

'The law locks up both man and woman
Who steals the goose from off the common
But lets the greater felon loose
Who steals the common from the goose.'

ANON.

Apartheid Man

ROUND THE GALLERIES

Great Future for Contented Cows

TORY and Labour M.P.s view the Budget with despondency and elation respectively — their immediate concern being votes at the October General Election. According to the *Guardian's* City Comment (15/4): "The City is delighted with the Budget. The general view last night was that the market will open better today". And Mr. George Woodcock, the general secretary of the TUC, was reported by the same journal as "welcoming" the budget as "courageous" though he thought it "lacking in inspiration". We are

told that Mr. Maudling has "taken a gamble on savings and taken back in taxation about £100 millions, no more than the TUC—or Mr. Woodcock at least—considered appropriate."

The *Guardian's* Labour correspondent goes on to suggest that on the more constructive part of the Budget—if it has one—neither side of industry can claim that much heed has been paid to its usual pre-Budget entreaties, the Promised White Paper on a corporation tax is in line with TUC thinking, but there was no shifting of the burden of taxation on the grounds

of greater social justice, for which the TUC stands

★

LAST week we concluded the editorial, *Trade Unionism by Tort* on a cynical note:

Trade Unionism is for a large number of people . . . an onerous task which, however, they carry out with no more feeling of vocation than the man whose job it is to sell bricks or detergents. because, in our opinion, Trade Unionism in this country today is part and parcel of the capitalist system. George Woodcock and his

fellow "directors" sell Labour, just as Mr. Bloom sells washing machines and holidays in Bulgaria (and in the process both put over their "personalities"). (In a sense Bloom is more "human" than Woodcock. He sells mass-produced machines and treats them as commodities whereas Woodcock seeks to manoeuvre human beings as if they were commodities and, like Bloom, charges for them according to their performance).

Bloom is a millionaire, a capitalist and makes no bones about it.

Woodcock is paid by the workers to represent their interests and whatever he may think, we have no hesitation in saying that he does not, for we believe that the workers' interests are that they should enjoy the full product of their labour as well as the right to work, neither of which Mr. Woodcock and the TUC have secured whereas they have established themselves, as individuals, as "responsible" people on whom both bosses and governments rely for the maintenance of the *status quo*—that is, the capitalist system and authoritarian government.

During last week, if one happened to be outside the Exhibition Hall at Earls Court, it was possible to see the unlikely spectacle of senior executives of firms unloading packing cases and carrying them into the hall. The reason for this unusual employment of executives was that the labourers at the exhibition halls were out on strike.

This stoppage arose from the recent pay settlement in the industry. This award was achieved after craftsmen (excepting electricians) and labourers had operated an unofficial work-to-rule (FREEDOM No. 10, Mar. 28th). This dispute ended with the craftsmen receiving an extra 3½d. per hour, labourers getting 1½d. per hour and all of them gaining an extra 5/- subsistence allowance. The labourers are now demanding an increase of 2d. per hour to bring their overall rise in line with that of the craftsmen.

This dispute has again thrown the contractors' plans into chaos and although the labourers have returned to work now, a number of trade exhibitions have either opened incomplete or the openings have been delayed. The Heating, Ventilating and Air Conditioning Exhibition has been postponed from last Wednesday until Monday. The Fluid Power International Show and Conference was at first going to open with incompleting stands, but it was later decided to put the opening off until the Saturday. Other shows which were nearly completed just about managed to open. Mr. Price, Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade was able to open the incredibly named exhibition of the International Pipes, Pipelines, Pumps and Valves Exhibition and Convention at Earls Court.

This dispute really annoyed the employers. They have been frantically dashing about all over the place trying to get the shows open on time. The joint statement issued by the different employers' associations in the industry says—"The present position is that the

Labourers Act for Same Rise as Craftsmen

work by other trades is proceeding and although stand-fitting work may not be completed it is expected in the interests of the export trade that the exhibitions affected will open."

As far as I know, the craftsmen did not assist the labourers in any way, except perhaps financially, and I don't know how the employers stand over insurance if only part of the labour force takes strike action. I know that they insured against a general stoppage. I do know however that the National Joint Council of the Exhibition Industry was very worried, and this included the union officials and especially Bro. Smith, General Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers, who are members of this council. This Joint Council issued a statement in which they said that craftsmen would become redundant if they did not do their own labouring.

This statement made not only the craftsmen, but also the labourers very angry and according to the stewards' convenor was one of the main reasons why the labourers did not return to work sooner. Bro. Smith also gave verbal instructions to the A.S.W. organiser, Bro. Rusca, that he should tell the men to do their own labouring. Although the organiser carried out these instructions, he made it perfectly clear where he stood on the subject and that he did not agree with Bro. Smith. This shows the length to which the union officials will go in order to break a strike by ignoring the basic trade union principle of "no scabbing".

Although at the outset, this stoppage was unofficial, the two unions who organise labourers in the exhibition and building industries, the Amalgamated Society of Building Trade Workers and

the Transport & General Workers' Union, made the strike official after a few days. This dispute affects these unions directly, for the labourers are also claiming direct representation on the joint council for pay talks. I know this sounds ludicrous, but they have only had an official of the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives to watch over their interests.

The employers seem set against any further pay increases to the labourers. They are worried that if the extra 2d. is conceded, what they call the "fetcher and carrier" will be earning more than an electrician's mate. Then this of course might lead to further disputes.

Soon after the strike was recognised the men, on the recommendation of the two unions, resumed work and this must have brought a big sigh of relief from the contracting firms for without the labourers, completed jobs were piling up at the supplying joinery shops and work being done at the halls was also slowing up. Already 300-400 carpenters had been laid off and if the dispute had continued, there would have been a slow run down in the industry.

The men went back to work on the basis that "officials will report to them

Continued on page 2

There are anarchists who argue that it is unrealistic to expect the Trade Unions to be what they were never intended to be. Even if we limit ourselves to that definition which states the function of the Trades Unions to be "an organised association of workmen of a trade formed for protection and promotion of common interests" what reason is there to assume that these "common interests" must inevitably always be the same. To write-off the Trade Unions as reactionary and conservative bodies *per se* ignores the fact as pointed out by the Webbs in their *History of Trade Unionism* that they have "at various dates during the past century at any rate, frequently had aspirations towards a revolutionary change in social and economic relations". Are the Trade Unions today pillars of capitalism because of their structure and leadership or are they what they are because their membership is what it is; in other words is the trade union movement reactionary because its members are concerned with improving their economic

Continued on page 3

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS OR BLOODBATH?

