

# Return on Easter Monday

AT THE COMMITTEE of 100's Public Assembly at Downing Street last Saturday, a letter to the Prime Minister was read out to a small crowd of supporters and passers-by before being handed in. It urged Mr. Wilson to take the initiative in ending the nuclear arms programme, withdrawing troops from Malaysia, to 'Use any influence you may have with President Johnson to urge the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, and seek to restore order in that country and in South-East Asia generally, without the kind of "gun-boat diplomacy" that has led to torture and massacre of men, women and children with the connivance of supposedly civilised states.'

The letter gave notice to Mr. Wilson that the Committee of 100 would return on Easter Monday for a reply from him and his Ministerial colleagues. If they fail to give a reasonable undertaking to do something concrete about these things, then the Committee will continue 'the campaign of non-violent resistance to war, putting our case at by-elections, in factories, at military bases and elsewhere.'

After the letter was handed in by a deputation, the police, who had cordoned off Downing Street, started moving people on, they went up to Horse Guards Parade where, under cover from the rain, a committee member addressed a small crowd. The police informed him that it was War Office property and he could not speak and so the meeting broke up.

### RESOLUTIONS OR ACTION

Although the assembly lacked organisation, it did show that some people were ready to act for themselves. They were not going to ask Wilson to do something and leave it at that, but are prepared to carry on a campaign against the sort of policies that Labour Government intends to follow. This was not at all like the proposals of Lord Brockway and 'left wing' Labour MPs at the Central Hall meeting called by the Movement for Colonial Freedom. They called for pressure on Wilson by resolution and Trade Union and Party branches, etc. In fact the usual answer of the politicians.

There is one major complication in respect of the proposed action of returning to Downing Street on Easter Monday. This was pointed out in the leaflet by the Chairman of the International Sub-

Committee, for the Communist Party have plans of their own for Easter Monday. They have planned the usual type of demonstration at the United States Embassy. This type of thing has happened before and there might be a case for going on to the American Embassy after the visit to No. 10. 'Forewarned is forearmed. We cannot allow an essentially non-aligned demonstration to be prevented for the power-political purposes of either side.'

P.T.

## Whatever Happened to Frank Cousins?



## Too Many Strings

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S OFFER of a billion dollars for economic aid for South East Asia is a red herring which will probably never come to pass. All the fuss in American right wing circles about 'Buying Peace' is phoney too, for the Americans have no intention of stopping the war in Vietnam other than through the surrender of the Vietcong and the acceptance of the right wing military government.

If talks are held, Johnson or his men will meet delegates from China and North Vietnam, but not from those actually taking part in the fighting (Vietcong).

How typical this is of the arrogance of governments everywhere. America and China meeting to decide the fate of the ordinary Vietnamese peasant, you can bet that they will really have his interests at heart.

This comes about either as a consequence of the American government believing their own propaganda (I suppose that by now they have convinced themselves that every single member of the Vietcong is a Chinese, or at least North Vietnamese communist) or just wishing to prolong the war for some other purpose. Perhaps they still believe in spite of everything that they can win the war by sheer force of arms.

### STRIKING ATTITUDES

Not that the communists have anything to be proud of in this affair. Mao Tse Tung is neither interested in ending the war or giving economic aid. He is just striking militant poses so as to be thought of as the friend of Asia. He says a lot but actually DOES very little. It's all very fine to talk of British

*'Throughout history, the potential good which advances in knowledge have placed in men's hands, has almost always been vitiated by their actual use in the service of the ruling groups in society. And so it will be with the atom bomb. Fears about the future will not be allayed by the pious resolutions and political shifts. Treaties about atom bombs are not likely to be given any more respectful attention than the other scraps of paper which have decorated political history. It is time scientists faced up to their responsibilities in such matters. If they groan at the cruel desolations their ingenuity has inflicted on suffering millions, then let them refuse to put their brains and their labour at the service of the political groups which seldom use science to better the lot of the workers, but never hesitate to turn it to their own ends in war.'*

Marie Louise Berneri, in FREEDOM, January, 1946.

IT DID NOT take the Anarchists ten years to work up an opposition to nuclear weapons. We did not have to wait until 'the other side' had the hydrogen bomb before we discovered the threat to humanity in the possibility of thermo-nuclear devastation. When the world was given the dreadful tidings of the atom bombs on Japan in August, 1945, the Anarchists of Britain did not cheer, as did the Labour Party and the Conservatives and the Liberals and the Communists and the Christians supporting a 'Just war'. Nor did

we fall for the specious argument that the Bomb had shortened the war and thus saved human life.

Although we did not know then what was afterwards exposed—that the Japanese High Command already knew it had lost the war and was suing for peace—we knew full well that the atom bomb had not been developed as a boon to mankind, but simply as one more weapon in the hands of a nation State to be used against the ordinary people of the world in the struggle for and maintenance of power.

### NOT ISOLATED

One more weapon . . . a more terrible weapon, certainly, and one which extended, almost to infinity, the power of governments to destroy people, a power which had been gradually developed over the centuries from fire and sword to bows and arrows, muskets and cannon, rifles and artillery, machine guns and the tank, the plane and the bomb—and THE Bomb. The culmination of authority over humanity.

It is not an isolated phenomenon. The Bomb is not something that just happened out of the blue. It is the latest in the line—and because of the possibilities of what could happen in a nuclear war, it may be the end of the line for humanity. This, and this alone, is what gives nuclear weapons their special significance. This, and this alone, is what has moved respectable churchmen, who have blessed bombers loaded with 'conventional' bombs, and patriotic politicians, who have cheered on the ground troops in 'ordinary' wars and 'police actions', to join in respectable exhortations to their government to please do something about the Bomb.

It has been futile. From the one State which had the Bomb in 1945, membership of the club has now grown to four, with a fifth knocking at the door. Three are avowedly capitalist and Christian ('Brotherly Love') countries, one of the four and the fifth are Communist ('International Brotherhood') countries. What they all have in common is the readiness and the ability to destroy the world if their power is seriously threatened.

The politicians have of course taken notice of the exhortations. In an electioneering poster the Conservatives cynically showed a demonstrator sitting down with a CND 'lollipop' while they claimed to have organised a test-ban treaty, which as we all know will be ended the moment one of the nuclear powers wants to start another series of tests. The Labour Party pretended to be interested in abandoning Britain's independent deterrent while it was cadging for votes, but now it is in power is soft-peddalling the issue.

### POWER TO DESTROY

The Labour volte-face, of course, is not new. The late Aneurin Bevan, when leading the 'Bevanite Revolt' in the early fifties, played with anti-bomb sentiments, but when an election drew near and he thought Labour stood a chance and he might

become Foreign Secretary, he changed his mind and stated that no statesman could 'go into the conference chambers of the world naked'.

He was right. No State's man can. The continual bargaining, tensions and crises between States is, after all, power politics, and the pre-eminent role that the nuclear powers play in world politics is based, not on any moral supremacy or any greater concern for the well-being of the peoples of the world, but purely and simply on their ability to destroy the peoples of the world.

