

Indecency in Church—by Whom?



Tom El Greco: Jim Radford Driving the Traders from the Methodist Temple

By a correspondent

THE nine people who were arrested in the Brighton church demonstration on October 2—Nicolas Walter, Susan Abrahams, Derek Russell, Bernard Miles, Heather Russell, Andy Anderson, Meg Walsh, Jim Radford, and Faith Barron—were held in custody by the Brighton police for a night, and were then remanded in custody for seven days by the Brighton magistrates on October 3. The five men were taken to Lewes Prison, and the four women to Holloway. They were released after two or three days when Mr. Benedict Birnberg, a solicitor instructed by the National Council for Civil Liberties, made successful applications for bail to a Judge in Chambers on October 5 and 6. Faith Barron then travelled to the United States. At the next court hearing, on October 10, the other eight were remanded (on bail this time) for three weeks, because the police had referred the case to the Director of Public Prosecutions in the hope of bringing charges of conspiracy.

On October 27, the Director of Public Prosecutions told the police not to bring such charges; but just before the next court hearing, on October 31, the police brought another charge—that the demonstrators had been concerned with each

other in 'riotous, violent or indecent behaviour' in the church. Originally all the demonstrators except Sue Abrahams had been charged with riotous behaviour in the church, and four of them were also charged with other minor offences. The new charge was brought so late that the morning of October 31 was taken up with procedural arguments and adjournments, and in the afternoon it was found that the charge was technically inadmissible anyway—it was 'bad for duplicity', because it included more than one distinct offence. At first the police wanted to change the wording to 'riotous, violent and indecent behaviour', but after realising the difficulty of proving all that, they settled for just 'indecent behaviour'. Then all the demonstrators except Nicolas Walter and Jim Radford refused to be tried on more than this joint charge; so that Nicolas Walter would be tried for riotous behaviour in the church and threatening behaviour outside the church on his own and for indecent behaviour in the church with the others, Jim Radford would be tried for riotous behaviour in the church on his own and for indecent behaviour in the church with the others, and Susan Abrahams, Derek Russell, Bernard Miles, Heather Russell, Andy Anderson, and Meg Walsh would be tried for indecent behaviour in the church with the others (the other charges should technically be heard afterwards in fresh trials). Derek Russell, Bernard Miles, Heather Russell, and Meg Walsh were represented by Ben Birnberg; Nicolas Walter, Susan Abrahams, Andy Anderson, and Jim Radford defended themselves.

The trial finally began at 2.30 p.m. on October 31, and continued on November 7 (all day), November 14 (all day), November 15 (morning), and November 16 (morning). It will continue on November 21 (all day) and November 22 (all day). The prosecution originally intended to bring 17 witnesses, but four dropped out on the way. There were three formal witnesses, six civilians, and four policemen.

The formal witnesses were: Leslie Newman, the minister of the Dorset Gardens Methodist Church, where the demonstration took place, who had refused to prosecute and now refused to give evidence against the demonstrators because this would be 'un-Christian', and

DURING the last week in October five militant anarchists were arrested in Madrid and accused by the Spanish police of intending to kidnap the American Ambassador to Madrid, Mr. Biddle Duke (FREEDOM, 12.11.66), so as to awaken world opinion to the farce of the 'Trade Union elections' at present taking place in Spain and to bring pressure to bear on the Spanish authorities for the release of political prisoners.

A group of 'Libertarian Youth', to which the five militants belong, had already carried out an operation of the same kind in kidnapping in Rome, last April, Monsignor Ussia, ecclesiastic counsellor to the Spanish Embassy in the Vatican.

Following the arrest of Luis Edo (38), Antonio Canete (51), Jesus Rodriguez (32), Alfredo Herrera (26), and Alicia Mur (28), the Peninsular Committee of the FIJL gave the following details:—

'1. Our comrades' mission was to carry out an action which would tend to show the falsity of the "liberalisation" of the Franco regime, and to continue the campaign, started in 1964, for the liberation of all political prisoners in our country, which campaign our organisation continues.

'2. We ratify all that the "Group 1st of May" affirms in its communique giving the lie to the declarations of the Franco police (see attached).

'3. The Peninsular Committee of the FIJL, appeals urgently to all organisations, groups, and individual anti-fascists of the world to co-

ordinately give evidence that the church was a church and the service was a service (in cross-examination he said that war was 'un-Christian' too, which may explain his unexpectedly sympathetic attitude); and Albert McCabe, a *Daily Express* photographer, and Douglas Eatwell, a *Sun* photographer, who simply gave evidence that they had taken the photographs used in the case.

The civilian witnesses were: James Moody, the senior steward, who was in the main body of the church and the corridors; Donald Lain, a house-father in a children's home, who was in the church gallery; William Page, a steward in charge of the relay system for the overflow hall, who was in the corridors; William Groves, a steward, who was in the aisle where most of the demonstration took place; Albert Herriott, a regular congregant, who was in the body of the church; and Margaret Savage, a teacher, who was in the choir.