OVER the last couple of years or so the Anti-Apartheid Movement (A.A.) in this country has endeavoured to expose to the people of Britain the criminal policies exercised by the South African Government against non-Europeans.

The A.A. movement has organised demonstrations, lobbied M.P.s, and circulated endless amounts of facts and figures on conditions in S. Africa. This activity more or less culminated into the boycott campaign which had partial success. But to be perfectly frank, the Labour Party, the Co-operative Movement and the T.U.C. were, at no stage, very happy about the campaign, as soon as they could decently drop out, they did with gusto.

Industrial action could have made the boycott campaign really effective, regrettably it didn't get past first base, which left the all-important question of what could be done.

Ronald Segal and a few enthusiasts, thought up the idea of an international conference to discuss the idea of 'economic sanctions'. At first this idea was thought to be 'out of this world', but after weeks of hard graft such a conference became a fact.

Last week, this conference, attended by official and unofficial delegates from 26 countries, discussed the possibilities of economic sanctions against S. Africa. Four leading economists believe that total economic sanctions could be im-

posed against S. Africa without major disruption of international trade, or of the employment situation in any country.

This is a broad statement and obviously the pros and cons were examined in great detail, to the extent that it was estimated that sales, if lost, could put 150,000 out of work, but the firms involved could find alternative customers. Mr. Roger Ofie, a Fellow of New College, Oxford, said that if S. African gold could be effectively prevented from entering the world market, this is likely to hasten the day when gold is demonetized internationally. The only damage to the U.K. economy from measures to expand liquidity by other means would be the loss of commission income to London bullion brokers.

As one can gather this conference was very detailed in its examination therefore a full report will be issued in Penguin pamphlet form.

Last Friday the A.A. movement called a public meeting at Friends' House, the speakers being delegates to the Sanctions Conference. David Ennals, the Chairman, opened the meeting by giving a brief history of the A.A. movement and the conditions in S. Africa. Two important points that David Ennals raised were: (1) Is the arms ban enough? (2) Economic Sanctions must be organised thoroughly and effectively, otherwise, if it goes off at half-cock, it will harm the people we wish to help. He then introduced the first speaker who was K. K.

Shah (Secretary Congress Party), leader of the Indian delegation to the Sanctions Conference. K. K. Shah outlined the inhuman laws in operation against the non-white S. Africans including the 45 days' detention without trial which could be repeated over and over again. What was wanted he said, was democratic institutions, a new constitution in which the white population could play their part. 12 months inconvenience would see the sanctions effective.

The speaker who followed was the Executive Director of the Committee for Africa (U.S.A.), an organisation in America not too dissimilar to A.A. He was not too optimistic about the necessary change needed in American policy, for the three reasons that he outlined. (1) The increase of American investment in S. Africa over the past four years. Just after the Sharpeville massacre 23 million dollars worth of new investment went into S. Africa, which put the Verwoerd government on its feet again. (2) United States own racial struggle with many forces opposed to racial equality. (3) Lack of understanding and scepticism. The speaker ended on a brighter note when he described the Longshoremen's token stoppage in support of the boycott of S. African goods.

Mongi Slim (Tunisian Foreign Minister) who was chairman of the Sanctions Conference spoke next. He took us back to 1935 when the idea of the master race started and spread and on

to the United Nations Charter and the clause concerning 'human dignity and rights'.

The last speaker I was able to stay and listen to was Diallo Telli (Chairman U.N. Special Committee on Apartheid). He gave his remarks with the assistance of an interpreter. He stated the U.N. Committee fully appreciated the work A.A. was doing and complimented them on the information they were able to supply to the U.N. Committee. Diallo Telli stated quite clearly and firmly that 'economic sanctions' was the last possible remaining peaceful endeavour. He said such sanctions were economically possible, politically opportune and within the law.

The public meeting was well attended especially for these days of poor attendance at public meetings. The one criticism that I would make of the meeting is that there was so little said about the deliberations of the Sanctions Conference itself.

Implementing the policy of 'Sanctions' is going to be a tough job, as was pointed out in the "Collaborators", British investment in S. Africa is heavy. The majority of 'business' interests whilst paying lip service against Apartheid, act differently when it affects their pockets, therefore 'industrial action' is the key to the problem.

For those who cry "the first to suffer would be those a boycott is supposed to help". Any suffering that will be caused by sanctions will be very little compared with what is already experienced in South Africa. So say the African National Congress (A.N.C.).

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

ANARCHY 39: Puts the Spotlight on Nottingham

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

An Apartheid Man

(From our Correspondent)

I HARDLY think there is anyone in Southern Rhodesia—either black or white—who believes Mr. Ian Smith, the new Prime Minister of this country, when he says that his replacement for Mr. Field is "a matter concerning leadership and the general direction of the Government's policy". Rather it is the content and implementation of Government policy that is behind what is generally realised to be a shift to the Right in S. Rhodesian affairs.

On resigning from the office of Prime Minister, Mr. Field observed that "serious disagreements have arisen between my party in the House and myself in relation to policy". One can only conjecture about the disagreements, and despite Mr. Smith's denial that the change has anything to do with "the question of independence" your correspondent finds himself, with many others, in thinking that this change has everything to do with the question of independence.

Mr. Harry Nkumbula, the leader of Northern Rhodesia's African National Congress, on hearing of Mr. Smith's appointment, commented that: "Field is a good man, but Smith is a racist. Smith is an apartheid man. He is no better than Vorwoerd. This means trouble for sure in Southern Rhodesia." Mr. Chinamano, the headmaster of the African inspired Highfield Community School and Salisbury leader of Mr. Nkomo's People's Caretaker Council released a press statement on behalf of Mr. Nkomo which stated: "Mr. Field's expulsion together with the past expulsions from premierships of this country are but symptoms of a deadly disease (minority rule) which has been eating into the fabrics of our country for some time now." The Zimbabwe African National Union president the Rev. N. Sithole declared: "Now that the most reactionary element have won the day, and the way is cleared for a unilateral

declaration of independence, African people must immediately gear themselves for an inevitable head-on collision.

Even the settler press is talking of a "Move to the Right" and the dangers of "some new action" by the Government. The parliamentary opposition, the Rhodesia Nationalist Party has stated that there is the danger of unilateral action for independence and the implementation of apartheid in S. Rhodesia. This is backed up by the resignation from the Cabinet of Mr. Howman, who was Minister of Community Development. The point is that, as the political correspondent of the "Rhodesia Herald" put it: "Apartheid, it seems, is what some members of the Rhodesian Front want implemented in the name of community development." The correspondent goes on to suggest that this is why Mr. Howman has joined Mr. Field in resigning from the Cabinet.

