

Oswald? Again to quote the report Police say that the assassin . . . had apparently taken a picnic lunch with him into the hiding place beside the fifth-floor window of the storeroom.

Does this not suggest that the assassin had taken up his position by the window some time before the shooting? For it can hardly be suggested, even by the police, that he had his lunch after the shooting!

Yet the same report quotes a Detective Edward Hicks as saying that

a man who was working with Oswald about the time of the President's procession of cars was going by said to Oswald, "Let's go see the President."

"No, you go down and send the elevator back up," Oswald was said to have replied.

Soon after came the shots.

The report does not tell us what is vital to the case, viz: where were Oswald and this man working "about the time, etc . . ." And where were they when they parted and how soon after did the fatal shots come? Now Mr. Currie, the Dallas police chief, does say according to the *S.T.* "Oswald had been on the floor at the fifth-floor window in the book warehouse from which the fatal shots were fired . . ."

in the building when he was employed at the time of the assassination." This could obviously be said of other employees at the warehouse. It is curious that the police checked up with Oswald's wife and ascertained that he possessed a rifle similar to the one used by the assassin but did not bother to check up with her whether she had given him a picnic lunch and if so taken down a description of it. Whilst it would have proved nothing one way or the other it would have given some relevance to the press report about the "picnic lunch" and if it were not his, would at least indicate that someone else besides Oswald could have been near the window.

The *Sunday Telegraph* report also states that

the police believe that the assassin intended to kill the vice-president as well as Mr. Kennedy. It is thought that the bullet meant for Mr. Lyndon Johnson whose car was behind the President's ricocheted off a man-hole cover.

But the same report points out that Oswald had some time previously written to Mr. Connally, then Navy Secretary, but now Governor of Texas (and who was in Mr. Kennedy's car and was hit by a bullet and seriously injured) "pleading that he had been unjustly discharged from the Navy" and asking for a review of his case but received no satisfaction, and states that

according to Dallas police this may well have been a motive in yesterday's crime. In other words he had a grudge against Mr. Connally rather than the President.

★

IF one assumes Oswald to have been sound of mind, which we do, then we must also assume that to have done what he did he had a reasonable motive. Indeed we would put it stronger and say a "burning" motive. According to the Press reports here which after all stem from official and police sources on the spot, and are, if anything biased against Oswald rather than in his favour, there seem to be none. Because of a hard childhood, which Mr. Kennedy did not experience and which his bereaved

family will not suffer (we understand that the late President left £4,000,000) Oswald who was "an intelligent boy" and "something of a bookworm" was unable to complete his secondary education, let alone go to university, joined the Marine Corps from which he was dishonourably discharged in 1958 "for reasons which are not yet clear". Soon afterwards he went to Russia where he unsuccessfully applied for citizenship. By 1962 all the workers' fatherland had given him was a wife and a babe and political deceptions. He succeeded in getting back to the United States with his family where he soon realised that he had jumped out of the fire right back into the frying pan. No wonder his "interest in Cuba seems to have been somewhat ambivalent"! And this is, if one is looking for motivation, important for it is on the issue of Cuba that Kennedy took up, and maintained a particularly reactionary stand. The anti-Castro "underground" (?) leader in New Orleans, Carlos Bringuier has stated that earlier this year Oswald offered to train a group of guerrillas for operations against the Castro regime and that some time later he was seen distributing pro-Castro leaflets and campaigning for the "Fair Play for Cuba" organisation. The president of the latter "has hastily denied that Oswald was ever a registered member".

In spite of so much alleged political activity, and confirmation by police sources that all known "subversives" and other potential "trouble makers" had been thoroughly checked during the rigorous security precautions taken by the police before the President's visit, and this must have included visiting premises along the route, Lee Oswald eluded screening. Was it a slip up on the part of the authorities, or simply that the man who was in fact no such thing but is the useful political scapegoat for powerful anti-Kennedy right-wing elements in Texas and, who knows, possibly the Dallas police as well, who we are sure know more about who the assassin was than it would be expedient for them to say in Election year.

