

FREEDOM

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY -4d.

MARCH 14 1964 Vol 25 No 8

'Liberty for the few is not liberty.
Liberty for me and slavery for you
means slavery for both.'
SAMUEL M. JONES.

Anarchists ? Everywhere

THE LAST INTERVIEW

'OBEDIENCE TO THE LAW
IS LIBERTY'

ONE of last week's amusing events in the political world was the reaction to the allegation which was strongly rejected by Mr. Wilson, that he proposed to "give away" the British Navy to the United Nations. It was immediately seized on by Conservative press and politicians, including members of the House of Commons, for use in electioneering propaganda. After these people had been forced to withdraw their remarks the Labour press and election speakers turned the episode into a campaign to show how distorted and hypocritical the Tory press was.

The only points that come out of the affair that illustrate anything at all in the political field are that none of the politicians or press want to get rid of the British Navy, and in passing the potential supporters of Labour as a necessary step to-

What to do with the Navy

wards socialism should note that not only does the party intend to keep the Navy but it is indignant at the very suggestion that it might harbour anti-militarist ideas, and its plan for the future is a *more effective* deployment of armed force, which will give the British government a greater influence in international affairs.

Despite his denial of wanting to put the Navy under U.N. control, Mr. Wilson did not appear to deny another report that was ascribed to him, that he thought there was a great future for "gunboat" operations, which would be tackled by the navy in the future. These operations could quite conveniently

be carried out without the risk of nuclear war, for as Mr. Wilson pointed out, no-one would use a grenade to kill a mosquito.

What then, is Labour Party policy on militarism? A hint at the answer comes when one looks at the series of military pacts now being signed by the government with the newly "liberated" countries in Africa, following the old-fashioned gunboat actions of the British army in helping to put down army mutinies in several East African states. It seems to us that war and military policies are invariably carried out to further commercial ends, and the cold war deadlock between the United States and Russian governments is advantageous to both of them in providing a basis for the economy and political system which makes government so profitable.

When a division of opinion occurs among political leaders it is never on a question of what will be in the interests of the ordinary people, but on what will best serve the interests of the ruling class which the government presents. Keeping in with the U.S.A. is one policy which some of our rulers favour, but it is equally obvious

that there are interests among the British capitalist class for whom the alliance is far too strong, and who would prefer some independent action, whether in the fields of trade, gunboats or paratroops.

To the socialists who built up the Labour Party over half a century ago, gunboat actions were one of the aspects of raw capitalist imperialism that had to be fought against and prevented if possible. The heroic actions of the London dockers in refusing to load the *Jolly George* to carry arms for use against the Russian Revolution almost comes in the class of an anti-gunboat strike. Nowadays when so-called socialism has become so degraded that its leader regards imputations of anti-militarism as an opposition libel, now that imperialism of the jingoist school has been replaced by subtler forms of exploitation in which the new rulers of "liberated" states share the work and the fruits of oppressing the ordinary workers of their countries, gunboat diplomacy has become a progressive and up-to-date policy that might young people are supposed to fight for, and put the Labour Party into power in order to see it achieved.

The sooner the British Navy is turned over to the transport of food from the stockpiles in Europe to the hungry countries of Asia, fishing, or even the harmless pastime of passenger cruising, the better it will be for us all, but that will not be done by any government.

P.H.

Vietnamese Pie

FOR nearly 20 years the unhappy South East Asian Republic of South Vietnam has been racked by civil war. Firstly the Vietnamese against French imperialism and more recently the American backed Saigon government against the communist guerillas who have infiltrated from the north. American military experts on the spot maintain that the political and military situation has deteriorated to such an extent that Washington must give permission for the war to be carried into North Vietnam. This could take the form of a naval blockade, commando raids as a last resort out and out invasion. The communists who have 45 divisions in the field have extended their control of key areas of South Vietnam to such an extent that the capital Saigon's food supplies are in danger. The extent of the fighting can be ascertained from the fact that 20,500 guerillas were killed in 1963 alone.

The American reason for continuing the struggle is simple. They just cannot afford to lose; they would lose too much prestige. The South Vietnamese people, the main sufferers in the war (thanks to the callous military technique of both Americans and Communists), are sick of war and cannot end it quickly enough but America intends it to continue. The American threat to extend the war to the North is foremost a psychological manoeuvre aimed at frightening Russia and China into reducing their aid to the guerillas. But if Russia and China ignore the threat then the Americans may blockade or attack the North and what would happen then is anyone's guess.

As well as communists and Americans having their fingers in the Vietnamese pie, France expelled from Vietnam a decade ago, is advocating re-unification of North and South. What de Gaulle hopes to get out of his proposal if it is taken up is not yet clear but we can be sure there is something behind it all.

The military techniques used by both sides are horrifying. The American use of chemicals, napalm and planned annihilation of villages is quite well known. A communist technique is to provoke the Americans into committing atrocities, something which is done fairly easily. It is a technique used with great success by the I.R.A. during the Irish troubles, but has now reached cynical, horrifying depths. For instance communist guerillas dig in around a pro-American village. Unable to dislodge them the Americans bomb the village with napalm inevitably killing more civilians than guerillas and thereby providing the communists with ideal propaganda material. It is ironic to think that the increased repugnance felt in the modern world towards violence and the killing of civilians should be indirectly responsible for the death of civilians.

R.J.

NERVOUS TENSION

(FROM OUR CORRESPONDENT IN
S. RHODESIA)

THIS is certainly a country of nervous people. No one knows what is likely to happen in the near future and everyone tends to fear the worst.

It took some time for your correspondent to take the talk of a unilateral declaration of independence seriously and I have already reported that when Mr. Field returned to this country to announce that negotiations would continue with Britain for independence the tendency was to warily relax a little. Events have now shown just how slippery the situation is, just how close we are here to serious trouble. It is hard to think the whole question through without a conclusion being merely in the form of a headache.

Firstly Sir Alec Douglas-Home stated on TV that the granting of independence to S. Rhodesia should be made provided "that the majority shall be in a position to rule the country. We have put no time limit on that." This was a definite swing away from an earlier statement that majority rule was a condition for independence and it led to Mr. Nkomo cabling Home that "independence for this country before majority rule, no matter whatever guarantee for such majority rule in the future, would be a clear betrayal of the African people by you."