I heard Mr. Howman speaking recently on Community Development, along with a panel of religious leaders, an African nationalist and one or two supposed experts. He was the only person to speak who struck this writer with any appeal, a misguided idealist and a kindly old man. I really cannot imagine why he allowed himself to be used as window-dressing by the Rhodesian Front. But no longer. The cards are down and we may put forward a suggestion as to what we can expect out here in the near future.

RECENTLY, a former Southern Rhodesia M.P., Mr. John Pittman, spoke at a meeting in Salisbury of the steps that would follow a declaration of independence; he spoke of raising the franchise and abolishing the Consti-

tutional Council (which recently described the Land Apportionment Act as discriminatory) and he stated that the illegal Government would "probably begin with a concentrated brain-washing campaign directed at the white population" ("The Sunday Mail" 22/3/64). The report continues: "There would be a rapid strengthening of the police and military forces, with Government sympathisers enlist as reservists. It might be found desirable to merge the two forces, to simplify control."

"The traditional dawn swoop might follow. Likely opponents of the new regime would be rounded up and strategic points, like Broadcasting House, the Railways and the Kariba, would be commandeered." Later Mr. Pittman is reported to have said: "The Governor is a key figure and he would have to be arrested." This also ties up with a report in the same issue of the "Sunday Mail" concerning the President of the Rhodesian Guild of Journalists, who claimed that a planned campaign with the eventual object of press censorship was being furthered by members of the Rhodesian Front Government.

With this in mind one turns back to Patrick Keatley's "The Politics of Partnership" (p. 495):

"In 1962 I was one of five correspondents who lunched informally with someone I suppose I must refer to simply as 'a senior minister in Salisbury'. It was not an occasion for pulling out notepads, but one thing our guest said was so astonishing—and alarming—that I slid an envelope on to my knee and scribbled the words as he spoke them. He had pointed out how well girded Southern Rhodesia is for a 'fortress' operation against any outsider—at Kariba the power station is on our side, the south bank—and so on.

But if it came to the crunch, Rhodesians would fight, he said: 'And that includes my Africans . . . many I know and trust. I wouldn't hesitate to arm them either; we'd give them F.N. rifles like the rest of us. And we'd have our own underground in London and there's not one Cabinet Minister whose life would be safe.'

One other interesting fact is that the talk of a Boston Tea Party by Sir Roy Welensky some time ago, with reference to the Federation, led Kenneth Kaunda to reveal details of the plan which included the arrest of Northern Rhodesia's Governor and a coup in Northern Rhodesia. With the talk of the royalties of the British South Africa Company which Kenneth Kaunda has set in motion recently one wonders, somewhat tentatively (let me emphasise), whether the settlers are plotting both South and North of the Zambezi. Indeed one suspects, to some extent, whether the Rhodesian-Katanga pressure group has not also interlocked the probable return of Tshombe to Katanga with some overall plan. A report in the lunatic right wing paper in Salisbury "The Citizen" carried a report (20/3/64) referring to the military might of South Africa, and he reports that "A big part of this military might of South Africa, enough to face any eventuality, is solidly behind Southern Rhodesia, I was told." Later the reporter claims that "if the future were to bring the country (S. Rhodesia) face to face with the threat of military interference, South Africa will not hesitate to throw its might on our side." He claims also that he was told by an unspecified person that: "If and when your Government feels they need our military assistance, all they have to do is ask."

With a man described as "an apartheid man" now the Prime Minister in Southern Rhodesia, one cannot ignore the various possibilities and dangers of the moment. It looks as if Mr. Field resigned because he was not prepared to lead his country to a unilateral declaration of independence; it seems that Mr. Smith is prepared to do so. It is likely that this would be followed

by press and radio censorship, an increase in the franchise halting all likelihood of progress towards majority rule, the implementation of separate development and the ending of all multi-racialism with the arrest and detention of all possible opponents—including no doubt the Governor

Labourers Strike

Continued from page 1

on any talks. They will expect this report within a three-week time limit. This seems to be a very unsatisfactory basis for a return to work. Who is to do the negotiating if the men's unions are not even on the National Negotiating Council? Even though I think the employers concede this point, they are sure to resist any pay increase. In fact some of the contractors are saying that the return to work is unconditional and that the present agreement remains in force.

The whole basis for the unions' recognition of the strike seems to have been a method of getting the men back to work. They did not show the least concern when the differential rates were negotiated. The labourers thought differently. They wanted no more widening of the pay differentials. Already there has been increases in these, last year's building settlement is one example, and it is to the labourers' credit that at least there is a section of the industry fighting it. They should be receiving the support and backing of the other workers in the industry.

Even the Communist Party supports differentials in the building industry and has even given a percentage that labourers should get for each pay rise. At this rate the differentials will get wider and wider. This is no way to bring unity in the industry, a thing the Communist Party is always shouting for, for differentials only divide men one against the other. Workers in the exhibition and building industry should try to close and eventually eliminate differences in pay. The labourers in the exhibition halls and supply shops have taken the first step but further action will be needed by them and the rest of the workers in the industry to achieve parity of wages. The labourers have threatened to strike again if their demands of 2d. per hour and union representation are not met.

BRISTOL DOCKERS GET RESULTS

Dockers at Avonmouth and Bristol have recently been on strike, claiming special rates of pay for unloading a difficult cargo. The dispute started when 60 men walked off the Israeli ship "Geffen", which was carrying a cargo of "hard packed" potash.

Two days later the rest of the dockers at Avonmouth stopped work in sympathy and this led to a total of 21 ships being held up. While efforts were being made to effect a settlement both by the employers and the men's union, the T.G.W.U., dockers at nearby Bristol joined in the dispute. Employers offered to put the case before the National Conciliation Council, but in the meantime the dockers should resume work. The union leaders agreed to this proposal but it was turned down by the strikers. Arbitrators' proposals of a double piecework rate were also rejected by the dockers.

A comrade from Bristol has informed me that a leading local official of the Transport and General Workers Union, actually went down into the hold of the ship and showed the dockers how to handle the cargo. He said he didn't know what all the fuss was about, the cargo was easy to unload.

After being out for a week, the dockers decided to return to work following what has been described as a "stormy meeting", and to await the result of new arbitration. It seems that the new arbitrators were unable to agree and so a neutral umpire, Mr. J. L. Thomas, lecturer in industrial relations at Bristol University, was appointed. He has awarded an increased rate per ton and an extra £1 per half-day of unloading, which is in line with the dockers' claim.