THE circumstantial evidence against Lee Oswald is strong but the "motives" for killing the President slender. On the other hand the circumstantial evidence to link the Dallas police chiefs with the Attentat are also very strong. The haste with which the homicide chief of the Dallas police publicly announced that the case against Oswald "is clinched. This man killed President Kennedy", is obviously filling many Americans with grave suspicions rather than reassurance. And the ease with which a member of the public was able to shoot Oswald at point blank range though he was between two detectives as well as "protected" by a hundred more; far from calling for a check up on Dallas police's security measures, surely suggests that for reasons of their own the police wanted to have a dead Oswald on their hands.

And from the point of view of motives there were many in Dallas Texas, who hated Kennedy's guts and considered him a "nigger-lover" and a "red".

For the Dallas police the Oswald file is closed; they have tied up the case in every detail and are ready to deal with the doubters. Yet our feeling somehow is that the "Oswald case" is only about to begin.

ERRATUM - LAST WEEK

Two line transpositions in the first paragraph of the first column on page 3 may have made the meaning difficult for some readers. The sentence should have read:

But with the Home Secretary's increased responsibilities, the powers—or to be more exact—the responsibilities since they have no executive powers, of the Inspectors of Constabulary are also that much greater. Who are these seven £5,000 a year) officers who according to the *Guardian*, . . .

A TRAPALGAR SQUARE meeting decided not to form a Trade Union for Prisoners but to join with the Prison Reform Council. Pat Arrowsmith announced that when she next goes to Holloway she will help to form a union, she said, "I came here to form a union—not to talk about reform." The Home Office had previously announced, "The principles of trade unionism could not operate within the present framework of prison rules". . . .

MR. HENRY BROOKE rejected the idea that George Madden was in 'solitary confinement' in Parkhurst since he was able to watch television for an hour and a half six days a week, and exercised with another prisoner. Robert Stroud died at the age of 73 in Springfield Federal Prison hospital in Missouri. He was 18 when he killed a man for beating a girl; he was sentenced to 12 years for manslaughter in 1909. In 1916 he stabbed and killed a brutal warden at Leavenworth. He was sentenced to death but the sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. He served 43 years in 'solitary'. During his exercise he found three fledgling sparrows, these he smuggled in and reared in his cell. He was allowed to keep many birds for which he built cages. One day his birds fell ill, and he studied and investigated the cause of the disease and became such an authority on bird diseases that he wrote and had published a standard work on the subject. In 1946 he helped to quell a mutiny at Alcatraz, in January of this year 100,000 signatures were received pleading for his release. In April last year Mr. Robert Kennedy turned down his petition for a Presidential pardon. He died from "natural causes and the infirmities of old age". . . .

THE GREEK government released fifteen prisoners and promised the release on parole of almost all the 979 prisoners from the civil war—including Tony Ambatielos, subject to the government getting a Parliamentary majority. For this a general election may be again necessary. The Appeal for an Amnesty in Spain received a copy of a letter from prison sent by sixteen Spanish political prisoners in Burgos to the Minister of Information and Tourism. They were sentenced to 42 days' solitary confinement with bread and water diet as a punishment for sending the letter, in it they say "on the basis of testimony extorted by the police without the possibility of civilian defence or security of evidence, people are condemned to imprisonment for a number of years, unheard of in any civilized country, with the death sentence still being imposed in political trials". Tortures had been inflicted on the signatories who are serving from six to thirty years. They include lawyers, physicians, painters, a sculptor, a journalist, a writer an engineer, a musician, a translator a designer and one who simply describes himself as 'a syndicalist'. . . .

THE WAR Resisters International (88 Park Avenue Enfield, Middlesex) supplies a list of names and addresses of war resisters who will be in prison on December 1st, and to whom greetings may be sent. There are about 200 French prisoners, three Dutch, five Americans, three English, seven Jugo-Slavians (serving between six and nine years), there are listed two Italian Jehovah's Witnesses and there are others of this sect in other countries who are not listed. The French Government Bill to recognise objectors has again been rejected by the Senate. This is the bill that Louis Lecom fasted to support. In Italy a priest and a journalist were sentenced to eight and six months' imprisonment for defending desertion and military disobedience by criticizing the sentence passed on a conscientious objector by a military tribunal. Groups of Italians were arrested for distributing leaflets drawing attention to the problem of conscientious objection. . . .