The simple fact is that no State voluntarily gives up any of its power. The fallacy in the respectable Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament lies in the fact that its leaders—and its followers—have believed the opposite.

The CND has believed that the British Government will listen to moral arguments. True, most of its supporters have not really believed that the Conservatives would do so, but they thought the Labour Party would. This is not so, has never been so (at least since 1914) and now never will be so. The Labour Party in power has to operate the British State in the world of power politics, and cannot denude itself of the trappings of power. If Aneurin Bevan out of power could see that, how could Harold Wilson in power think differently?

Readers may draw their own conclusions about the honesty of these gentlemen. We here are not concerned with that. What we are arguing is that what has to be taken into account is the nature of the State, and our contention is that wars will not cease and the terrible weapons that are thrown up in wars will not be abolished until the institutions that depend upon them are abolished.

### THE ANARCHIST ARGUMENT

This is something that has dawned upon many anti-bomb militants during the last five years. Just as many anti-war militants of 1939 were anarchists by 1945, so many thoughtful opponents of the Bomb in 1960 had become anarchists by 1965. The logic of the argument is inescapable, and led to the development and use of essentially Anarchist methods of direct action by the Committee of 100, and the recognition that only the Anarchist philosophy meets the situation today.

Who needs the Bomb? The State. Who makes the Bomb, who pays for it, and who will perish by it? The People. Never before has the conflict of interest between State and People been so stark and clear.

The Anarchists therefore do not appeal to the State to give up its power—neither do we deceive ourselves that any different individuals in the offices of superficial power within the State will be able to act differently even if they wished to.

The Anarchists appeal to the People to take that terrible power away from the State. We appeal to the scientists to withdraw their services and apply their knowledge to the elimination of the scourges of mankind; we appeal to the workers to withdraw their labour from the making and distribution of the engines of destruction. We call for a boycott of the State, its anti-human powers, its bureaucracy, its shabby bribes.

We call for the ordinary people everywhere to pull out from under—to take control of their lives—to establish the conditions where we can look to the future of mankind without fear.

We know what we are saying. A seemingly impossible task it may be. But we make the wealth of society. We make the wheels go round. And if we so wish we can make them run on another tack. If we so wish.

P.S.

## ANARCHY 50

## ANARCHISTS & THE COMMITTEE OF 100

## Discovering Malatesta

NOW ON SALE

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

# Books!

## NEW BOOKS

Rebel in Paradise Richard Drinnon 44/6  
 Come Out to Play Alex Comfort 16/-  
 Growing up Absurd Paul Goodman 21/-  
 Anarchy and Order Herbert Read 16/-  
 The Anarchists James Joll 35/-  
 Anarchist Thought in India  
 Adi H. Doctor 18/-

## REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Mr. Lydward's Answer Michael Burn 12/6  
 The Death Ship B. Traven 3/6  
 Communitas Paul and Percival Goodman 12/-  
 Anarchism George Woodcock 7/6  
 Revolution: Five Centuries of Europe  
 in Conflict (ed.) Charles H. George 6/-  
 The Political Philosophy of Bakunin  
 (ed.) G. P. Maximoff 25/-  
 Homage to Catalonia George Orwell 3/6  
 The Ego and His Own Max Stirner 15/-  
 The Art of Loving Erich Fromm 4/6  
 Fear of Freedom Erich Fromm 7/6  
 The Sane Society Erich Fromm 12/6  
 Does God Exist? Sebastian Faure 1/3  
 The Root is Man Dwight MacDonald 4/6  
 Socialism and State Rudolf Rocker 1/3

## REMAINDERS

William Thompson Richard K. P. Pankhurst 5/-  
 A Hundred Years of Revolution  
 (ed.) George Woodcock 5/-  
 No Gold On My Shovel Ifan Edwards 1/6  
 The Barns Experiment W. David Wills 3/6  
 Pierre-Joseph Proudhon George Woodcock 12/6  
 Postage extra on order under 20/-

## 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

## 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.

E. MALATESTA  
 Anarchy Paper 1/-

PROUDHON  
 What is Property? cloth 42/-

ALEXANDER BERKMAN  
 ABC of Anarchism paper 2/6

HERBERT READ  
 Poetry & Anarchism paper 2/6

ALEX COMFORT  
 Delinquency 6d.

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

RUDOLF ROCKER  
 Nationalism and Culture  
 cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN  
 Towards a Free Society 2/6

JOHN HEWETSON  
 'I'-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

E. A. GUTKIND  
 The Expanding Environment  
 (illustrated) boards 8/6

GEORGE BARRETT  
 The First Person (Selections) 2/6

# Refusing Rates

I HAVE ALWAYS thought of rate-payers as the people who charge large rents for small rooms and try to stop local authorities from doing anything worthwhile, so it came as something of a shock, back in 1963, when I found that by signing a lease I had become a ratepayer myself. Before I go any further, I should explain how the local property tax called the 'general rate' is calculated.

First, the powers that be fix an arbitrary sum which your property could theoretically raise every year; this is called the 'net annual value' or 'rateable value'. Then they add up the rateable values of all the properties in the area, and decide what proportion of the total they will take; this is called the 'rate poundage' because it is expressed as so much in the pound. In 1963, the Hampstead rate was 7s. 9d. in the pound—Hampstead ratepayers paid Hampstead Council 7s. 9d. for every pound of the rateable value of their property. The rateable value of our flat is £154 (though the annual rent is nearly three times as much), so our rate came to just under £60. This annual debt to the local authorities gives them power over us, because they can force us to pay it; but it also gives us power over them, because we can force them to force us.

## OUR FIRST CASE

In September and October, 1963, I got rate demands for the ten months from June, 1963 (when we got our flat) to March, 1964 (the end of the financial year), amounting to £49 14s. 1d. I was about to write out the cheque, when I looked at the back of the demand form where they must by law explain how the rates are used, and I noticed that of the 7s. 9d., 0.38d. went to Civil Defence and 9.8d. to the Metropolitan Police. This happened to be the time when the Hampstead Civil Defence Corps were fighting hard not to admit that they were no damned use to anyone living in Hampstead, and when the Metropolitan Police were fighting hard not to admit that they had framed demonstrators during Greek week. I decided to see what happened if I refused to pay for the people I was against in each of these quarrels, so I deducted £5 8s. 11d.—4s. 1d. for Civil Defence and £5 4s. 10d. for the Metropolitan Police—and paid the rest.

At first the Council was just puzzled. The Borough Treasurer explained that rates 'must be paid in full, and no deductions can be made in respect of services which ratepayers consider that they have not received'. I explained that my deductions were not made in respect of services which I considered I hadn't received: 'In the case of Civil Defence, it is a service which I cannot ever receive, because of the position of Hampstead and the con-

dition of Hampstead's Civil Defence. In the case of the Police, it is a service I have received too much of and have paid too much for during the last few years.' He threatened that if I didn't pay up, 'proceedings will be taken for recovery'.