Then the Governor in his "Speech from the Throne", prepared for him by the Government announced that negotiations for independence with Britain would not be initiated by "his" Government. It was claimed that Britain's terms were extravagant. We read, with some consternation, a report from Pat-

rick Keatley in the March issue of *The Central African Examiner* that "the political position of Mr. Nkomo and Mr. Sithole and their respective forces has been immeasurably weakened by the patent deficiencies of African administration in East Africa and Accra. Mr. Field's case for slow transition has been impressively strengthened."

Elsewhere in the same issue of the *Examiner* a contributor refers to the understandable concern felt by Africans at Home's statement and continues "They are only too well aware, with South Africa's example before them, what happens in a multi-racial country which gets its independence before the majority have political control."

One wonders whether the very definite change in direction on this whole issue has anything to do with Field's return from South Africa where he met Dr. Verwoerd. Historically this country is more a South African colony than a British one. S. Africa has £100,000,000 invested in this country and S. Rhodesia is S. Africa's second largest export market. Would S. Africa, one wonders, let the economy of this country collapse in the event of independence outside the Commonwealth? S. Rhodesia's strategic position is also relevant. The two countries have mutual interests and Sir de Villiers Graff, leader of the Opposition in S. Africa has spoken of "a period of closer co-operation ahead" between S. Africa and S. Rhodesia.

The *Zimbabwe Sun*—an appalling news-sheet put out by Nkomo's P.C.C.—claims editorially that "we do not fear the unilateral declaration of independence by the desperate Rhodesian Front Government. We know that if they do so it will be the surest way to commit suicide." Yet the plain truth is that ways and means are patently being found to achieve independence in this country without a declaration being made, it is certainly likely that S. Africa will not see her neighbour commit suicide.

One grim feature of this scene is the alternative one is faced with. No one wishes to see apartheid here, if he has sense, but to resist the forces of reaction one feels impelled to support African Nationalists whose words and deeds speak of a lust for power, self-glorification and little else. This desire to support the Nationalists is dangerous and valueless—but the African people are in no position to resist.

Can one stand aside and see the country turn deliberately to segregationist madness? Can one likewise support men who are authoritarian and obviously intolerant of freedom—those who produce blazen rubbish attacking rival political groupings as imperialist tools in an unreasoned, emotionally suspect manner?

Marathon Strike by American Railmen

For fourteen months now, railwaymen with the Florida East Coast Railway and who belong to eleven "non-operative" unions, have been on strike over a wage dispute. The unions withdrew their labour when Mr. E. Ball, Chairman of the Company, refused to pay a wage award of 10.28 cents which other companies had agreed to grant following an emergency Board recommendation. Mr. Ball has been called a "feudal baron" by the unions, and the strike has been compared to the disputes in the 1920's and 30's.

All through the dispute, Mr. Ball has insisted that he has the right to make agreements independent of any national negotiations. The unions have taken him to court on this matter, but needless to say the law has backed him up.

Although members of the "operating" unions have joined the strike, the company has managed to keep a reduced freight service going. This has been worked by what is described as "new employees and a few returned strikers" but this service has not run very smoothly. There have been, according to *Time* magazine, "200 acts of sabotage against the line. All told, 82 freight cars have been derailed, a station and a bridge burned, another bridge blown up." Recently, near Miami, 27 wagons out of a 91-wagon freight train, were blasted off the line into a stream below, and this was followed by the destruction of the only wreck-clearing wagon in the district.

Time describes these and other occurrences as "bad enough", but goes on, "perhaps even worse was the 48 hour disruption of the construction work at Cape Kennedy (née Canaveral) space complex, where 3,500 workers refused to cross the picket lines set up by the strikers." The railway company has a contract for delivering building materials there. The National Labour Rela-

tions Board stepped in and stopped the picketing there, and work was resumed.

It appears that it took this last incident to bring this dispute to the notice of the public nationally. Now that this has been done, Government officials have become anxious. This strike did not worry their Labour Department previously, but since the construction workers respected the picket line of the railwaymen, the whole dispute has, in their eyes, taken on a different complexion. For them and *Time* it is certainly "even worse".

Since the F.E.C. railway is the only company serving Cape Kennedy, one wonders why this picket line wasn't set up before. Up until now there has been no likelihood of a settlement and when strike action is taken, the whole point is to strike where the Company is weakest, and in this case, it is the Government contract at Cape Kennedy.

Until now the Company has got by with its cuts in the freight service and although these are no accusations in the reports that these "acts of sabotage" were committed by the strikers, if it were the case, one can not condemn them. These strikers have been cut off, without any assistance, from workers of other railway companies. It shows how poorly workers are organised when a strike can last so long and in such isolation, for it was not until it prevented construction work at Cape Kennedy that it made news in the papers.

P.T.

ENERGY, ENTHUSIASM AND MONEY ARE REQUIRED FOR THE ANTI-ELECTION CAMPAIGN

ANARCHY 37: Symposium on 'Why I Won't Vote!'

ANARCHY is Published by
Freedom Press at 2s.
on the first Saturday of every month

The Futility of voting Liberal

A RECENT correspondent to FREEDOM declared that he would vote Labour in the forthcoming General Election even if he knew in advance that the only difference that a Labour Government made would be one man less hanged. Surely, however, the issue is not as simple as that. A Labour Government would never abolish hanging while 75% of the electorate, egged on by the Press, supported it. They would lose too many votes. A Labour Home Secretary might relieve more condemned men than his Tory opposite number but there is no guarantee that he would. The top strata of both parties contain some nasty customers but also one or two inclined towards humanity where capital punishment is concerned.

Even if the Tories hanged ten men more than Labour that would still not be a logical reason for voting Labour. If a balance sheet comparing all the suffering, unhappiness and death caused by five years of Tory rule with five years of Labour rule were to be drawn up we would find that the ten men hanged by the Tories were offset by ten smallholders or small shopkeepers driven to despair and suicide by Labour's pecksniff, bureaucratic legislation. A less spectacular death than the nine o'clock walk but none the less

real. Against the 2,000 or whatever it was Egyptians killed at the time of Suez due to the Tories remember the Malayan peasants, Jews, Arabs and others killed, all due in part to the 1945 Labour Administration. Between Labour and Tory there is no difference of principle merely of degree of application and these differences tend to cancel each other out. It is impossible to foretell in advance which of the two main parties will be the lesser of the evils and there is every likelihood that they would be equally as bad. Both parties are agreed on war, capitalism, hierarchy, waste, "progress" and permanent bamboozlement of the people. And short of Mosley, Jordan or the S.P.G.B. coming to power things will be much the same.