The police witnesses were: Det.-Insp. Field, who was both inside and outside the church, and is the detective who made most of the inquiries in the case; Sgt. Head, who was outside the church; Det.-Sgt. Osborne, who was both inside and—as it turned out—outside the church, and is the detective who works with Field; and Sgt. Sullivan, who was inside the church.

The main features of the prosecution evidence, as of the general conduct of the prosecution case, were confusion and contradiction.

Over and over again, witnesses who had been produced by the police gave evidence which conflicted with what the police had alleged or later gave in their own evidence. It was generally agreed that very few people had been upset by the demonstration and that the demonstrators themselves had not used any violence. But the most important and interesting evidence was of course that of the police witnesses themselves. While they were in the witness box, on November 14 and 15, the court heard most of the strange story of the case.

Detectives from the Brighton police had attended the service as part of their 'normal duties'—i.e. they had been co-opted into the Special Branch while Wilson, Brown & Co. were in Brighton for the Labour Party Annual Conference. But apparently they had no idea that

there might really be trouble in the church. Of the 20 or 30 people who demonstrated during the service in one way or another, only nine were taken to the police station, where they were detained without being charged for between five and nine hours, and were then refused bail (though they were allowed visitors). On the following day they were taken to the court in handcuffs, and the magistrates accepted the police application for a remand in custody and for photographs and fingerprints to be taken, quite regardless of anything the demonstrators said. One of the reasons the police said they opposed bail was that the demonstrators might repeat their offence, although they said they were prepared to give undertakings that they would not do so. Another was that the police didn't know enough about the demonstrators, although they had taken 'characters' from some of them—i.e. obtained answers to personal questions—and although they checked the address of only one of them.

Spain, November 1, 1966.

After three days of interrogation at the Security Headquarters, the five militants are at present being kept in the cells of the Palais de Justice in Madrid, at the disposition of the Tribunal of Public Order. (We are told that the men are in the Carabanchel Jail, Madrid, and the woman comrade in Women's Prison of Ventas, Madrid.)

Luis Edo, former secretary of *Jeunesse Libertaires* and present secretary of the CNT local at Paris, had already, last May, organised two press conferences in Madrid denouncing the farce of the 'liberalisation' of the regime and the so-called 'Elections syndicales libres'. Since the 28th October he has been on hunger strike and his condition is giving rise to anxiety.

A Defence Committee has been set up in Paris with a central fund to provide a legal defence. Donations should be sent to Clement Fournier, CCP, 13 536 34 Paris.

Also, a co-ordinating committee has been set up in Belgium and donations should be sent to: Gurucharri, S. — CCP, 2269.41 Bruxelles.

(Comrades in British Isles please note: Money cannot be sent CCP (giro) through our post office. Please address donations to Clement Fournier, c/o Freedom Press. We will transmit.)

The Group '1st of May' further declares that the abduction of Mgr.

Ussia had nothing to do with those arrested in Madrid. The handwriting of the note, which was sent to the Press and was transmitted by Agence France on November 1, can easily be verified to be the same as the one sent out by the Group at the time of Mgr. Ussia's kidnap. Therefore the boasts of Franco's police to have arrested and destroyed the Group '1st of May' are completely false. They emphasize that none of the comrades arrested in Madrid took part in the abduction of the Spanish prelate. This is confirmed by Mgr. Ussia himself who stated in *Il Tempo* (29.10.66) that, judging from the photographs of the five arrested in Madrid, none of them had participated in his abduction.

Our comrades are resolved to show that these accusations, which carry the air of usual police methods of 'throwing the book' at arrested people, are false, and they will demonstrate this at the appropriate time.

We have also received a communication from a French comrade, Jean Coulerdeau (68 rue Montgolfier, 33 Bordeaux, France), a member of the 'Anarchism and Non-violence' Group, who proposes to enter Spain as soon as the date of the trial is announced. This is meant to be a non-violent demonstration of solidarity and he wants to hear from comrades who would go with him. He says: 'The supporting action that we have to take must take into account public opinion, which was favourable to the kidnapers at the time of the abducting of Ussia. Now they are accused of banditry and terrorism!'

Our detained comrades need our help and we expect solidarity on this matter from all libertarians, whether groups, individuals or sympathetic newspapers.

Eds.

Wilson shakes hands with Anarchy

ABOUT 20 supporters of the 'West Ham Anarchists' infiltrated the meeting at Poplar Civic Hall. There was no other main heckling except for when the group started, although there was a group of dockers heckling a lot. Just after Wilson began to speak, one of the group jumped up, pointed to Wilson and said 'Killer of the Vietnamese'. As the heckler was gradually dragged out, anarchists all over the hall stood up. Another slogan which went down well and was reported was, 'Wilson you are a dirty fascist pig'. As these two of the group were dragged out there were shouts of McCarthy. This came from a group of anarchists and militant dockers.