This gives the dockers who are unloading this "hard packed" potash a substantial pay increase. After all, if cargoes are difficult and involve extra effort, then the employers should pay, but it needed a strike to get it. This new rate is established now and for unloading any future cargoes of this type, dockers will be paid at this rate. The sympathetic action of the dockers soon made for a settlement of this dispute.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

P.T.

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

Soviet Agriculture and Peasant Affairs (ed. R. D. Laird 60/-) Soviet Russian Imperialism V. S. Mamatey 12/- REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS The Golden Calf Ilf and Petvov 21/- My Old Man's a Dustman Wolf Mankowitz 16/- The Future of Mankind Karl Jaspers 14/-

SECOND-HAND

A Land Jacquetta Hawkes 5/-; The Wall John Hersey 3/-; The Opinions of Anatole France Nicolas Segur 4/-; The Forgotten Ally Pierre van Paasen 4/-; The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy J. L. Talmon (paper-back) 7/6; Quatre-foils James Barr 5/-; The Industrial and Commercial History of England James E. Thorold Rogers 5/-; Sexual Ethics Robert Michels 5/-; Boston Upton Sinclair (damaged) 6/-; The Fallacy of Saving John M. Robertson 3/6; The Merchants of Death (1936) H. C. Engelbrecht and F. C. Hanighan 5/-; The Necessity of Pacifism (1937) John Middleton Murry 3/6.

PERIODICALS

Peace News 6d.; Socialist Leader 4d.; Freethinker 6d.; Direct Action 4d. New Left Review, No. 26 3/6 Reason, No. 1 1/- Yeah, No. 7 (A look at the White Problem) 1/9 Limbo (Surrealist), No. 1 & No. 2 each 2/- Anarchist Youth, No. 5 6d. Solidarity, Vol. 3, No. 3 6d. Region 2/- American Rationalist, January (Postage extra of course) 3/6

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

IT is approaching Walpurgis night for our Town-based brahmans, and the ominous sharpening of fish knives mark the gathering of the cliques as they line up for the final struggle for control of your Tate Gallery. Sir John Rothenstein the present Director of this lush office since 1938 is due for a personal appearance at his nearest unemployment exchange and the Prime Minister must, within a month or so, name the successor. Of all our national galleries the Tate is the easiest to run for odd though these words may read the Tate is a gallery that requires neither wit nor aesthetic appreciation on the part of those who govern to make it fulfil its functions.

Unlike the national Gallery that deals in reputations Sir Henry Tate's gift to his customers is a fairground for those whose personalities have won them a following and its walls are a huckster's heaven. There within this seventy-year-old stone pad of the original sugar daddy, the pseudo with his manifesto and his pressure group, the man with talent, and the fawning hack of the influential art committees can find an audience willing to accept them by virtue of the fact that they have been chosen to hang upon the walls of the Tate. Yet this is as it should be, for the Tate is the mirror of our public culture and a Director should be duty bound to show that upon which our society has placed its seal of approval. It is the nation's junk shop of the arts and the Director's task is to provide a swiftly changing side-show for the Town. Protests have been made that the National Gallery and the Courtauld Institute have syphoned off some of the best known work, yet there is little to complain of when a Renoir, a Manet or a Whistler have joined the illustrious dead at Woburn or Trafalgar Square for as long as the good, the bad and the gimicky catch-penny are allowed to swan around the walls of the Tate in a glorious mixture of talent and charlatanism the Director has fulfilled his function.

It is idle to believe that a painting by Salvador Dali has any lasting value and one would despise any small gallery that wasted money on a Dali work for its permanent collection, yet the Tate is justified in buying a Dali painting and delighting the Town by showing it as long as that gallery accepts its function as the muck-raker of the arts. The walls of the Tate cover too vast an area to pretend that taste and good breeding shall be its criterion, for quantity is its keynote and the spectator must of necessity be forced to make his own assessment of the work before him. But the tricksters and the con-men of the

arts with their parasitical dealers breed like mosquitoes upon the scum of our society and their artistic life is relatively just as short. They clown for the amusement of the gelled and the vulgar and their equivalent of the pop singer's golden disc is to be purchased by the Tate Gallery for a brief exhibit.

Sir John Rothenstein has made a reputation as a guardian of our cultures merely by sitting on his arse and letting it flow in and around him. It is a negative act that has won a nation's grateful thanks for this little man with the air of a clerk, the fawning smile of

power and from his headquarters at the Institute of Contemporary Arts he has long learned the lesson of who is and who is not of value as water boy in the rat race. From New York we are offered the name of Lawrence Alloway, now fighting in the colonies, and the thought of that Guggenheim Museum squatter swooping through the lofty halls of the Tate like unto a berserk canary will cause many a London lip to whiten. For myself I would choose David Sylvester a man of taste and sensitivity of quiet charm and a ready wit. This stout and bearded critic is one of the few men writing today who approaches the work of the painter with understanding and humility, a failed painter in his own right he has always considered the painting itself as worthy of his final judgment and though always marching in line with the avant garde he has never become involved in the stupid quarrels of rival personalities. But Sylvester is the painter and not the politician's choice so we can dismiss his chances. For the rest it is assumed that Lawrence Gowing will grab the crown for he has all the attributes to appeal to the Hogs and the Homes. Historian, head master, academic painter now sweating out his second year as a trustee at the Tate what more could he offer in the way of references for even George Brown would accept these qualifications.

Round the Galleries

a Disney sub-character and the calculating eye of a scrap metal dealer has never sought to be the arbiter of our taste and by default he has won our thanks for he has given the people who visit the Tate the one thing that every other institute denies them and that is the right to make a personal choice between good or bad. If Sir John Rothenstein has made mistakes it must surely be in the purchase of work from artists whose prices no longer bear any relation to their merit and the £45,000 paid out for a pleasant but unimportant abstract by Matisse was in my view money wasted. With that money Rothenstein could have gambled on the future of at least a hundred young and unknown painters but the Matisse is big and pretty and it gives an unneeded piece of name dropping for the catalogue compilers. But Rothenstein is on the way out and the politicians of the art establishment are busily ward-heeling for the vacant job. Each man heads his own pressure group for there is room at the pork barrel for sympathetic friends and many a phoney artistic reputation will be made or marred by the man who first gets his foot inside the office of the Director of the Tate. Bryan Robertson the director of the White-chapel Gallery carries the torch for the younger artists and his lower middle class background and love of the racous and the shockmaking type of exhibition, married to the bare-foot boy start in the art racket, while endearing himself to the spiv element within the arts will not find favour with our present Prime Minister. The name of Roland Penrose has been battered about and he is a man who has long padded the corridors of