Then the Council got annoyed. In December, 1963 I got a Final Notice, which I ignored, and in January, 1964 I got a summons to attend the Hampstead Magistrates' Court on February 13. I began working hard. I studied the law of Civil Defence, and the attacks made on the Civil Defence system. I studied the law of the Metropolitan Police, and the story of the bricks case. I studied the law of rates, and the story of Andy Anderson's case (see *Solidarity* Vol. II Nos. 3 and 5, and *Solidarity Pamphlet* No. 9). I studied the law of magistrates' courts, and my rights in my case. Then on February 12 I served a subpoena on Brian Wilson (the Hampstead Town Clerk and Civil Defence Controller) to give evidence on my behalf the next day. The legal people at Hampstead Town Hall promptly got my case adjourned for a month.

This suited me fine. I spent the time serving some more subpoenas—on Leslie Stroud-Osborn (the Hampstead Civil Defence Officer), on Sidney Torrance (a Tory Councillor and the Chairman of the Hampstead Civil Defence Committee), on Jack Cooper (a Labour Councillor and a member of the Hampstead Civil Defence Committee, and the Labour Parliamentary Candidate for Hampstead), on Joseph Simpson (the Metropolitan Police Commissioner), and on Henry Brooke (the Minister responsible for both Civil Defence and the Metropolitan Police, and the Tory MP for Hampstead). The subpoena on Brooke was actually invalid, because Members of Parliament and Ministers of the Crown are privileged; but it was fun serving it—I think he thought I was going to assassinate him. One interesting thing was that the only person who was really nice was Sidney Torrance, and the only person who was really nasty was Jack Cooper (who was so cross that I told him not to come after all); there's a moral in that.

I also spent the time raising some support. The case was well reported in the *Hampstead & Highgate Express*, *Peace News* and *Sanity*. I told the local CND branch and the local Committee of 100 group. And I persuaded some friends to come to the court with Ruth and me. Just before the hearing, I paid the Council £5, so that I owed them only 8s. 11d., and I signed a memorandum giving all my possessions to Ruth, so that they wouldn't be able to take anything from the flat.

At the hearing on March 12, the Clerk of the Court—a nasty piece of work called George Spiller—tried to bully

me into silence from the start. He began by asking me if there was any reason why a 'distress warrant' shouldn't be issued for bailiffs to seize my possessions, and I began by telling him that according to the law I first had the right to show why I hadn't paid all my rates. He repeated his question, and I repeated my answer; I added that I had just given all my possessions to my wife, so I had none to seize; I also asked for proper facilities to conduct my case—a table and chair—as my lawyer would have if I had a lawyer. He refused, but he did begin to obey the law. The Borough Treasurer gave evidence that I had paid all my rates apart from the 8s. 11d.; I noticed that he didn't take the oath, which seemed odd. At last the Clerk of the Court asked me why I hadn't paid the rest, and I told him I couldn't explain properly without calling witnesses to give evidence about the services I hadn't paid for. He asked who I wanted to call. I named them, one by one, explaining what I wanted each one for, but each one was refused. In the end the Clerk told the Magistrates to issue a warrant, but I refused to leave the court until I could put my case properly. Two policemen grabbed me and dragged me out. It was a lot better than Trafalgar Square, though an American friend was shocked by it all.

Outside the court, I apologised to my witnesses for wasting their time, joined my friends, and talked to a reporter. As I had disappeared from the court, I had shouted: 'Thanks for the justice, you cunts!' This appeared in the headline to the brief report in the *Hampstead & Highgate Express* as: 'Thanks for the justice, you chaps!' There was also a brief report in *Peace News*.

A few days later, the bailiff came round with a distress warrant to seize my possessions. He apologised for disturbing me, read my memorandum of gift, thanked me for my trouble, and left empty-handed. In April I got a summons to attend the Hampstead Magistrates' Court on May 14, to show why a commitment warrant should not be issued for me to be imprisoned. Just before the hearing, I paid up, and that was the end of my first case. Our second case had already begun.

NICOLAS WALTER.

Next week: our second case.

## NOW READY!

## Malatesta: His Life and Ideas

V. RICHARDS

309 pages and 16 pages of illustrations.  
 Cloth 21s. Paper 10s. 6d. Freedom  
 Press, 17a Maxwell Road, London,  
 S.W.6.

Special rates to FREEDOM readers  
 ordering now direct from Freedom  
 Press: Cloth 17/6 and paper 8/6 post  
 free.

# Of the Weak and the Strong

(Continued from last week)

THE 'CRIMINAL' in modern society is one who in attempting to satisfy his wants, uses forms of trickery or violence which are not sanctioned by the law. If he uses 'intimidation' he does so without hypocrisy. He is a much misunderstood figure. He may be, and often is, a schoolboy whose pocket money is inadequate to buy all the thousand and one delights that the advertising world tries to persuade him that he cannot possibly do without. Generally his criminality is quite temporary; he grows out of it and settles down to be a more or less law-abiding citizen, unless he is unfortunate enough to be sent to an approved school or borstal where he learns to identify himself with some sort of 'criminal world'. The criminal is generally an inadequate creature; he often lacks any special talent. He is all too susceptible to the pressures of contemporary society in the way of being greedy and acquisitive, but lacks the capacity of postponing his gratifications until he can lay his hands on the boodle—legally.

It is all very well for those who are snugly well-protected in their lives, those who like work, those who don't want to be flash, to despise the criminal. He is often a thug because he is so powerless. Ravachol at his trial for murder claimed that dynamite was the weapon of the weak: so one might say that the puny weapons of the robber are those of the weak. I, with my formidable weapons of education, intelligence and cunning have always managed to lead a fairly satisfactory life without being imprisoned for criminal offences, and so have many friends and acquaintances of mine with a similar armoury of weapons. We are the strong. But the unfortunate individuals who by heredity and the chances of environment have unlucky combinations of inadequate abilities with ill-organized appetites—they are the weak. The police, prisons and the whole legal machinery can be regarded as originating largely as a device for protecting the rich from the poor, and being perpetuated as a device for protecting the strong from the sporadic outbreaks of the weak.

It may seem to some people as odd that I should categorize even such robbers as hold-up men, who occasionally get away with large sums of money as 'the weak'. Yet it is because they

are weak that they have to resort to coshes and stolen Jaguars to pursue their profit. Their counterparts on the legal side of the fence have all the resources of the State's power in their pursuit of profit, and the State protects their retention of the boodle. That criminals as a class are weak, the victims of a society which perpetually martyrs them in a ritual manner from their youth up, is no new idea. Many people will be aware of the philosophical ideas of Durkheim, who not only recognized that criminals were helpless victims of social forces which controlled them, but asserted that they conferred a benefit on society. In Durkheim's view, the benefit was that of suffering martyrdom—by the ritual of punishing a certain class of men in a conspicuous and cruel manner society clarified its legal prohibitions in a way that was unmistakable.