But why all this comparing of Labour and Tory in an article which aims at pointing out the futility of voting Liberal? Because if Labour and Tory are as near as dammit identical how can the Liberals who stand between them be different? I frankly admit that I haven't read the Liberal Party election manifesto and haven't the slightest intention of doing so. But I bet my bottom dollar that it is just a re-hash of the better sounding ideas of the other two parties. And I also bet that Liberal speakers take different lines at

meetings in working class districts than they do at gatherings of business men. All part of the racket called politics.

Instead of voting and deluding yourself that it matters who wins the election why not use it as an opportunity for propaganda. It is the only time that a slight chink appears in the surrounding mass apathy so it's best to make the most of it. Every five years this election circus is held where you can choose whether to have Tweedledee or Tweedledum as your nominal master for the next five years. (Nominal because all major decisions are made by permanent civil servants and top financiers who don't stand for Parliament). Display the posters and distribute the leaflets that the anti-election campaign has produced. Barge in on the correspondence in your local rag. Spoil your paper if you like but that seems a bit childish to me and only the vote counter will know what you have written.

Better still try to get your own affairs on to an anarchist footing. An anarchist society is one in which people take responsibility for their own lives and it will happen when enough people want it to happen and are prepared to make the effort.

JEFF ROBINSON.
(Next week: "The Futility of Voting Labour")

Work Passports and Payment by Results for all Russians

MONDAY'S *Daily Worker* publishes a short report from its Moscow correspondent on Mr. Khrushchev's speech to leading Communist Party, local council and farm administration workers which he made some nine days earlier, the text of which had just been released. Among these things he said were:

In building the new Communist society, said Mr. Khrushchev, "along with the moral factor material incentives are of exceptional significance.

"We must ensure higher pay to those who work more efficiently produce more with less expenditure of labour and resources," he said. "We must oppose egalitarianism and fight for observance of the principle of payment according to work."

Back in 1952, he recalled, "the work of most collective farmers was practically unpaid."

Mr. Khrushchev supported recent proposals in the Press for introducing work passports, which would show where a man was working and where he had worked. Lenin had proposed such documents as far back as in 1919.

"It is the public's right to know what a man does and what money he is living on," said Mr. Khrushchev. According to the *Observer's* Moscow correspondent

At present every citizen has a "work book" kept by his employers; it is not

usually seen by the police or other officials. Under the new system, people with bad work records who get involved with the authorities are likely to be dealt with more severely than those with good records.

And who will fill in the work passports of those whose job it is to fill workers passports? Who, incidentally will fill in Mr. K's? How will the government prevent corruption of the "fillers-up", of private vendettas, of suspicion spreading among workers? The fact that Lenin proposed such a thing doesn't make it a good thing but only confirms what the anarchists have said all along about Lenin being the architect of the counter-revolution, the precursor of Stalinism and of these latest measures which not even a mild democratic socialist in this country would subscribe to.

Proposed British Federation of Anarchists

INAUGURAL CONFERENCE at the Arncliffe Gallery, Triangle West, Bristol 8, 11th & 12th of April, 1964. Suggestions for Agenda and Enquiries to Bristol Federation of Anarchists, 9 Cornwallis Crescent, Bristol 8.

Reports of changes or proposals for changes in the structure of the Trade Unions often appear in the newspapers. For years now these have been discussions, suggestions and plans for the amalgamation of unions relating to specific industries. In 1962, at their annual meeting, the Trades Union Congress voted in favour of a resolution to review the present structure of the trade union movement.

This week the T.U.C.'s "inner Cabinet" the Finance and General Purposes Committee, has been meeting to discuss this question of amalgamation of unions in certain industries. Although the T.U.C. is in favour of amalgamation in principle, it suggests that as this is not possible at the moment, associated unions should have "closer working arrangements". The T.U.C. has listed seven industries in which it is hoped that

Towards Industrial Unionism

progress will be made along these lines. They are the iron and steel industry, railways, metal trades, a section of the cotton textile industry, the Post Office and retail distribution.

Talks on amalgamation and "closer working arrangements" are already taking place in the printing and building industries and a certain amount of agreement has been reached. In the latter industry, eight of the associated unions comprising the "trowel section" with over 200,000 members, have agreed in principle to form one union. The "wood" unions have also had talks and amalgamation is likely here too. By uniting the different sections of the industry, Mr. Harry Weaver, the General Secretary of the National Building Trades Operatives, hopes to weld these units into one big union for the whole of the industry. Other unions are also considering proposals for re-organisation.

NEW PAMPHLET.

Last August the National Union of Public Employees issued a pamphlet entitled "The Challenge of New Unionism". In this they put forward a very strong case for industrial unionism, and a section entitled "What are we here for?" reads as follows:—

"Although unions arose as a spontaneous protest movement, concentrating on bread-and-butter issues—such as wages, hours and working conditions—which were of immediate concern to workers, it was not long before it was recognised that if unions were to be effective they would have to extend their activities to matters which had previously been considered the preserves of professional politicians. This recognition gave a new content to the unions and provided them with a dual function in life. First, to secure the best possible immediate conditions for union members and their families. Second, to extend and direct their activities so that they operated as a vital social force, constantly advancing to the point where the creation of a new form of society became a possibility."

The pamphlet argues that by changing the structure of the unions, to embrace the whole of an industry, not only can better conditions be won "here and now", but because of this re-organisation, unions can become "agents of social change". It points out that with workers in each industry divided up into different unions, effort is wasted and the strength which could be gained if the workers in a particular industry belonged to one union, is dissipated. From these divisions arise conflicts in policy, and rivalry for membership. All workers in a particular industry should belong to one union which, in its turn, is linked with other industrial unions through a "centralised body".

This method of organisation would give workers the "maximum union

strength" when conflicts arose with employers. The present structure of the unions does not give this, although shop stewards get over this weakness to a certain extent by forming their own joint committees when workers belong to several unions. This enables them to formulate a united policy with which to confront employers. However, these committees are handicapped, for they have to keep a balance between the national policies of all the unions involved. In many cases, they give up the attempt and come to an agreement on a policy of their own. Sooner or later this brings them into conflict with their national representatives and gains them the title of "unofficial", thus reducing their ability to confront the management and win gains for their members."

Although industrial unions would unite workers in any particular industry and would lead to a general policy of action against the employers, they would not necessarily become "agents of social change". By social I mean that the workers would own and control the means of production in their industry. The N.U.P.E. pamphlet mentions a "centralised body" but they do not state what powers it would have. Do they mean that the power that is now divided between the many different union executives, would be concentrated in one small body in the industrial organisation. This question remains unanswered in the pamphlet.