power and from his headquarters at the Institute of Contemporary Arts he has long learned the lesson of who is and who is not of value as water boy in the rat race. From New York we are offered the name of Lawrence Alloway, now fighting in the colonies, and the thought of that Guggenheim Museum squatter swooping through the lofty halls of the Tate like unto a berserk canary will cause many a London lip to whiten. For myself I would choose David Sylvester a man of taste and sensitivity of quiet charm and a ready wit. This stout and bearded critic is one of the few men writing today who approaches the work of the painter with understanding and humility, a failed painter in his own right he has always considered the painting itself as worthy of his final judgment and though always marching in line with the avant garde he has never become involved in the stupid quarrels of rival personalities. But Sylvester is the painter and not the politician's choice so we can dismiss his chances. For the rest it is assumed that Lawrence Gowing will grab the crown for he has all the attributes to appeal to the Hogs and the Homes. Historian, head master, academic painter now sweating out his second year as a trustee at the Tate what more could he offer in the way of references for even George Brown would accept these qualifications.

FREEDOM

April 26 1964 Vol 25 No 13

Good Future for Contented Cows

Continued from page 1

situation regardless of questions of social status and human dignity? If this is the case, anarchists can help to reverse the trend, it seems to us, not by seeking to draw away the revolutionary elements from the workers' movement, and thus leaving it even more at the mercy of the professional negotiators (while at the same time achieving very little with a revolutionary organisation which represents an infinitesimal section of the working class), but by working within the Unions as anarchists, supporting the day-to-day demands for improved working conditions and a larger slice of the cake of production while at the same time using every opportunity that presents itself to underline the ephemeral nature of legalistic methods and of wage increases, so long as the people do not control the means of production and the land and other sources of natural wealth.

Less than half the working community in Britain belongs to a Trade Union. While it is true that among the 58 per cent. outside the Unions are individuals who are militants and who either have a "conscientious objection to belonging or are not eligible, let us be realistic and recognise that we shall find more revolutionaries among the "organised" 42 per cent. than among the other 58 per cent. apart from the fact that 8 million organised workers are a potential force against the *status quo* which 11 million unorganised workers are not.

★

ANARCHISTS have a more important part to play in the Trade Unions than ever before—at least so far as the affluent nations of the West are concerned. For if the Trades Unions have become, as it were, part of the Establishment it is because the "prosperity" of the working class is as much the concern of the ruling class, as it is of the Trade Union leadership. As one TU apologist for the "closed shop" pointed out in a BBC programme the other night, many employers "welcome" it—that is 100 per cent. trade unionism—obviously because they then know where they stand and are not involved in struggles between the workers themselves. At the same time we read of Union leaders who oppose the limitation of Company profits on the grounds that it was against the interests—the "prosperity"—of the workers! It seems to us that such a chaotic situation is a golden opportunity for anarchists to drive home to the workers the anarchist arguments which expose and transcend the petty interests both of boss and "boss' man".

The *raison d'être* of capitalism is, as ever, production for profit. The giant strides made in the field of technology during World War II in the interests of "bigger and better" destruction could not suddenly be turned off like a tap when man eventually stopped slaughtering man, and the problem which has faced the industrialists in the post-war years has been that of productive potential outstripping purchasing power on a scale undreamed of in the pre-1914 or the inter-war years. In an effort to expand markets for the industrial nations all kinds of financial expedients have been resorted to; at home it is the Hire Purchase facilities, and for the have-not countries long term loans and "aid". But this is not a new

solution. Britain was doing just this in the 19th century, and just as the long term effect was to create, as Cole puts it "powerful rivals to the British producer . . . and bitter rivals in the remaining markets of the world", so the industrial development of the undeveloped countries today can only be viewed as a stop-gap solution to the problem, which, if anything, will blow up on a much bigger scale than ever in the not distant future.

The industrialists and their economic "experts" are obviously aware of what is building up. We believe they have discarded war as either a solution or even a regulator, whatever they may think of the effectiveness of a cold-war economy. And because, in this writer's opinion, financiers, industrialists and politicians no less than CNDers, Committee of 100 and anarchists, want to go on living, an H-bomb war in which to all intents and purposes the whole of mankind is wiped out will be discarded—because by destroying mankind, capitalists, politicians and industrialists included, does not solve the problems of capitalism.

★

WHAT then are the kinds of solutions one may expect in the next fifty years under a capitalist system? We foresee an intensification of monopoly on an international scale in order to streamline production of specific commodities to levels which have a relation to "demand" (industrialists denounce *nationalisation* but have no objection to take-overs, Common Markets and other monopolistic measures and set-ups. Where's the difference? Is it not significant that a Dr. Beeching is as much at home as boss of a nationalised industry as he was as boss of Imperial Chemicals Industry?) We also foresee that workers will enjoy a greater purchasing power, will work fewer hours (with new industries thriving on the exploitation of leisure) and that the unemployed members of society will have a New Deal. All that the Trade Unions of the past struggled to achieve for their members will be done by the employers' corporations automatically not out of love for workers, but in the interest of profits and privileges. The only snag in this utopia of contented cows will be that though everybody has all the gadgets, the services and the time-consuming pastimes that man's ingenuity can think up, the world will be suffering from a chronic shortage of food or will capitalists have found by then how to make food production as profitable as the manufacture of useless gadgetry?

We have attempted to present a picture of the Capitalist future because we believe that only by seeking to foresee what our rulers have in store for us and concentrating our propaganda on the real dangers can our efforts be used to their best advantage. And this applies with added force to the Trade Union movement which has the power, if only the rank and file could be made conscious of it, to halt the trends we have outlined—or at least those which will result in the concentration and consolidation of Power, economic and political, in huge international combines—and seek to direct the great discoveries, the "breakthroughs" in the fields of science and technology towards satisfying the basic needs of all mankind.

THE GREAT Train Robbery wound to its last reels. Twelve men were sentenced to a total of 307 years imprisonment. The judge said that their crime, in its enormity, was the first of its kind in the country. "I propose to do all within my power to ensure that it will also be the last . . . Your outrageous conduct constitutes an intolerable menace to the wellbeing of society. Let us clear out of the way any romantic notion. This is nothing less than a sordid crime of violence inspired by vast greed". . . .

THE GREAT Tax Robbery played again to a rather bored House. Mr. Reginald Maudling held up the smoking and drinking public for another £1,514 million which it is estimated is enough to subsidize the combined violence of the army, the navy and the air force. . . .