To say that criminals are the weak in society is simply to contrast them with the prosperous strong. They are by no means the only class of weak people in our form of society. It has been said that power corrupts, but I know of an equally corruptive thing: powerlessness. The law-abiding poor are corrupted by their weakness. We no longer have 'the poor' in all the spectacular dirt and squalor of half a century ago; certain minimum standards apply. The poor eke out their ineffectual lives and bring up their families in a meagre and pinched world. All around them there is conspicuous waste, an orgy of lavish production and spending in which they can only participate vicariously. It is no surprise that if for a brief period of his life the son of a poor home can lay his hands on better wages than his dad, most of it goes up the spout in his form of conspicuous consumption.

It is asked, why in a time of comparative prosperity and higher wages for young people are the criminal acts of young men on the increase rather than lessening? The answer is, I think, that the weak are not quite content with their weakness as long as there is a class differential based upon money, so the weak will try sporadically to emulate the strong. The fact that their weapons are inadequate and their struggles mostly doomed to failure accounts for most of the permanent population now sleeping three to a cell.

## ANARCHIST FEDERATION OF BRITAIN

Co-ordinating Secretary: Frank Hirshfield, 4 Albert St., London, N.W.1.

## London Anarchist Group

"Lamb and Flag", Rose Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2 (near Garrick and King Streets: Leicester Square tube), 7.45 p.m. All welcome

## SUNDAYS

APR 18 No meeting  
 APR 25 Philip Sansom  
 The Messianic Mission of the Working Class.

## HYDE PARK MEETINGS

As from April 25 (Sunday), 3 p.m.

## NOTTING HILL ANARCHIST GROUP.

Secretary N.H.A.G., Flat 3, 5 Colville House, London, W.11. Meetings 2nd and 4th Thursday of each month at above address.

## REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS

**BIRMINGHAM ANARCHIST GROUP.** Details of meetings from Peter Neville, 12 South Grove, Erdington, B'ham, 23.  
**BRISTOL FEDERATION.** Regular fortnightly meetings. Details from Ian Vine, 3 Freeland Place, Hotwell, Bristol, 8.

**CAMBRIDGE ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact V. Madge, Newnham College.  
**DUNDEE GROUP.** Contact Mike Mallet, 20 South George Street, Dundee. Meetings Saturdays 2.30 p.m.

**EDINBURGH ANARCHIST GROUP.** Correspondence Secretary: Douglas Truman, 13 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh, 3. Meetings every alternate Monday at above 7.30 p.m.

**GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP.** Correspondence: Joe Embleton, top Left, 11 Baliol Street, Glasgow. Meetings at Horseshoe Bar, Drury Street, Tuesdays at 8 p.m.

**MANCHESTER GROUP.** Fortnightly meetings held. For information contact Alan Barlow, 25a Duffield Road, Irlam o' the Heights, Salford, 6.

**MERSEYSIDE FEDERATION.** Enquiries: Vincent Johnson's, 43 Millbank, Liverpool 13.

**ORPINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP.** Knockholt, Nr. Sevenoaks, Kent. Every six weeks. Next meeting Sunday, April 11, 2.30 p.m. at Greenways, Knockholt. Phone: Knockholt 2316. Brian and Maureen Richardson.

**OXFORD ANARCHIST GROUP.** Contact H. G. Mellor, Merton College, Oxford.

**SOUTH WALES.** Irregular meetings held. Enquire Peter H. Morgan, 15 Pursefield Place, Roath, Cardiff.

**SURREY ANARCHISTS** are invited to meetings on the first Thursday of every month at Chris Torrance's (63 North Street, Carshalton, Surrey—please ring three times) and on the 3rd Thursday of every month at M. Dykes, 8 Court Drive, Sutton, Surrey. Both meetings 7.30 p.m.

## PROPOSED GROUPS

**EDGWARE-ELSTREE and District.** Planning discussion meetings and activities. Contact Colin Seal, 8 Oakwood Drive, Edgware or Anthony Frewin, 31 Burghley Avenue, Boreham Wood.

**THANET.** For information contact Peter Davey, 14 Fitzmary Avenue, Westbrook, Margate, Kent.

**NOTTINGHAM.** Anyone interested contact Peter Bowden, Flat 2, 11 Rectory Road, West Bridgford, Nottingham.  
**SOUTH BEDS., NORTH HERTS., HITCHIN, LETCHWORTH, BIGGLESWADE, BEDFORD.** Anyone interested forming a group contact Peter and Maureen Ford, 102 Stolford Road, Arlesley, Beds.

**NORTH-WEST ESSEX.** Close to W. Suffolk, S.E. Cambs. and N.E. Herts. Contact Robert Barltrop, The Old Vicarage, Radwinter, near Saffron Walden.

**HULL & YORKSHIRE (East Riding).** Anyone interested in forming anarchist group contact R. A. Baker, 6 The Oval, Chestnut Avenue, Willerby, E. Yorks. Phone: Hull 58543.

## OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

3rd Wednesday of each month at Jack Robinson and Mary Canipa's, 21 Rumbold Rd., S.W.6 (off King's Rd.), 8 p.m.  
 Last Thursday in month: At George Hayes', 174 McLeod Road, S.E.2.

2nd Friday at Brian Leslie's, 242 Amesbury 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.

3rd Saturday of each month at Sid and Pat Parker's, 2 Orsett Terrace (off Gloucester Terrace), Paddington, W.2, 8 p.m. (Please ring second bell from top.)

# We Told You So!

THIS week-end the seventh CND March is taking place. There is probably some occasion for joy in the mere fact that we are here at all to take our constitutional exercise, but the fact that we have confounded the more morbid harbingers of doom and seem to have confirmed the more optimistic supporters of the bomb brings no joy, for we would have to plunge into a full nuclear war to confirm or deny their theories.

However, it may seem to some superfluous that they should have to march at all, with a Labour Government in power. A Government committed (well almost) to disarmament. On the other hand there are those who feel that to march at all is, to use a fine nautical expression, to rock the boat. That the boat appears to be sinking or at least keeling over and has several leaks is irrelevant to some but not to others on the march.

The anarchists worked for several months before the elections, running a campaign against voting. This was described by *Sanity* as 'grotesque'. How 'grotesque' can be judged by the record of the Labour Party in office. The only retort we can make now and it is an infuriating retort, an unconstructive retort, but a thoroughly deserved retort, is 'WE TOLD YOU SO'.

## PERVERTED IDEALS

We warned that any government would betray its election promises. We warned that any government would commit exactly the same crimes and be subject to the same faults as its rival. We warned that any government in power would compromise, temporize and pervert any ideals they may have expressed during the election campaign; all, mind you, from the highest motives. Indeed, in some cases without the knowledge that such compromises, such temporizing and such perversions were taking place, or even when they took place, it was not noticed what has happened.

There is nothing like a spell in the House of Commons to transform one of US, into one of THEM. The whole function of the House of Commons and the apparatus of State and Government

is something far removed from human life in society as we know it.