Any union, industrial or otherwise, must serve its members. If this is to happen, the control must be in the hands of the rank and file. With the present pattern of trade unionism, this control rests in the hands of highly paid officials and I see no change from this advocated in the T.U.C. proposals or the N.U.P.E. pamphlet. Of course there will be certain advantages with industrial unionism, even under the present pyramid form that unions take. The danger lies in the amount of power that could be wielded by the leadership of these industrial unions. I am certain that they would not tolerate any unofficial action and would back any legislation against this.

THE SWEDISH SYSTEM.

We surely do not want the type of set-up found in Sweden, where the L.O., the Swedish T.U.C., has very extensive active intervention in the settlement of inter-union disagreements, takes part in union negotiations and makes proposals for agreements. Unions affiliated to the L.O. have to get its permission to strike if this is going to involve more than 3% of its (the union's) membership.

Here we have a strong centralised union control which dominates the rank and file. As for the employers, they have a complementary body, the Swedish Employers' Confederation, the S.A.F.,

and this gets together with the L.O., to reach whatever settlement will suit the national interests, which in turn means their interests. In this the State plays its part, bringing strong pressure to bear on these two organisations if settlements are not reached. The State also has wide powers to intervene if strike action threatens the so-called "national interests".

In time, no doubt, all unions here will be organised on an industrial basis. While I think this is a step in the right direction, any attempt by the T.U.C., powerful union leaders and the Government to restrict or legislate against unofficial strikes, must be resisted by the rank and file. The ordinary member must safeguard his own freedom in the union and at the same time maintain

and extend it. Within the industrial union there are great opportunities for creating a national unofficial movement. Joint shop stewards committees are attempting this at the moment and have, in some cases set up national links with other factories within their industries. This is the type of organisation that should be encouraged in every industry. If this could be achieved, the union leaders would be redundant, for the control would be in the hands of the members.

*"THE CHALLENGE OF NEW UNIONISM".

A National Union of Public Employees' Pamphlet, price 6d.
From: Civic House, Aberdeen Terrace, Blackheath, S.E.3.

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

Cost of Loving Eustace Chesser 18/-

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Three Plays Robert Bolt 12/6

Report on Peace V. I. Lenin 3/6

Memoirs of a Revolutionist Peter Kropotkin (edited) 10/-

The Black Jacobins C. L. R. James 15/-

SECOND-HAND

The Life and Death of Stalin Louis Fischer 6/-; New Horizons J. T. Murphy 8/6; The Socialist Tradition: Moses to Lenin Alexander Gray 10/-; Baudelaire Enid Starkie 5/-; Man's Worldly Goods Leo Huberman; Problem Families (ed.) Tom Stephens 3/-; Generation in Revolt Margaret McCarthy 5/-; Hotel in Flight Nancy Johnstone 5/-; Heretics G. K. Chesterton 6/-; The True India (1939) C. F. Andrews 3/6; Ancient Society Lewis H. Morgan 5/-; Fields, Factories and Workshops, Peter Kropotkin 7/6; Pioneers of Reform D. C. Johnson 4/6; A People's History of England A. L. Morton 4/-; The Paris Commune of 1871 Frank Jellinek 5/-; Days of Contempt Andre Malraux 4/-; Men in the Pits F. Zweig 3/-; The Popes and their Church Joseph McCabe 3/-.

Freedom Bookshop

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

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

THE LAST INTERVIEW WITH THE ANARCHISTS

TURNING up a road opposite Chelsea Football Stadium, I went past some rather decrepit-looking houses and eventually came upon the place I was looking for: a rather battered sign nailed on a gate, which said "Freedom Press". This is the home of FREEDOM, the anarchist weekly.

I went through the small door in the gate that had been left open and walked down a yard to a building at the end. Pushing open the door I went into the den of London's Anarchists.

I looked through the window into the back of the shop. I could see many books and newspaper and a middle-aged man with a greying beard and razor eyes appeared to be sorting some of these out. I opened the dividing door and went in.

Then I noticed that there were three younger men, just standing idly looking at books in the shelves.

No one looked up from what they were doing, except the older man who came forward smiling, asking if he could help.

I said that I was a reporter, and would like a story about anarchists. Well at least, that's what I started to say, when the younger men turned round scowling. One of them, who wore a cap with a broken peak, an anarak, and very large boots said: "you bastard!" At this the three younger men came round the table at me.

They brushed aside the older man (whom I had thought to be their leader) as he said "No violence", and I was grabbed by the coat collar. Suddenly a fist crashed against my face and I went sprawling backwards into a pile of newspapers, my glasses fell off and I saw a big foot stamp on them.

I was quickly dragged to my feet and even more quickly knocked down again, this time by a blow on the eye. My

only thought now, was how to get out of the place, away from these terrible people. I scrambled up and tried to run, but was caught again, receiving a savage blow on my right ear.

I was then picked up bodily and thrown through the door of the shop into the concrete yard outside. Before I could get up off my bruised knees, I was roughly seized and frogmarched up the yard, towards the gate.

The older man ran up, and told them to let go of me, but they paid no attention to him at all. "Shut up Jack!" said one. "We should use new tactics sometimes."

I was carried to the gate, being held by the collar and the seat of my now badly torn trousers. The gate was then opened by giving it a sharp blow with my head and I found myself in the street once more.

"Heave," they cried. I flew through the air from the pavement into the middle of the street.

While I lay there battered and bleeding, an old Austin 7 drove out of the gate. I tried to crawl clear, but too late! I can still see the leer on the man's face as he lent out of the window, driving the car backwards and forwards over my helpless body.

Then the car drove off and I passed out, but just before I did, I heard the young man with the big boots. He was closing the door again, taking a last look at me lying in the road. He shouted, mimicking Punch, "That's the way to do it."

I am writing this report from a Southampton Hospital where I am awaiting plastic surgery. I dare not give my name as I fear reprisals against my family. I have also lost my job, because I was told to get an amusing Story. And a journalist always gets his copy.

JAFSIE.

FREEDOM

March 14 1964 Vol 25 No 8

OUR FUNCTION

ONE of the functions of an anarchist weekly, apart from presenting and discussing anarchist ideas, must be that of commenting on issues of "topical interest" even if they are ephemeral, or basically have no special relation to anarchism. For as well as being concerned with putting over anarchism as an alternative way of life for the individual and a desirable and possible alternative form of social and economic organisation for communities, an anarchist propaganda weekly must also demonstrate and seek to convince its readers that the existing forms of organisation are oppressive as well as undesirable for most of us.