MR. BASIL DE FERRANTI who, it is reported, made 63% from a contract on Bloodhound Mark One, has decided not to be so vastly greedy and will adjust the price on Bloodhound Mark Two. The amount of profit estimated by the Ministry on Bloodhound Mark One is £4.9 million on a contract price of £11.7 million. From this must be deducted £357,000 for excess cost of materials. . . .

ACCORDING to the *Daily Express* the Great Train Robbery netted £2,631,784 of which £336,534 was recovered. The cost of the trial and investigation are estimated at £226,000 and the cost of keeping the convicted in jail £140,000. The judge at the trial, Mr. Justice Edmund Davies was described by the *Express* as a "humanist rather than a psychologist" and the judge is recorded to have said to the Magistrates' Association in October, 1963, "There are those who talk as though the sole object of punishment is the reformation of the accused. That is so exceptionally benevolent as to be capable of being positively mischievous". . . .

IT IS RECORDED by the *Guardian* that the longest sentence in recent years have been for spying: Blake—42 years; Lonsdale—25 years; Mr. and Mrs. Kroger—20 years; Vassall—18 years. At Nuremberg Von Schirach was given 20 years for participation in the deporting of Jews from Vienna; von Neurath under

Millions Necessary

DEAR COMRADES,

Derek Stubbs' letter on the Monk Street Gathering (FREEDOM 11/4/64), though clearly and persuasively put, is a typical example of the political puerility which has sabotaged the Committee of 100 and anarchist movements far too long.

Let me start by saying that my desire to see the RGSs removed is no less intense than Derek's. Listening to him in Great Smith Street was very moving; I wish I could find the issues so clear cut and catalogued, but unfortunately there are some political realities which must be taken into consideration before we enter the anarchist bloodbath and the realms of revolutionary martyrdom and fame.

Derek Stubbs is living in a world of splendid isolation. His call for action, though emotionally appealing, lacks rationality, worse, he is indulging in the futility of futilities—demonstration for its own sake. The RGSs will be removed and the Free Society created only when mass political consciousness of working people has reached saturation point. His sporadic minor riots by disgruntled intellectuals gets you just where your political immaturity deserves—behind bars. And if and when the time is ripe for demonstration, then it wouldn't be a bad idea if the participants decided *beforehand* on a course of action instead of humming and hawing and standing around looking vague. Looking back now the Monk Street fiasco seems even more ludicrous. There were some sitting, others bobbing up and down, not quite sure which posture to assume, the majority standing and smoking fags while the hotheads (pacifist and militant) fought out the war of words. Then someone bellowed "To the Houses of Parliament!" and the sheep trotted off *en masse*, the "young anarchists" who shout "no leaders!" one minute and follow them like bovine cows the next—all looking like a flock of film extras about to engage in the Rape of Greater London.

Don't get me wrong. I was against the use of violence at Monk Street, not so much because of moralistic pacifist motives, or because violence is authoritarian, or even out of respect for the Committee of 100 pleas for non-violence, but simply because violence at the time would have been suicidal and, most of all, strategically inept. The success of any demonstration should be gauged by

OUT OF THIS WORLD

whose authority war crimes and crimes against humanity had been committed received fifteen years. Sir Alexander Paterson once said "it requires a superhuman to survive twenty years' imprisonment with character and soul intact." The *Guardian's* leader said "Apart from the scale of this crime [the mail-train robbery] there is nothing unique about it, and the sentences seem out of proportion with everything, except the value of the property involved." Dr. Donald Soper said "There is nothing that makes me hotter under the collar than the miserable and dreadfully un-Christian thing which has been done in sentencing these men to thirty years' imprisonment. I don't tell you I am in favour of robbing mail vans—it is a dastardly thing, but if Methodists and Anglicans could get together, we might thrash out and work out what we believe is Christian punishment." The Home Office announced, the day after the mail-train sentences that a Royal Commission is to be appointed to review the whole field of penal practice—its purpose and effectiveness—in England and Wales. No such comprehensive study has been made since that of the Gladstone committee in 1895. . . .

PROTESTS HAVE been made about the imprisonment of the Reverend Charles Stimpson (74) and Lily Lee to six months for their part in the Ruislip demonstration. Both are in a poor state of health and were imprisoned for refusing to be bound over. Lily Lee

has been refused leave to appeal. It was stated in the hearing of Ruislip incitement charges that the police in making arrests, had in each case searched the premises without a search warrant. Papers seized in one raid were produced in evidence, but notebooks removed from Pat Arrowsmith's flat were not so used but they were not returned to her until after the trial. . . .

TWO MEMBERS of Plaid Gymru (the Welsh nationalist party) were fined £5 each for painting on a wall at Merthyr "Lift the T.V. Ban on Plaid". They alleged that canvassers for the Labour Party had informed on them. When asked "Did you deface the wall?" one of the defendants said "I don't think so. People have expressed the opinion that the painting improved the wall. I think it has. For an amateur I think it is quite good. I haven't had much experience in these things." Cross-examined by Mr. Hamilton, for the prosecution, who asked him what right he had to paint on the wall, Williams said, "There is a precedent." He referred to the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel, in which the fingers of a man's hand wrote upon the wall of Belshazzar's palace as a warning to the King. . . .

THE POST OFFICE did not strike, the Housing Minister did not say, "Any minister is honestly wicked", Mr. Krushchev did not die, the Williams family were misunderstood and *Sanity* was mistaken in attributing to Alex Comfort verses implying that he was in favour of the vote; they say "Dr. Comfort, who is of course well known for his anarchist views, tells us that he has been embarrassed by queries as to whether he has now changed his opinions about the Labour Party. He has not. We apologise for the difficulties we have inadvertently caused him". . . .

IN THE *Sunday Express* on April 5th there was an account of a private luncheon given by I.C.I. at which Mr. Harold Wilson was present and, after stating that the brandy was mellow and the cigars were of the finest value, said that "he had no plans to grab the I.C.I." The luncheon was one at which the I.C.I. "discreetly entertained V.I.P.s"

JON QUIXOTE

LETTERS ON MONK STREET

the following standards (i) its influence on public opinion; (ii) its influence on government policy; (iii) its effect on the movement. The Monk Street Gathering was a failure in all three respects and would have been disastrous had we resorted to violence. Not only was there nothing to be gained, but the appeals for violence were prompted simply by emotional frustration and, I suspect, a sheer animal lust to have a blood-letting ceremony with the cops, especially after that insipid and impotent Trafalgar Square rally.