It was especially interesting for London anarchists who had concentrated on the Fulham area to watch the transformation of 'their' member Mr. Michael Stewart (an expert on housing we were assured at the election) to the Ministry of Education and then (after the debacle of Patrick Gordon Walker) to the Foreign Office. We did not know we had such a talented and versatile a member; we did not know either that we had such a reactionary member. We are glad we did not vote for him and are very glad if we managed to persuade others not to vote for him.

In this world it is desirable, as Camus says, to be 'neither victims nor executioners'. We may, willy-nilly be the victims of a nuclear war started in Vietnam but we, at least, have not given our consent, by a voter's cross, to the execution of the peoples of South and North Vietnam.

## WHAT COULD BRITAIN DO?

But what, it might be asked, could Britain do otherwise? What could Michael Stewart do but voice his 'concern' about Vietnam and then back up the Americans? Precisely. In this rests the whole of the anarchist case. Power does not lie in Parliament; Labour, Conservative, Liberal and Communist as the government may be, political and military power rests elsewhere and the casting of a vote is the mere indication of a wish that things would happen in a preferred direction.

There is the inevitable talk that the Labour Party has betrayed the voters. This is untrue, the voters betrayed themselves by voting. Once they had given up their power to the Wilsons, the Homes, the Grimonds and the Gollans, those politicians are free to do whatever they can with the brief and limited power they are given.

The real power to which the voter has access, is the exercise of his own will to associate freely with his fellows to secure the kind of society he requires.

JACK ROBINSON.

# 'Seven years of Marching Against the Bomb'

-Sanity

TSR2 was scrapped in the midst of a budget which stopped the paying for business men's entertaining, except for foreign buyers, and made it more complicated for business men to make profits. However, Mr. George Brown, First Secretary of State, interviewed in *Director*, the journal of the Institute of Directors, said (according to the *Guardian*) that business men have more hope of making progress and money under a Labour Government than they had before. By business men he meant people who were making and selling real things 'not the spivs who are just cashing in'. The prospects were better under a Government that was picking priorities, deciding just how much to allocate for overseas investment. 'For any dynamic business man this must be better than the archaic system up to the present.' Those directors he had met clearly agreed with him what ought to be done 'at least as far as running the country's economy is concerned.' 'After all I'm willing to get myself in trouble from time to time with my left-wing. Why shouldn't some of them (business men) risk getting into trouble with their right-wing?'

PATRICIA MCLAUGHLIN, a Tory MP, accused the pacifists in the Labour Party of being responsible for the scrapping of TSR2. Orders up to £357 millions have been placed for America's F-111A aircraft.

SIR ALEC DOUGLAS-HOME, a Tory MP claimed that the Conservatives had forced the Government to turn 'at least a semi-somersault' on both immigration and defence.

THE TEXT of the Government's Race Relations Bill was published, in which it has not been thought fit to interfere with a landlord's choice of tenant or a landlady's choice of a lodger. Religious discrimination is excluded from the bill, and the operative clause 'a place of public resort' will not include schools or private clubs. Sir Bernard Waley-Cohen, former Lord Mayor of London, said 'The Jewish community in this country has lived very happily on good terms with their fellow citizens. This new legislation may well end this by

damaging these good relations by projecting a sense that Jews are different from others'. Mr. Robert Nunes Carvalho, past president of the Anglo-Jewish Association, said the Association has always opposed legislation of the kind now proposed, and said 'I don't think the Jews stand in need of protection in this country and I don't think this Bill will be of any use in any case'. Mr. Leonard Stein, a lawyer, felt dubious about the Bill's legal effectiveness or even its sense. He believed it might give the wrong impression of the Jews' position. 'And,' he asked 'I wonder what would happen under the Bill if Jews expressed resentment at the words of "St. Matthew's Passion"?'. A Vatican spokesman stated that the Pope meant no offence to the Jewish people in a sermon in which he said that the Jewish people 'when Christ came, spoke and showed himself, not only did not recognise him, but fought against him, slandered and injured him, and finally were to kill him'. Lord (né Fenner) Brockway 'thanked Harold Wilson and Frank Soskice (Home Secretary) for introducing the Bill although regretting the exclusion of private lodgings and multiple lodging houses; the omission of any provision against the refusal to lease or sell houses or flats to coloured people; and also the failure of the bill to include a provision making it illegal for employers to refuse a coloured person a job. A spokesman for the gypsies is seeking enlightenment as to whether the bill includes protection for them against discrimination.'

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY introduced the Associate Movement of the Union Movement which aims to send all immigrants back where they came from. Two of his supporters at the inaugural meeting were from Lagos, Nigeria and the West Indies, both coloured. The Nigerian is, it appears, a convert from hostility to Mosley and says 'a lot would go back tomorrow if they could, and for half the wages'. But neither of these founder members of the Movement intend to go back. *The Thunderbolt*, the magazine of the National States Rights Party, proclaims that 'scientists say negro still in ape stage', and that Jefferson believed negroes should be deported to Africa. Mr. William Buckley, editor of the *National Review* (USA) said that Mrs. Liuzzo, who was shot in Alabama, deliberately courted disaster by sitting on the front seat of her car with a Negro. 'She got shot as might have been expected.' He praised the police at Selma and commiserated with their lot. His audience (of 6,000 New York policemen) roared approval.

THE POPE HELD out the hand of friendship to unbelievers, setting up a new secretariat to establish 'a dialogue' with atheists, agnostics, sceptics, and communists. This is in line with the late Pope's policy of extending a friendly hand to 'all men of goodwill'. *The American Atheist* magazine is to be re-titled *The American Freethinker*. The village of Chobham decided by a public opinion poll of 64 to 55 that a dog can be a Christian.

SIR ROBERT MENZIES, the Australian Prime Minister, said that America's intervention in Vietnam was 'the greatest act of moral courage since Britain stood alone at the beginning of the Second World War'. Mao Tse Tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, speaking to Arab leaders of the Palestine Liberation organization said, 'Don't tell me you've read this or that in my books. You have your war and we have ours... America cannot defeat us in a non-nuclear war. The days of nuclear war are gone.' Clare Hollingworth in the *Guardian* described the press-gang methods of the Vietnamese Army and reported that some members of the Viet-

nam general staff 'say openly (though generally in French) that this is a war between Peking and Washington which unhappily for them is taking place on their soil'. 'The elaborate propaganda the Americans are putting out does not take us in'. The Americans tell the Vietnamese, 'It is your war, we are here only to help. You must get on with it yourselves.' In the *Village Voice* (New York), a Captain in the US Medical Corps writes a reply to David McReynolds, a pacifist on 'The Abominable Necessity of the War in Vietnam'. He approves of American intervention but writes 'Who's getting hurt from this game of political ping-pong? Only the people in that town. Do they support the Vietcong or the Government? Chances are they don't know too much about either. They pay taxes to someone in uniform one day and the same taxes (different money) to someone in another uniform the next... What about this villager whose village doesn't belong to him but to the military force currently in the area? He has two governments competing for his allegiance, and he doesn't know too much about either. Nor does he really care. If free elections were held in this country (Vietnam) today he wouldn't vote. If forced to vote, he'd vote for the man who promised to let him grow his rice the way he pleased.'