To build you must also demolish—at least this is so when you are building in a politically built-up area! And unlike the Clores and Cottons, who demolish to build, irrespective of whether what they demolish is good or bad, anarchists are anarchists, are demolishers of the old order, not because they have bees in their bonnets, not because they see Man through rosy, utopian, spectacles but because their experience and observation of the world they live in, coupled with that of other thinking people throughout recorded history, leads them to the conclusion that all authoritarian organisation is fundamentally bad, whether it be capitalist, socialist, communist, or nationalist.

Not that these forms of authoritarianism do not work—obviously they do, and it could also be shown that once the routine has been established over a long period of years there is a remarkable degree of social and even economic stability; there is even the appearance of "concern" by governments for "justice" (obviously Terry Chandler's valuable game of deflating the law, and Donald Room's scientific approach to "planted" brick-bats would be lost say, in Nkrumah's Ghana, Franco's Spain or Verwoerd's South Africa—both of them would be in preventive detention without trial!). But with all the "stability", the "justice", the "rights" the "never-had-it-so-good" there is not the stability (the feeling of security) which allows people to grow to their full stature without eying suspiciously the Jones' to see what their next move will be; there is not the economic security which makes it unnecessary for people to worry about how they will manage when they can no longer earn the money to pay for what they need to keep alive, or are too old to look after themselves; and when it comes to justice everybody knows that "there is a law for the rich and one for the poor"—and how right their "instincts" are; and as to rights, well, the only rights to the means of production, the natural resources that you and this writer have, in this country, in America or in any capitalist country of the world are those which money can buy. And since most of us live, in money terms, from day to day, the wealth of the nation is in the hands of a limited section of the community who have cornered it either by inheritance, by manipulation of the money markets or by the direct exploitation of the labour of others—or by a combination of all three.

Now, let us get this quite straight; in the eyes of the Law one can do any, or all three, of these and be looked upon as a highly respectable member of society. And because most people have been brainwashed

into accepting the Law as the criterion by which they judge what is right and honourable, the tendency is for them to aspire to acquire wealth (through pools, crystal gazing, Old Moore *et alia*), to have their own businesses, or to employ the labour of others. The hard facts are that if everybody could climb to the top financial- or power-rung of the ladder (as the Tory and Lib-Lab politicians assure you when they tout for your votes) there would be no point in having a ladder to climb, since we would all be equals at the top.

The "ladder" is the symbol of privilege of the unequal society, even if you assume that everybody starts at the bottom. The Tories and other believers in the historical role of the ruling class are, in this writer's opinion, no more despicable than the Labour politicians who, today, talk of giving everybody equal opportunities to climb the ladder. To socialists, communists and anarchists the disease they were once united in fighting, even if they could not always agree on the method, was *privilege*. The equality that we anarchists are now alone in defending is that of every individual being able to be himself, of developing his potentialities to their full extent.

We maintain that the means and the know-how exist to-day to provide everyone with the necessities of life; that these can be produced and still allow ample leisure for each of us to *live* his own life. We believe, therefore, in a world in which every individual will expect the necessities of life as a right; will contribute to the common pool to the best of his ability as a self-assumed duty to the community of which he feels himself to be a part; and will defend the freedom, the uniqueness, of others if not because of a love for mankind, then as the only way of defending his own freedom.

★

WE have a number of pieces dotted about this issue of FREEDOM which illustrate what we have been saying here. We have a "told you so" column which, we suggest, confirms the validity of anarchist analysis and criticism of existing society rather than implying that anarchist commentators have "a nose" for exposing the vagaries of politics. We also defend ourselves from the "governmental" anarchists and warn our readers as to the intentions of the politicians who are now busy forcing their attentions on them. And, finally, and most important of all the points we have made, the news from Russia and Yugoslavia is, in our opinion, a text-book illustration that authoritarian means inevitably lead to authoritarian ends. In saying which, this writer for one, cannot suggest that anarchists should write-off and ignore the *potentialities* of social upheavals because they have not started with the seal of libertarian purity . . . or underestimate *their own efforts*. As anarchist propagandists, in our various capacities we sow ideas; this is our function as we see it. If they germinate it is because both the soil and the climate are favourable. We can seek to choose the most favourable conditions, but beyond that we depend on others to nurture and feed these ideas with their own, until they are a part of their own lives. And more than that we cannot do without thinking of ourselves as custodians of other men's lives.

MR. WILSON said in Washington (*vide Daily Herald* 4/3/64) "I believe that in the remaining years of this century our [Britain's] historic role as a naval power is going to find a new fulfilment both in helping newly established nations and in moving rapidly and effectively in fulfilling an international police role. This means naval forces. These cannot be afforded if we are spending our substance on the pursuit of illusory nuclear status". This, it being election year, was interpreted in some quarters as "giving our Navy to UNO", subsequently Sir Alec apologized. A radio announcer in a newly-independent colony was in trouble for playing 'Rule Britannia' in error. Britain recognized the new Government of Zanzibar which nationalized the British Club and the Sailing Club (both British-owned) immediately after the departure of M. Duncan Sandys. . . .

MR. RICHARD CROSSMAN gave Mr. George Strauss, Minister of Supply in the Labour Government credit for the responsibility of production of the atomic bomb. The decision, says Mr. Crossman, was taken by the defence sub-committee without discussion in full Cabinet before or after it was taken. The French carried out an underground nuclear test explosion in the Sahara. The United States Navy Secretary claimed that even if all American bombers and land-based missiles were immediately put out of action, the Navy would still be able to inflict 25 million deaths with its present submarine Polaris fleet. Damage to enemy war-making capability would be "of such major proportions as to make the initiation of a nuclear war by an enemy irrational". . . .

AN ORGANIZATION is being formed to bring CND back to the policy of unilateralism from which it is believed by some to have strayed. They are holding an open forum on Easter Sunday evening. Laurens Otter is amongst the sponsors and Robert Shaw, 8 Parsons Road, Irchester, Northants will supply details and leaflets. . . .

PRINCE WILLIAM of Gloucester failed the Civil Service examination for the second time and hence will not be able to join the Commonwealth relations office. The



Prince said, "It's not the end of the world." Princess Alexander gave birth to a boy. The baby ranks 13th in the Royal bread-line. The *Standard* quotes the adage "Saturday's child works hard for its living". . . .

A GREEK WARSHIP raced to the Island of Timos to collect a 'miracle-working' ikon—an image of the Virgin Mary. It was to be put at the bedside of the dying King Paul of Greece. It didn't work. . . .