I'm sorry if I'm being something of a killjoy, but it's just because I believe that the corner-stone of capitalist society is the factory bench and it is here that we should make ourselves effective. Demonstrating at RGSs is only rubbing away at the symptoms of a deep-rooted and all-infecting cancer. Derek condemns benign bosses, but his actions will lead to nothing less—or more. The ruling class will tremble and twitch not at the sight of spasmodic rioting by dissident students but by the spreading of discontent among all strata of society. This may sound very similar to the Communist Party line, but let me seek sanctuary in the wisdom of Bakunin: ". . . Several hundred well-intentioned young men, when organized apart from the people of course do not constitute an adequate revolutionary force . . ." Very apt. Minor conspiracies, he writes, "would be confined to mere intentions, being too impotent to attain their goal since they would never be able to draw in more than a very small handful of workers . . . the vast majority of millions of proletarians . . . are necessary in order to overthrow and destroy the political and social order which now crushes us." And very wise too.

He even goes as far as to deny the theory of, popular spontaneity: "An elemental force lacking organization is not the real power . . . the question is not whether the people have a capacity to rebel, but whether they are capable of an organization enabling them to bring the rebellion to a triumphal end" The effectiveness of direct action is relative to the degree of nation-wide support that exists. And remember this: there is a time for preparation and for execution—a construction for destruction

if you like. Even Eliot says it: "In order to arrive there, to get from where you are not, you must go by a way wherein there is no ecstasy". Our most effective weapon at the moment is not physical violence but the spoken word.

Only the blow that is planned and premeditated will shatter the framework that spontaneous action cannot even shake.

Edinburgh, April 15 BILL JAMESON.

Beyond repetition

DEAR FRIENDS,

Reference . . . "The C of 100 has gone in for the same old tractics of co-operation with the police, open-ness, rigidity of organization and cultivation of respectability". . . .

The value of the Committee of 100 has been in that through its open-ness and fluid organization—and all to often its very poor organization—there has been an acceptance and a willingness to listen to some of the things that people taking part in civil disobedience demonstrations—taking part in non-violent action at bases—had to say.

The failure of the various Committees has been, in my view, to develop so that new working groups in each locality sprang up; so that social issues like housing and education, work and leisure, civil liberties and authority, were discussed and acted upon where necessary. There has been too little thought given to setting up co-operative libraries on radical, libertarian ideas i.e. like those mentioned by Harold Drasdo in the current ANARCHY; and so take the thought on pacifism and anarchism beyond the mere repetition of dogmas—the same applies in the field on non-violent revolutionary thought (i.e. it must be revolutionary to attempt such other forms of political action outside of parliament. Non-violent action: in a democratic society beholden to parliament).

Perhaps we shall have the courage in the near future to develop local projects which will be long term—designed to change the structure as much as to knock the police or government, for whilst knocking such authority must be seen to be done so must there be fumbings towards fresh schools and workshops, new groups based on the community, new bookshops carrying our ideas as well as having poetry and song, discussions and demonstrations.

London, April 14. DENNIS GOULD.

'The Anarchist'

THE EDITOR, "FREEDOM". Following the suggestion made at the Bristol conference, Birmingham Anarchist Group will continue the publication of "The Anarchist".

The exact details of the scheme have not yet been worked out. But as we have through the Birmingham College of Commerce Anarchist Society the means of duplicating and/or photocopying, we feel we are in a position to produce the journal either at regular intervals or, as copy is available.

It is intended that "The Anarchist" should be a serious theoretical journal (though this may be altered or widened with future issues) discussing all aspects of anarchist thought and activity. The views expressed shall be the views of the individual writers, whose names (not initials or pseudonyms) shall appear with the articles concerned.

As this journal will be operated on the basis of workers' control, its editors will have final say in publication of both articles and letters. However, we shall endeavour to cut or refuse articles as little as possible, except in the case where publication may lead to (a) Libel; (b) The editors' prosecution; (c) Incomprehension on the part of the reader (clarity please); (d) When articles are too long for publication.

We hope to be self financing, but we may have to put the journal on a subscription basis. Any finance: P.O.'s or cheques will be gratefully received (made payable to me).

I have requested the present holder for a copy of the circulations list of previous copies. If anyone does not wish to receive a copy for any reason please write as soon as possible—controversial correspondence with reference to the journal publication should be accompanied by a stamped envelope and should state whether for publication. Nothing will be published without the writer's consent but if this is not refused we will presume it has been given.

Any constructive suggestions will be gratefully received. Please to note:

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

PETER KROPOTKIN
 Revolutionary Government 3d.

RUDOLF ROCKER
 Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN
 Towards a Free Society 2/6

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

"The Anarchist" is not a newspaper but a discussion forum with the intention of aiding anarchists in understanding each others views and opinions, and has no intention of usurping the functions of FREEDOM, ANARCHY, Direct Action and other news vehicles.

Yours fraternally,
 Peter Neville,

for Birmingham Anarchist Group.

Only Anarchy is Order

DEAR COMRADE,
 I have been asked by the Anarchist Conference to examine the possibilities of co-operating with other organisations; in order to hold a continuous four day demonstration.

It has been suggested that this could take the form of a Wethersfield to London March, and I would appreciate your views and any alternative suggestions.

The reasons that the Anarchist Federation of Britain feels that the 1964 arrangements at Easter were inadequate are:

The intended mass demonstrations lost their effectiveness due to the dispersed nature of the demonstrations. As was apparent from the small number of demonstrators at Ruislip, and the comparatively small number at the Easter Monday Rally, such fragmented efforts do not raise the enthusiasm of a four day march. The resultant ineffectiveness of these types of dispersed demonstrations gives the press and news organs a good excuse to write the unilateralist cause off.

I think personally that not having a march undermines the moral of those who support disarmament in the more inaccessible parts of the country, who have to work all the year round alone or in small groups. In ever increasing numbers they have come to an Easter March, meeting people who live in the same area as they do, that they might

not have met if it was not for such a large scale gathering.

I also think that the long and uninteresting rally at Trafalgar Square could be dispensed with and a large scale demonstration could be held. Possibly outside, since we shall presumably not be admitted, the New Ministry of Defence or Parliament.

If you feel that you or your group are interested in any such ideas could you contact or write to:—

The Convenor,
 Easter March Committee,
 Anarchist Federation of Britain,
 22, Hampton Road,
 Bristol, 6.

I would also like to point out the march cannot run on nothing and would appreciate physical, monetary as well as verbal or written support.

Yours fraternally,
 M. WALSH,
 Bristol, 18th April

Where its needed

DEAR COMRADES,
 In most of the issues of FREEDOM appear articles relating to events occurring in particular parts of the country. This is especially applicable to the Industrial Notes. Unfortunately the paper does not get to the people it most concerns and the men on strike at certain factories do not know of our opinions and the fact that we are in sympathy with them.