JON QUIXOTE.

## End of the Line?

AT A MEETING on 9.4.65 union officials informed the men working at the goods depot that 300 men will be laid off by June. The goods they handle will go to St. Pancras depot. There are no jobs at St. Pancras for these men, some of whom have been there for forty years. The news has been given without any warning at all. So the men have gone on Work-to-Rule.

The men are of the opinion that the Government has betrayed them. The Union too. The strike is unofficial. Recently 78 men were moved to the Cross after the fire at Bishopsgate goods depot. The Railways must have known that the Cross was to be closed some time ago.

It seems a case of the Unions and the LABOUR Government doing the dirt on these men in a fantastically brutal way.

Many of the men will find it difficult to get jobs as they are no longer young. Is this how Labour dumps the Beeching Plan?

J.S.

## Contact Column

**Accommodation—London.** Anarchist 18, seeks cheap accommodation with others. West London preferred. Contact A.M., 28 Sun Street, Haworth, Keighley, Yorks.

**Work Wanted.** Student librarian wants profitable work from April 12 to 24 in London area. Write Jim Burkitt, 87 Shepherds Lane, Leeds, 7.

**London Accommodation.** Couple and son (two years) seek 2/3 unfurnished rooms, North London. Box 8.

**Pen Pal Wanted.** Sixteen-year-old male anarchist wants young pen-pal active in ban-the-bomb movement. Reed Shetler, 320 Smith Avenue, Morgantown, West Virginia 26505, USA.

**Books in French.** Several hundred French books, partly paperbacks, Maupassant, Zola, Anatole France, etc. Also a large number of excellent text books. What offers? Please write to Pax House, 17 Melville Road, Hove, 2.

**Bronia, Mac and Cat (N.H.A.G.).** Want a furnished (unfurnished) or semi-furnished flat near Fulham or Paddington. Any offers or suggestions. Phone: McDonald, BAY 1306. Evenings.

**Agony.** Will C.W. (Taunton) please ring Weston Zoyland 240 some week-end? Agony. Will Vikki Kirkness late of Hull get in touch with Mrs. C. B. Saville, Hull. Confidences respected.

**Porton.** Support for Porton Germ Warfare Picket. All those interested please contact Richard Harvey, 6 Folkestone Road, Salisbury, Wilts.

**Intelligent, tolerant lady** required to look after two Anglo-Indian boys 3½ and 4½ and house—good accommodation provided. Write Gill, 204 Stafford Street, Walsall, Staffs.

**Cuddon's Cosmopolitan Review.** A fortnightly anarchist journal of art and literature wants contributions—drawings and so on. Address 283 Gray's Inn Road, W.C.1.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

## NOT SATISFIED

Dear Comrades,

Stuart Christie! I don't know how many anarchists are pummeling their pillows through the weary night stretches and wondering what can be done in a positive way. Covered in feathers, I had a shot at it myself, and apart from writing to Stuart once a week, sent some off, with the following results:

**MPs.** The MP for Glasgow did not reply. The MP for Swansea West, Alan Williams, did. He said that he was contacting the Foreign Secretary.

**Harold Wilson.** He doesn't answer letters, but his secretary has a shot at it. I don't know the secretary's name. The signature cannot be read. But I'd be hearing, etc.

**George Brown.** We all know how he hates Spain.

**Franco.** He must have run out of ink. I haven't heard a word from him.

**The Governor of Carabanchel Prison.** He obviously can't write letters, because no reply has been received.

**Amnesty International.** One representative said that Stuart's crime was 'not political', but the Secretary wrote to say that things are no too bad in Carabanchel Prison. They get remission for Saints' Days and National Holidays. Amnesty did not think Stuart would serve twenty years.

**International Commission of Jurists, Geneva.** The sentence was tough, sure enough, but I might try Amnesty International, because the Commission didn't handle this sort of stuff.

**Society of Friends (Quakers).** They will look around for anybody who is going to Spain, and ask them to look into things.

So here we are, buddies, out in the cold and Stuart still inside those stone walls. Anybody for a rescue party?

It is pretty obvious that none of the usual agencies want to know about Stuart and his plight, and I have the impression

## LETTER

that this is because anarchist remains a dirty word.

It is not enough to send money to Stuart and picket the Spanish Embassy. What we want is some concrete action to get things moving. The Spanish authorities let Joan Bryden, convicted of complicity in a murder case, out and she is now back in this country. I have no doubt at all that Stuart was framed for some reason, and despite the Foreign Secretary's declaration in a letter to Alan Williams, MP, that a declaration of guilt was made in open court, I'm damned if I'm satisfied.\*

Interest in Stuart's plight has been falling away. It's amazing that anarchists can sleep at night with an easy conscience. Let's get going on this thing and really stir things up. The only aim is to get Stuart out—now!

Fraternally,  
FREDERICK OUGHTON.

Swansea, April 2nd

\*The editors think that the question of guilt or innocence is irrelevant.

## Footnote:

Frederick Oughton and other readers may like to know that from a personal letter received from Stuart we understand that his sentence stands at nine years at present, with the possibility of a further reduction of a maximum of 4½ years. Stuart is also preparing a plea for clemency based on a misunderstanding at the trial due to his ignorance of the Spanish language at the time. We understand from Stuart that the lawyer who defended him at the trial is helping him prepare his plea and so far has received no payment whatsoever for his services. The stipulated fee is something in the region of £1,000 (although the lawyer does not expect to be paid in full) and Stuart has asked us to try to raise some money to send him. Steps are also being taken to get support from appropriate people from this country to support Stuart's plea. (We are not at liberty to quote names.)

The Christie-Carballo Defence Committee has been in touch with various MPs who pledged support and also with the Foreign Office. The general view is, however, that no action should be taken which might prejudice Stuart's plea for clemency. Naturally, if the plea fails our efforts will be redoubled.

M.S.

## MAKE SURE OF YOUR ANARCHIST JOURNALS BY SUBSCRIBING!

### Freedom WEEKLY

Price 4d. Every Saturday except the first in each month. (40 issues per year.)

**BY POST:**  
1 year (40 issues) 20s. (U.S. \$3)  
6 months (20 issues) 10s. (\$1.50)  
3 months (10 issues) 5s. (75c.)

**SPECIAL RATE FOR 2 COPIES:**  
1 year (40 issues) 30s. (U.S. \$4.50)  
6 months (20 issues) 15s. (\$2.25)

**BY AIR MAIL:**  
1 year (40 issues) 45s. (U.S. \$7)

**FREEDOM by AIR MAIL, ANARCHY**

### Anarchy MONTHLY

Price 2s. (2s. 3d. or 30c. by post)  
Appears first Saturday of each month.