THE BISHOP of Bath and Wells in a letter to the annual meeting at Spaxton Parish Church, Somerset, said, "I want you to know . . . that particular curses put upon individual people are not envisaged in the Prayer Book or any other formulary of the Church of England. Ordained ministers have no more authority than anyone else to indulge in this practice, which belongs to the Old Testament and not to the New. Mr. Grubb [the Rector] has been advised of this." Mr. Grubb claims that the meeting was unconstitutional. The altar at Durham cathedral had to be rehallowed because a 52-year-old man cut his throat on it. He had been unemployed for seven years. A Roman Catholic priest was fined £65 for driving without reasonable consideration and failing to stop after an accident in which a 66-year-old man was fatally injured. The priest was in a "sheer, blind panic" because he was in a hurry to be in by 11 p.m. . . .

THE BRISTOL BRANCH of the National Campaign for the abolition of Capital Punishment states that it will make every attempt to have the life of Christopher Simcox who is due to hang on March 17th. The secretary, Mr. Gummer, states that the NCACP in Birmingham, where Simcox is in prison, is doing 'nothing official' this, says Mr. Gummer is "not merely inadvisable but positively dangerous." Christopher Simcox is condemned to death for the second time. In 1948 he was sentenced for killing his second wife, he was only reprieved because the question of the death penalty was then under official consideration. Doctors have testified that he is a paranoid personality suffering from reactive depression which impairs his responsibility. No improvement seems to have been effected by his imprisonment and no police or official action was taken when complaints were made of his violent behaviour after his discharge. He attempted suicide after the crime for which he is now condemned to death. The *Daily Sketch* commenting (falsely) that the Abolitionists were ignoring Simcox, "confirming that they are nothing more than a bunch of dedicated and insincere do-gooders who really don't give a damn for the damned [i.e. condemned] and care less for the victims of those who have damned themselves." This is a postscript to an understandably confused and pathetic letter from Simcox's third wife (who he attempted to kill), declaring herself in favour of capital punishment for Simcox. Nine out of 23 men accused of economic crimes in the Soviet Union were condemned to death. A West Berlin Court found that a former SS warrant officer committed murder, but acquitted him on the grounds that he was acting under orders. A Canadian Royal Commission has begun an inquiry into charges that an innocent man was hounded to the gallows to satisfy pressure from the United States and to protect the tourist industry. . . .

A FURNITURE dealer in Hertford sold his collection of 3,500 flowered chamber pots for £800. The buyer is a dealer in the United States, where china chamber pots are being used as ice-buckets and table decorations. JON QUIXOTE.

Anarchists Everywhere

DON'T get us wrong; we are not anarcho-sectarians, jealously guarding the purity of the idea. The more people calling themselves anarchists the better from the point of view of getting the public accustomed to the sound of the word and of arousing the curiosity of some to find out more about anarchism. So when we saw in the Londoner's Diary in the *Evening Standard* last week (Mar. 5) a "Portrait of an Anarchist" we hastened to read what it was all about. Here is the piece:

Mr. Emile de Antonio who made the film of the McCarthy hearings which has been so successful in America, is in London "D", as he is called, looks like a rumpled teddy bear. He describes himself as a Left-wing anarchist. At 43, he is following a reverse pattern to most people. "I had a house, two cars, a library, dogs, guns, a hi-fi and all that," he explained when I met him. "It's taken me till middle-age to get rid of them. The guns had to go—I decided it was wicked to shoot animals. The books were the hardest—I had two thousand. Now I buy paperbacks and throw them away when I've read them." Very interesting, and we would like to get into touch with Mr. de Antonio, if only to ask him why he is a "left-wing anarchist" and not just an anarchist.

And on Sunday the *Observer* published a lively profile of the Foreign Minister of the new government in Zanzibar, Abdul Rahman Babu, with the title "The anarchist from Notting Hill Gate". Apparently Babu's "most informative years" were 1951-57 when he lived in the Marble Arch and Notting Hill areas, and apart from sitting at the feet of A. J. Ayer, Nye Bevan and Fenner Brockway, he attended "lots of discussion groups run by anarchists and Communists, by the SPGB and by all sorts of other bearded Bohemian movements". And he added that, contrary to what some people have said, he never joined the Communist Party. "If anything, I was closer to the anarchists than to the Communists. I used to find some of their arguments very attractive, very intellectually stimulating." In the same interview Babu summarises his ambitions as wanting "to create a people's republic in Zanzibar." The people must be given a feeling of

belonging, of participating fully in the transformation of their society. Zanzibar is a small country. Its problems are manageable. We need land reform and economic diversification—particularly in agriculture. We shall grow cocoa and coffee as well as cloves.

With a population of only 300,000 its problems are "manageable" from an anarchist point of view, but one wonders whether the "anarchist from Notting Hill Gate" is going to be the initiator of "the first anarchist society in Zanzibar".

In the interview he said: "But we are not planning to nationalise land because peasants don't work at their best without a sense of ownership. We need some financial help from outside, but there is something to be said for the Chinese theory of self-help. It is rather dangerous to rely too much on external aid. Quite soon the recipients lose all initiative and the donors get fed up. Interdependence is much better."

We agree with what Babu says about nationalisation, about self-help and interdependence, but a *Reuter* report from Zanzibar last Monday states that the "revolutionary government" had announced that it would "nationalise all land"! President Karume, addressing a crowd of 50,000 added that "no new farming would be started without the approval of the government". So much, therefore for Babu's theories about the peasants' need for "a sense of ownership" in the land they work.

He also said in the interview: "There are two great advantages in seizing power by revolution":

The first is that one is bound by no promises, one is obliged to no one. The second is that the public expects one to take extreme measures. It is conditioned to expect the worst. This gives one very great latitude.

These, in our opinion, are the words of a cynical power-monger and not of an anarchist. The "seizing of power" he refers to is not revolution, which is made by the people, but a *coup-d'etat*. And therefore his first point is not worth examining except as arguments of a power-happy politician. The second which, incidentally, flatly contradicts the first, exposes him as the vain, budding-politician he is and not as a revolutionary. When people make their revolution they are prepared for lean times in the immediate future as the price of

rebuilding a future for themselves and their children. They do not make the sacrifices entailed in a social upheaval in order to replace one set of politicians by another, even if, in effect, this is what happens in most revolutions. Babu in the interview limits his "revolutionary" intentions when he declares that

there must be no violent divergence between our system and theirs [the East African States], as we could not then co-exist—and we need co-existence. Our policy must therefore reflect the wishes of East Africa and consoles himself with the reflection that "in governing our country we cannot, at any rate, do worse than the Sultan".