I feel that it is important from a propaganda point of view that we endeavour to get the paper to these men.

What it needs is for comrades to be willing to sell the paper, or even give it away outside factories in their area that are in dispute. It would be interesting to hear if other comrades have any ideas along these lines.

I personally thought that if interested comrades let Freedom Press know that they were willing to undertake this work, a bundle of say 50 current papers which contained an article applicable to their area could be sent to them for distribution.

Yours fraternally,
 G. J. TURNER,
 London, S.W.6: Apr. 19.

'Work to Rule'

COMRADES,

The description given in the leading article of last week's FREEDOM of the threatened postmen's action and the power workers' dispute is incorrect. It was not a "go-slow" that the postmen threatened or the power workers operated, but a "work-to-rule" which includes a ban on overtime.

Although the "work-to-rule" is often described as a "go-slow", especially in the national press (also the Socialist Leader), I was surprised to see the term used in FREEDOM. An article in FREEDOM (No. 5, Feb. 9th, 1963) called "Reflections on the Work-to-Rule", sets out the difference. A go-slow is an entirely different thing from a "work-to-rule" and consists of deliberately slowing up the production, while the latter is operated by sticking to the rules and regulations laid down by the management and union.

Yours fraternally,
 P. GEORGE,
 London, S.W.6. Apr. 19.

JOIN THE LFA?

Will comrades wishing to form Groups in London (or who have already done so) and wish to join the London Federation of Anarchists, please get into touch with The Secretary, at 17a Maxwell Road, S.W.6.

INDIVIDUALISTS

Any readers in the London area who are interested in meeting to discuss individualist anarchism are invited to contact: S. E. Parker, The Stables, 7 Spencer Hill, London, S.W.19.

HELP! HELP!

The Sit Down or Pay Up Fund.
 Donations urgently required to pay outstanding fines from Easter demonstrations.
 Send to Jeff Robinson,
 c/o Freedom Press,
 NOW.

PROPOSED GROUPS

HAYES & DISTRICT ANARCHIST GROUP
 Contact Mike Wakeman,
 12 Hoppner Road, Hayes, Middlesex.

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, Manchester.

MERSEYSIDE
 Details from Vincent Johnson, 43 Millbank, Liverpool 13. (STO 2632).
 Every Saturday 2.30.
 Outside Lewis's paper-selling.

SHEFFIELD
 Peter Lee, 745 Eccleshall Road, Sheffield.

Tyneside Federation
 Enquiries H. D. Nash,
 10 Simonside Terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne, 6.

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.

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.

Last Thursday in month:
 At George Hayes', 174 McLeod Road, S.E.2.

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)

WILL CND LISTEN?

At an open forum at the Conway Hall last Saturday, discussion revolved around the way in which the CND is progressing. Despite appeals by Michael Howard, Adam Roberts and a few others to "let's all work together and ignore the wicked troublemakers", a few home truths came out from the speakers. George Clark indicated how

much back-stabbing and pre-election crawling is going on amongst the Labour Party supporters in CND and its Executive. Despite the "moderates" objections it seemed to be an overwhelming feeling, ably pointed out by Maurice Patterson, Kent CND and Martin Grainger, "Solidarity" group, that "Steps to Peace" should be uncompromisingly rejected and CND should return to clear unilateralism, and all that it logically entails (e.g. leaving NATO). The average unilateralist is sick of the political chicanery being conducted to dull CND's voice so that it is no longer a menace to the Labour Party's equivocal defence policy.

About 250 people were there and one thing should be learnt from the organisers' unwillingness to impose themselves on the forum, that is that an agenda and a clear discussion basis is necessary to achieve anything and protect the audience from the waffle of some people who really don't like to see their position in CND challenged.

A final resolution was sent to Carthusian Street flatly rejecting "Steps to Peace" as a CND policy. It is hoped this will start groups reappraising the situation inside and outside CND throughout the country.

Bristol. M. J. WALSH.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT APRIL 18, 1964

Week 16	
EXPENSES: 16 weeks at £70	£1,120
INCOME:	
Sales & Sub. Renewals:	£
Weeks 1-15	745
Week 16	33
	778
New Subscriptions:	
Weeks 1-15	70
Week 16	6
	76
	854
DEFICIT	£266

DEFICIT FUND

Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; J.L.* 3/-; Solihull: K.D. 5/-; Brooklyn: B. 7/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* 10/-; St. Helena: S.S. 6/8; Hartford: M.A. £2/4/8; N.Y.: A.S.* 7/-; Less: 11/6 credited in error.

TOTAL £4 1 4
 Previously acknowledged £255 15 4
 1964 TOTAL TO DATE £255 15 4

*Denotes Regular contributors.

FINGS

Funds Wanted
 Anarchist Federation of Britain needs cash for purchase of duplicator, etc. Cash, cheque, etc., to Jan Wallis (Treasurer), c/o 5 Colville Houses, London, W.11.

Sellers and Agents Wanted
 for "Anarchist Youth". Apply Martin S. Gilbert, 10 Dansecroft Flats, Breat Street, Hendon, N.W.4.

May Day Meeting
 Libertarian Platform, Hyde Park, Friday, May 1st, 3 p.m.

French Libertarian Camp
 Utilabus hired from 7th August to 22nd August. Shared cost. Seats still available. Details, Albon, 55 Station Road, Hailsham, Sussex.

Bung Wanted
 Bristol Federation would like back the screw-tap taken from the cider barrel at the Conference Social. If not, could we have some money towards it as we don't want the ill will of a libertarian publican—an almost extinct species!

If you care a Tinker's Cuss
 Come to Hyde Park, Speakers' Corner, May 3rd at 3 p.m. for "Justice to Itinerants" meeting to be followed by Irish Embassy picket. (Rained off from last week, see "Freedom" 18/4/64).

Film Shows
 Did you know that there are film shows every Sunday night for anarchists and/or... For details ring: FLAxxm 5277.

Country Cottage
 Nr. Sudbury, 3 bedrms, v. low rent. Several share? Contact F. Hirshfield, 4 Albert Street, NW1.

Craftsmen's Co-operative
 Craftsmen are wanted to provide products for a collective outlet in Portobello Road, London, leading perhaps to co-operative workshops. Weavers, glass-blowers, silversmiths, etc., contact Frank Hershfield, 4, Albert Street, N.W.1.

If you think
 that your 'fings' are worth inclusion in this column let us know...