A GROUP of 23 walkers taking part in a march from Canada to Cuba organised by the U.S. Committee for Non-Violent Action were stopped by police in Griffin, Georgia. They sat down, and police used electric cattle-prodders on men and women, burning some of them. They were taken to the police-station and eventually released and allowed to distribute their leaflets. . . .

ACCORDING TO *The Guardian*, workers in the Central Ukrainian town of Krivoi-rog staged a sit-down strike in protest against a bread shortage and in support of wage increases to cover rising food prices. Rumania, unlike the rest of the Soviet-bloc countries which abstained, voted in favour of proclaiming Latin America a nuclear free zone. Eight



British communists expelled from the party for 'breaches of rules' are going ahead with a consistent campaign to defeat revisionism and for Communist unity. They protest that "the Communist Party of China has been publicly maligned by men who call themselves Communists. These so-called communists, its leaders, and their followers have broken with Marxism-Leninism and abandoned the cause of the working-class. Nationally and internationally, they go on, "they are collaborating with the class-enemy. They must be exposed. The working class and the people as a whole must be given the facts so that they may judge the true character of these men." The Communist Party of Great Britain called for the nationalization of the pharmaceutical trade as a prelude to the take-over of the chemical industry as a whole. . . .

SIR KEITH JOSEPH appeared to say that he was in favour of land nationalization in certain circumstances which impelled Mr. George Brown to comment "we're all nationalists now." However, the *Express* assures us he is not out to stop all profit-making on land but in major development areas the land will be "bought well in advance by a public authority . . . it will then be disposed of to private enterprise or to public enterprise as required."

ON OCTOBER 24th, Adlai Stevenson made a UN Day speech at Dallas, Texas. He was jeered and upon being struck with a 'Down with UN' placard as he entered the hall. Dallas, the home town of General Walker and L. J. Hunt, the reactionary oil millionaire, apologised for the 'storm-trooper actions'. Madame Ng Dinh Nu said of this attack Texans are "fed up with persons who are soft on Communism". The Secretary of the Senate majority, Mr. Bobby Baker is being investigated by the Senate, Lyndon Johnson, is considered his sponsor but nevertheless the Presidential Texan trip was taken to 'shed his glory on his worried running-mate' according to Alistair Cooke in Friday's *Guardian*. On Friday the *Express* ran a half-page with pictures by Karsh headlined "The man who's gunning for Kennedy"—the pictures were of 'crack-shot' Barry Goldwater in cowboy rig with a rifle. Anonymous phone calls received by Southern newspapers were on the lines of "So they got the nigger lover—good for whoever did it." A young man in Birmingham, Alabama managed to get a telephoned message on the radio: "I feel sure, and I am sure, that the majority of the people in Alabama feel that Mr. Kennedy got exactly what he deserved. I am sorry for his family. But I want to say that any man, any white man, who did what he did for niggers should be shot." The *Evening Standard* 'Londoner's Diary' on Saturday said, "The Queen and Prince Phillip are spending the week-end as planned at the Luton Hoo home of Sir Harold and Lady Zia Wernher—I was told at Luton Hoo. The shoot arranged for today has not been cancelled. It is just a quiet week-end." The 'City Notebook' in the same issue is headed "Business as usual on Monday". . . .

THE WORLD was poorer by the death of one of its keenest intellects who was at the same time a peace-lover. His keen analysis of the dark trends in technological developments have been a salutary warning to two generations. Aldous Huxley died at the age of 69.

SYDNEY LIBERTARIANS announced the Annual Libertarian Cricket-Match at the University No. 2 Oval.

ION QUIXOTE.

Anarchy—Next Week

The next issue of FREEDOM will be dated December 14th. ANARCHY—34 appears next Saturday.