What a comforting thought for the "anarchist of Notting Hill Gate" and what a "happy" prospect for the people of Zanzibar!

Legalising the Right to Strike in Yugoslavia

IT was reported last week-end that "Yugoslavia has restored the workers' right to strike." The announcement is of interest, as is the fact that Yugoslavia is the first of the "communist" countries to legalise stoppage of work. The legislation comes after a series of stoppages (especially in Slovenia, the most industrialised area), which it is said, were "in protest against the arbitrariness of leading functionaries".

Now what "puzzles" is it that we have for years been told that Workers' Control *actually operates* in Yugoslavia, in which case it is difficult to understand the purpose of the strike weapon and, for that matter, from where the "arbitrary functionaries" get their power. Might the answer be that there isn't workers' control in Yugoslavia after all?

ADVENTURE PLAYGROUND
Reading Adventure Playground require a male playleader for six weeks during the summer school holidays. The post is paid at £10 per week. Would anyone capable and interested please get in touch with:
JUDITH STEVENS,
8, Shepherds House Lane,
Earley, Reading, Berks.

I told you so!

IN my article on the reporter "A laugh for the posh Sundays" in FREEDOM of three weeks ago I made the remark that most people in this society today are Tories. I explained what I meant by this, and I think I made my point before I set out to describe what happened at that meeting (the one to set up a Federation of Groups in London).

I'm very sorry that Chris Segar should find that he needs to show solidarity with that reporter, who was not an anarchist. I should have taken it for granted, that he, as an anarchist, would have been more explicit and wouldn't have taken the piss out of us. After all if anarchists don't behave like anarchists, there seems no point in going on, does there?

I'm sorry that he was disgusted with what I wrote, but not to worry, for most of the comrades would give peals of cynical laughter at the suggestion that reporters go to meetings to report. Reporters go to meetings to get a story, the story is usually written in their minds before they even leave the office. A straight report on an anarchist meeting would not be printed, the reporter wants to earn money, so he makes a joke of it.

I dislike Politicians, Newspaper men (not anarchist newspaper men) and Policemen in that order. Some reporters may give a factual report of what took place (the one at our Cuba demo, for example), but most are Tories who just want to make a fast buck.

Jack Robinson says "Watch your blood pressure Jack", and the *Punch* has had an interview and that the *Observer* is on the trail. How do you feel now *Punch* has printed its interview Jack?

I said it was going to be a field day for the press, or rather a field year, didn't I? Jack by the way was the one I first heard say, that once upon a time, there was a river that flowed through "Fleet Street" but it dried up and disappeared, and out of the slime came newspapermen. You're not very consistent Jack are you?

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
Vol 12 1962: Pilkington v. Beeching

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.

HERBERT READ

Poetry & Anarchism paper 2/6

ALEX COMFORT

Delinquency 6d.

BAKUNIN

Marxism, Freedom and the State 5/-

PAUL ELTZBACHER

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

CHARLES MARTIN

Towards a Free Society 2/6

PETER KROPOTKIN

Revolutionary Government 3d.

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

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

GEORGE BARRETT

The First Person (Selections) 2/6

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 ★

So we get once again to the article in *Punch* in which Jack is described as "Looking like an alpine carver of Christs." In which the shop is described as being the headquarters of the British Anarchist Association (what's that?) and smelling of printers ink and tonka beans (what are they?). In which the micky is taken out of Lillian Wolfe who in her younger days was imprisoned for issuing a leaflet on birth control which, I might add, could have been read to advantage by that reporter's parents. In which Jack Robinson is mixed up with Jack Stevenson and let's face it we aren't much alike either in looks or character. But let's not worry about all the drivel that was written, let's just say that he came to ask about anarchism, that he was told about it, that his report was sneering and that he is a capitalist stooge.

This attitude that I have towards the press is not a built-in prejudice, it is something which has grown over the years with experience.

I can remember the last time I spoke to a reporter was at a time when they were trying to hound someone (Martin Grainger) out of his job.

He had written a pamphlet on the Belgian General Strike and the press thought it would make a good story to set him up as a bogey man, so they kept calling him up and besieging his house and making altogether a bloody nuisance of themselves. His wife knew how to deal with them however. A bucket of cold water cooled them down a little.

I was stewarding a meeting at which he (Martin Grainger) was expected to appear. The day before the press had described it as a trotskyst meeting (wrong again, well perhaps they were just mistaken, eh!), after a speaker from the platform (in their presence had told them in a voice raised to a shout) that it was an anarchist meeting, they still wrote that it was a trotskyst meeting the following day (how strange). Oh yes. What did I say to the reporter at that meeting. I said: "I'll give you 10 seconds to get out of this meeting and if you don't go, I'll throw you down those stairs". Not very nice of me was it? But then you can only stand so much.

Then there was "Inside Anarchy Headquarters" which was an article in the *Daily Scratch* on the Committee of One Hundred, a masterpiece of smears and lies but need I go on any longer boring some and disgusting others? I'll just say, that if the *Observer* is waiting to interview me, it'll still be waiting on judgment day that there ain't no judgment day.

JACK STEVENSON.

A Second Look at Yesterday's Headlines

IT is a characteristic of the gutter Press that what they tell you in glaring headlines today they deny in a paragraph in an inside page tomorrow. In the anarchist press we analyse topical events without so-called "inside information" but with anarchist values and more often than not our hunches prove to be not so far off the mark. We don't make a practise of indulging in a "we told you so" attitude because it antagonises as many people as it impresses, but occasionally a follow-up on a topic over which we have taken a particularly strong line in FREEDOM is not out of place.

The first topic to which we would refer readers is the "stamp war" which we discussed in these columns last november ("Another War to Pay for" FREEDOM Nov. 9) the gist of which was summed up in the last sentence in which we wrote: "The struggle [of the super-markets] has been engaged and will be fought to the last take over". Now, last week, in the financial columns of the *Daily Herald* one reads that

By the time the spell of readjustment is ended, control of Britain's near-2,000 supermarkets could have passed into four or five major groups.

These conclusions were prompted by the announcement that Express Dairies had disposed of their 39 Mac Fisheries-Premier Supermarkets (for a mere £5 million) to Mac Fisheries, a subsidiary, of the Unilever Empire, at a time when "a lot of other powerful retail people are getting second thoughts and slightly chilly feet" (*Observer*).