**BY POST:**  
1 year (12 issues) 25s. (U.S. \$3.50)

**BY AIR MAIL:** 1 year 47s. (\$7)

**JOINT SUB. FREEDOM/ANARCHY:**  
1 year 40s. (\$6), 6 months 20s. (\$3)  
3 months 10s. 6d. (\$1.50)

**2 COPIES OF EACH:**  
1 year 63s. (\$9), 6 months 31s. 6d. (\$4.50)

**by SURFACE:** 1 year 65s. (\$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 Phone: RENown 3736

# Industrial Action Against War

**E**VEN WITH THE newly elected Labour Government, we are still as far away from nuclear disarmament as we were under the Tories. It was thought that the Labour Party would at least get rid of the independent deterrent, but its servile support of the American policy in Vietnam has further illustrated the futility of giving support to this Government. Trying to get a solution to these aspects of war through political action has been a complete waste of time and energy. If and when Vietnam has been negotiated out of the way, some other trouble spot will flare up into a crisis, bringing misery and death to the inhabitants of the particular country and at the same time perhaps threatening a world nuclear war.

## THE INDUSTRIAL SUB-COMMITTEE

Over the years that the nuclear disarmament movement has been in existence, we have often heard the cry that we must have the support of the industrial workers, who will take strike action not only against nuclear weapons but also against war. Efforts along these lines have been attempted with, I think, a certain amount of success. Pat Arrowsmith worked very hard on Merseyside and did gain a certain amount of support, enough in fact to get building workers out on a one-day token strike on the site of a Petrochemical factory. Some dockers have also refused to handle goods going to Aldermaston.

At this time, May 1962, there was also in existence an Industrial Sub-Committee of the Committee of 100, doing work in the same field. Regular meetings were held in the London docks, CAV at Acton, and at a large building site in Victoria. This sub-committee also published a leaflet, 'Against All Bombs', which was given out in Moscow at the Congress for Disarmament and Peace. This leaflet went to the very heart of the matter. 'The class which dominates production, controls society. It decides policy and, despite the democratic facade, en-

forces it through its State apparatus. Until the ordinary people are free in production, they cannot have any effective say in the decisions of war and peace, life and death. Only a society with inhuman relations in production could produce these monstrous weapons.' The leaflet pointed out that both the USSR and Britain have 'the same monstrous weapons'. This puts the ordinary people of every country in the same boat and our struggle is an international one against our respective States. Although the sub-committee has folded up, I think there should be more effort along the lines this committee pursued.

## DON'T RELY ON LEADERS

It is the ordinary worker whom we have to involve in our anti-war struggle. The past has shown the utter uselessness of getting the support of the trade union leaders. For years now, Mr. Cousins, of the Transport and General Workers' Union, now a member of the Government, has been making statements in favour of nuclear disarmament, but no action has come from him. Never once has he brought the members of that union out on this issue, and the traditional 'left wing' of the Government is as useless—all talk and no action. It is time that this lesson was learnt, for over and over again we see the futility of relying on leaders. This is illustrated in the political field and is being increasingly recognised in industry in the struggle for higher wages and better conditions.

It is the organisations at shop floor level through the shop stewards' committees, on which we have to work. I feel there is already a considerable amount of support but the tragedy is that it is often directed into political channels. It is these allegiances which come first, but I think this can be changed. The example of unofficial rank and file action on the wages front is one which achieves results. The case against nuclear weapons has been shown to be part of the same struggle for it is all a struggle for control. The wage system,

nuclear weapons and war are linked together as part of the system we live under. If people the whole world over saw that their interests were the same, then national governments and states would not divide them. Once this is recognised then the ordinary working people would seek to control and run things for themselves and nations and states would become a thing of the past.  
P.T.

# TOGETHERNESS

**STAFFORD CRIPPS TRIED** it, Selwyn Lloyd attempted it, Reggie Mauding didn't even try but George Brown has not only tried, but thinks it will work—'Prices & Incomes Policy'.

The ballyhoo which has died down since the announcement of the 'Joint Statement of Intent on Productivity, Prices and Incomes' which employers and unions signed, has risen again with the 'Incomes Policy'. George Brown's baby has been knocked by all and sundry. We can say that the top of the pyramid is happy or at least has paid lip service but down at the base individual employers and rank and file unionists don't want to know.

Laissez-faire type employers will still pay what they think they can get away with, higher in some instances to corner the labour market and lower where labour is more plentiful. Rank and file unionists know that 'Incomes Policy' is a 1965 phrase for wage freeze. In an interview on TV the other evening, Brown frantically denied this, in fact he was most hurt that such an idea should have ever been thought of. Looking at the Government White Paper under the paragraph 'Criteria for Incomes', I quote: 'An important step will be to lay down a "norm" indicating the average rate of annual increase of money-incomes per head which is consistent with the stability in the general level of prices. In present circumstances the appropriate

# Freedom For Workers' Control

APRIL 17 1965 Vol. 26 No. 12

figure for this purpose is 3-3½ per cent'. It then goes on to say how this figure could be increased. Therefore to my tiny mind the object is to peg wages until the economists and statisticians have fiddled around some, and finally state that national productivity has gone up so much.

The Tory press claim that George Brown is off his rocker. The *Daily Worker* screams blue murder, yet the utopia they slavishly follow, the 'Soviet Union' has had this policy for years, don't let's have the tripe that the benefits go to the workers because we, and they, know different. The *Guardian* has been terribly sweet about the whole affair, giving George the benefit of the doubt. Their editorial (9.4.65) winds up 'For a wage earner to accept less than he knows he can get is as irrational as it would be for a manufacturer to charge less than the market would bear. Perhaps both sides will find the new principle easier to accept if they reflect that they are accepting it together'. How terribly wonderful, master and man striding forth towards a brave new Britain.

Only a Labour Government would have the gall to present such a policy, relying on the TUC to put the necessary rod up their back. The overtures have already been made to the City. Chancellor Callaghan has said if they had any problems to come to him and he would do his best. The budget has proved this,

the TUC, the bankers and the employers were quite happy, in fact when their representatives were interviewed it was nigh on impossible to arouse any controversy at all.

Getting down to cases, what does the 'Incomes Policy' mean to the Billy Muggins? It means that the lower paid workers are going to have a tough time. Some workers are well below the average and will need a 20% increase to draw level. Will they get it? According to the 'Incomes Policy' they have a chance, a bloody dog's chance, especially in the Health Service, Local Government, and the Paralyzed Industries. The latter it is stated must pay their way the same as private enterprise. The only way they can do this is out of the pockets of their employees. The 45,000 white collar workers of electricity supply, have stated quite firmly (not blooming likely), plans are being laid for a 'work to rule'. Workers in the Gas Industry are getting 'itchy feet', so are the mines and railway men.

The Government's idea is for the better paid workers either to take a smaller increase or mark time to allow the less fortunate to catch up.