The millionaire Press being essentially still individualist—capitalist (excepting the *Daily Mirror*-King group) can be expected to frown on monopolies and

Beatles vs the State

DEAR COMRADES,

Despite the temptation to dismiss F.H. & D.G.'s profound utterances on the Beatles as rubbish, I will endeavour to take them seriously, in the hope that they may be able to see this "social phenomena" as it is, not as they imagine it to be.

The Beatles exist not because of the state but despite it. Contemporary trends in pop music are reflections of the feelings and reactions of the younger generation to the world around them. "Beat", "Rhythm and Blues", etc. are the folk music of our generation expressing the hopes, fears and frustrations of young people. The Mersey sound evolved from the music created by working-class kids in Liverpool (unlike the cultured "Folk" music fostered by bourgeois intellectuals reflecting conditions of primitive peasants, etc., etc., which is alien to the 'sixties).

"Beat" is not a tool of the state it is a healthy reaction against the state. The state to exist must destroy communication and emotional bonds between individuals.

Contemporary conditions tend to cause more frustration, more alienation of individual from individual, i.e. one becomes hardened, tenderness is destroyed. "Beat" is a vehicle by which frustration is "worked out" and such records as Cilla Black's "Anybody with a Heart" provide the emotion detensionising sufficient to feel gentle for that all-important moment when individuals come together.

The vehicle of popular sentiment is continually changing but so are the times. When anarchists are able to translate the outlook of Shelley, Keats and Godwin into terms which can be understood by the working class today, then they will have achieved something.

Attempts have been made by bourgeois comrades to dismiss proles, their culture and their outlook. But this is merely wishful thinking on their part, for whoever has the mind of the producers has power or its destruction.

"If there is hope it lies in the proles", Beatlemania and all.

Fraternally yours,

London, Mar. 1. PETER CONSTABLE.

Stirner

DEAR EDITORS,

Anyone who has taken the trouble to properly read "The Ego and His Own" will realise that Jeff Robinson's attack (22/2/64) springs more from ignorance and Woodcock than from an understanding of his subject. I think that Armand did quite a good job of summarization and that anyone who is scared by his article must be of the type that looks for burglars under the bed every night. Stirner's style may not be

always easy to follow, particularly when he is dealing with some complex problem, but the extracts given by Armand show that he is neither ambiguous nor pedantic.

As for the criticism of Stirner the man, Well, one way out of confronting an uncomfortable challenge is to substitute epithets for arguments, but the trouble with the *ad hominem* approach is that it can be turned against its user. Jeff Robinson would, I am sure, be very annoyed if I rejected what he wrote on the grounds that he made such compromises with bourgeois society as using employment cards, the money system, passports and postage stamps, not to mention generally obeying the law rather than spend his life in prison. Stirner got married? Yes, and so did Godwin, Proudhon, Bakunin, Tolstoy and Kropotkin—to name five of the figures featured in Eltzbacher's "Anarchism". Are we to refuse to take them seriously and to heap abuse on their heads because of this?

I do not know who was the "better" individualist: Stirner or Thoreau. I do know, however, that the "theoretical" Stirner wrote a much more profound analysis of the State and other oppressions than the "practical" Thoreau (who, in any case, did not intend "Walden" to be a blueprint of anyone). Stirner refused to go into details about a future society because he thought we could not visualise how slaves would behave when they were free—we could only wait and see.

From some of the things Jeff Robinson writes in his "critique" he does not seem to be so far from conscious egoism as he thinks. Could it be that his protests are like those of the woman who says "no" when she means "yes"?

Sincerely,

London, Mar. 4. S. E. PARKER.

Anti-Election Campaign

Help wanted for the distribution of leaflets in Fulham.

Meet at 21 Rumbold Road, S.W.6. (off Kings Road, Stamford Bridge) on Monday, March 16th, at 7.30 p.m.

PROPOSED GROUPS

BIRMINGHAM AND

WEST MIDLANDS

Peter Neville,
12 South Grove, Erdington, Birmingham, 23.

BIRMINGHAM (UNIVERSITY)

Dave Chaney,
7, Birches Close, Moseley,
Birmingham, 13.

COUNTY OF STAFFORD

TRAINING COLLEGE
John Wheeler, C.S.T.C., Nr. Stafford,
Staffs.

HEREFORD

Peter & Maureen Ford, 9 Poole Close,
Hereford

MANCHESTER

John McEwan, c/o Farrish, 4, Sanby
Avenue, Mount Estate, Gorton, Man-
chester.

MERSEYSIDE

Details from Vincent Johnson, 43 Mill-
bank, Liverpool 13. (STO 2632).
Every Saturday 2.30.

Outside Lewis's paper-selling.

PLYMOUTH

Fred Spiers, 35 Ridge Park Avenue,
Mutley, Plymouth.

READING

Meetings third Friday of each month
7.30 p.m. at Eric and Carol Morse's,
16 Foxhill Road, Reading.

ROMFORD & HORNCHURCH

John Chamberlain, 19 Chestnut Glen,
Hornchurch, Essex.

SHEFFIELD

Peter Lee, 745 Eccleshall Road, Sheffield.

Tyneside Federation

Enquiries H. D. Nash,
30 Queens Road, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 2.

OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

First Tuesday in each month at 8 p.m.
at Jean and Tony Smythe's Ground
Floor Flat, 88, Park Avenue, Enfield,
Middlesex.

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

3rd Wednesday of each month at Jack
Robinson and Mary Canipa's, 21,
Rumbold Road, S.W.6 (off King's Road),
8 p.m.

Freedom weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times

a year, on every Saturday except
the first in each month.

Anarchy monthly

ANARCHY (2/3 or 30 cents post free),
a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas,
is published 12 times a year on the
first Saturday of the month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

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

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies FREEDOM

1 year (40 issues) 30/- (U.S. \$4.50)
6 months (20 issues) 15/- (\$2.25)

Last Thursday in month:

At George Hayes', 174 McLeod Road,
S.E.2.

1st Friday of each month at 4, Benhams
Place N.W.3. Beginning March 6th.

2nd Friday at Brian Leslie's, 242 Ames-
bury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill,
Nr. Station).

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

NEW OFF-CENTRE Wimbledon S.W.19
Third Saturday of each month at 8 p.m.
For details Phone WIM 2849.

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

1 year (40 issues) 45/- (\$7.00)

Combined Subscription to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 40/- (U.S. & Canada \$6.00)

6 months 20/- (\$3)

3 months 10/6 (\$1.50)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 63/- (U.S. & Canada \$9.00)

6 months 31/6 (\$4.50)

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

12 months 65/- (U.S. & Canada \$9.50)

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.