As anarcho-syndicalists our policy is different, not only should everyone press on, but the fortunate (by comparison) should actively help the not so fortunate. The 'Incomes Policy' could do one thing—it could spark off a wave of Solidarity Action, but only if we forget we are Sparks, Printers, Dustmen, Bank Clerks, and Nurses, and remember we are all Joes up to the eyes in muck and bullets.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

# ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM THE WORKERS' 9 NEXT STEP

## THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE

**A**LL the political opponents of Anarcho-Syndicalism, those who wish to achieve the classless society by Parliamentary means no less than those who are satisfied with things as they are, regard the Social General Strike as disastrous. And for them, so it is. For the Judge and his hangman, the Policeman and his mark, the establishment of a free society would seem disaster. Their minds bound by authority, their livelihood based upon the slavery of others, the abolition of authority and slavery would leave them dependent on—themselves.

And for those 'working-class' theoreticians who have thought up complicated ways of using the capitalists' own constitution against them, the successful general strike would seem almost more hurtful, for—it would prove them wrong! And nothing hurts a theorist more than to find he has been wasting his time on theories when the workers have had the answer all the time if they had wanted to use it.

For politicians of all shades, as for the capitalist class, the general strike, therefore, is an object of attack and derision because it shows finally that the workers have no need of them.

But for the Anarcho-Syndicalist, looking at the situation from the workers' point of view and not seeking power under any pretext, the Social General Strike remains the final expression of the class struggle. All the petty skirmishes, the little steps forward and the big set-backs (and what workers' struggle is without these?), all the experience gained in a hundred battles, find their culmination in that moment when the workers decide they will work for the bosses no longer. For what is the Social General Strike but this? What is it but the working-class deciding it will not go on working for the ruling class? That, regardless of the consequences, it will no longer tolerate the domination of man by man?

The general strike, even short of revolution, can be put to many uses. A general strike against war, for instance, was called by the Catalonian workers in 1909—with complete success. The Spanish Government, seeking to make war in Morocco, was answered by the militant Spanish workers—and the war had to be called off, for a hard-working industrial army is essential for a State at war. (A lesson for us today!) Spain, of course, gives us many examples of the general strike, and of every form of revolutionary activity, but workers in Russia, Sweden, Germany, France, Italy, and many other countries have also used the tremendous strength this weapon gives them.

In Britain in 1926, the general strike was called to oppose the attack by the ruling class upon the living standards of the workers. The main attack had been upon the miners and for the rest of the workers it began both as a sympathetic strike with the miners and because they saw that they would be the next to suffer. But the British general strike started off with

the tremendous disadvantage of being in the hands of leaders who were terrified of its possible consequences before it started. Because they knew—what the workers only dimly grasped—that a successful general strike could only have one end—a social revolution. And that was the last thing the TUC leaders wanted. As J. H. Thomas said: 'I have never disguised that in a challenge to the Constitution, God help us unless the Constitution won.'

The British general strike did not fail because the workers were not capable or courageous enough, but because the Labour leaders saw how capable they were to take over the whole thing and run it themselves. Before that happened, therefore, the leaders called the strike off, leaving the miners betrayed, but the Constitution secure, if somewhat shaken.

For the 1926 general strike did shake the British State. An attack by the workers on that scale is an attack in depth which a centralised authority just cannot meet. Any State is a minority propped up by the majority, and when that majority knocks away the props, the weakness of the façade is shown up. When there is, say, a strike in the London docks, the Government can send in a few thousand soldiers and the urgent work can be carried on after a fashion. But if a majority of the productive workers refuse to work, how can the numerically small forces of the State do anything about it? There are nearly 20 million industrial workers in this country. These cannot be replaced by blacklegs, in uniform or out; they can only be misled, bamboozled or bullied into remaining at work. And when the workers are clear in their own minds as to what they want and how to get it, the bamboozling or bullying just does not work.

The general strike, then, is a deliberate attempt to disrupt capitalist economy. The examples I have briefly given were of general strikes with a limited aim—of achieving a specific target within a capitalist society by the exertion of the full pressure of which the workers are capable. The Anarcho-Syndicalist wishes to see it used further—as a means of achieving a social revolution, the unlimited aim of ending once and for all the rule of boss or State and of establishing the workers' right to the means of life. When this is the aim, we refer to the *Social General Strike*.

When the workers have the experience and are conscious of their own strength, when they have created their revolutionary organisations for the precise purpose of one day taking over the means of production and distribution, then, when the moment comes and they exert that strength through the direct means of the Social General Strike, there is no other power in society that can oppose them, and the social revolution can be achieved.

P.S.

(To be continued)

## BUILDING

## POLITICAL CAMPAIGN?

**A** NEW CAMPAIGN for higher wages and better conditions is under way in the building industry, organised by the London Joint Sites Committee, an unofficial rank and file organisation. With the present three year tie-up ending in November, they are claiming 1/6d. per hour increase, a 40-hour week, three weeks' holiday with full pay and sick pay on a realistic basis comparable to the cost of living.

Last Thursday saw the real start of this campaign. Workers from three sites on the huge Barbican scheme marched with banners to the nearly completed Paternoster job. From here about 300 men from the two jobs marched on to the Conway Hall for a meeting. Here they were joined by workers from the big Wimpey job in Euston Road.

## POLITICAL ALLEGIANCES

Speakers from the platform put strong emphasis on smashing the wage freeze of the Government's incomes policy. Although the need for strong organisation on the sites was recognised, they also spoke of the necessity of 'pouring in resolutions to the executive councils' of the unions. They felt that union policies could be changed in this way and in turn those of the Government. In fact there was strong leaning towards the constitutional and political type of campaign, stemming of course from the political allegiances of the speakers. Whether they think that this type of action will really gain the demand is another thing.

A speaker from the floor said that he thought that in the future, unemployment would hit the industry and that now was

the time to push up the basic wage rate in order to cut the dependence on the bonus scheme.

A bricklayer steward said that he had tried to get a council flat but was told that it would take twenty years to clear the housing list as it stood at present and so he had been forced to get a mortgage to buy a decent place for him and his family to live in and subsequently he had to work all the overtime he could to make ends meet.

There was considerable support for unofficial action if the union failed to get demands.

Jon Palmer, the defeated Labour candidate for NW Croydon, said that he agreed with the attacks made on the Government. He spoke of the Contracts of Employment Act being used by the employers to sack men if they took unofficial strike action. (According to the Act this constitutes a break in employment so that the men can be instantly dismissed.) It was the 'mailed fist of the Incomes Policy'.

I think certain political considerations were more important to the speakers on the platform. The only way to smash the incomes policy is to create such a strong movement at rank and file level that the employers and the Government have to pay up. They must be shown that it is not the wage earner who is going to pay for the sterling crisis or to keep the cost of exports down. But this cannot be done through resolutions to the Executive Councils or change of leadership in the unions. It can be done by the men themselves and by the action they take.  
P.T.