Then it was the usual ructions, the bourgeois old dears tutting, etc. Some of the group stayed in at the meeting heckling, while others went outside with a few who had been out there while the meeting was on.

There were no crowds outside at the end as there had been in the beginning of the evening. So when Wilson came out the main crowd was the 'West Ham Anarchists'. To get to his wife, sitting in their car, Wilson had to go through them. There was hardly any fuss about, funnily enough. Wilson went over to the two who had started the uproar and spoke to John Clark and Stephen Higgs, and asked them why they disagreed with his policy. They said (although amazed) that they were against all his policies and against all governments. Rather than argue he shook hands, grinning, and went into his car.

By the way it was on TV, both channels' news, in national dailies (although it was twisted in the *Daily Mail*) and front page coverage in locals. Seems funny that just over 20 people can get more coverage than 20,000 in Trafalgar Square on Easter Monday!

'WEST HAM ANARCHISTS'

Continued on page 3

BOOKS for Presents

Please order in good time. Books can be sent direct to your friends, with cards if necessary. Invoices to you.

SUGGESTED BOOKS

- Qu'est-ce Que La Propriete?**
Pierre-Joseph Proudhon
(paperback) 7/6
- Germinal** Emile Zola (Penguin) 6/-
- The Sexual Revolution**
Wilhelm Reich (paperback) 20/-
- The Barns Experiment**
The Peckham Experiment
W. David Wills 3/6
- Innes H. Pearse and Lucy H. Crocker 12/6
- Summerhill** A. S. Neill 30/-
- Growing up Absurd** Paul Goodman 21/-
- The Free Family**
Paul and Jean Ritter 18/-
- Political Justice: Reprint of the Essay on Property**
William Godwin 6/-
- Caleb Williams**
William Godwin (paperback) 6/-
- Reflections on Violence**
Georges Sorel 30/-
- The Ego and his Own**
Max Stirner (paperback) 15/-
- In the Struggle for Equality** (the story of the Anarchist Red Cross)
B. Yelensky 17/6
- Pilate's Question** Alfred Reynolds 12/6
- Conscription Conflict** Denis Hayes 7/6
and
(of course)
- Freedom Press Publications listed below

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
Vol 13 1963: Forces of Law and Order
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.

VERNON RICHARDS
Malatesta: His Life and Ideas
cloth 21/-; paper 10/6

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
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

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

GEORGE BARRETT
The First Person (Selections) 2/6

Miller as Revolutionary

Dear Editors,

Having studied the bulk of Henry Miller's work in detail for the last few years in preparation for a full-length study, I disagreed vehemently with many of the points raised by Paul Potts in his assessment of Miller's talent in last week's FREEDOM.

I am sick and tired of critics and reviewers who waste time disputing the indisputable fact of Miller's genius, but Mr. Potts goes even farther: he doubts whether Henry Miller, musician, painter, and the most important and influential prose writer of the age, can really be called an *artist*. Of course, it is true that he doesn't wear a beard but even so...

And what is wrong with comparing him to Blake or Whitman? They are not only legitimate parallels, they are *obvious* ones. Like Blake, he is a mystic (and just how much of a mystic can be ascertained from the pages of *Time of the Assassins*), and like Whitman he is a revolutionary. I will come back to this point later.

I also quarrel with the phrase, 'Women never come to life in his work, they simply come to bed...' which, although a very witty catch-phrase, is not justified. Personally, I feel that I know June Miller better than any woman I have actually met, and her portrait in *The Rosy Crucifixion* is a literary masterpiece. This is not to deny that Miller is at his best describing men most of the time, but surely Mr. Potts recognises that his technique is impressionistic rather than naturalistic, and the impression women make on Henry Miller is made quite plain. Let me recommend Mr. Potts to pages 111-114 of *The Colossus of Maroussi*, Penguin edition, and let him dare say that the woman there described does not come alive!

I could write at great length (in fact, I have already done so), on Miller as revolutionary. In my opinion he is the most revolutionary writer alive... at least, using the English language... but I don't want to spend a lot of time labouring the point. Suffice it to close with a short quote (and Miller is never at his best in short quotes), from the Preface of *Remember to Remember*. I hope people will, if possible, read the whole of this Preface which is a fine piece of revolutionary writing, as I interpret the phrase.

'Today the world is bound, cramped, stifled by those existing forms of government known as the State. Does the State protect us or do we protect the State? Whatever form of tyranny exists today exists by our consent. No matter into what corner of the globe we cast our eye today, we see the spectre of tyranny. Perhaps the worst tyranny is that which is created for our own good. There can be no common good unless the individual is recognized first and foremost—and until the last, the weakest of men is included. Everything proceeds from the living individual. The State is an abstraction, a bogey which can intimidate but never convince us, never win us over completely.'

Henry Miller did not list Emma Goldman among the great influences of his life for nothing, Mr. Potts. And I would also like to point out that he is one of the very few writers I know who, when he uses the adjective 'anarchic', inevitably does so in a favourable sense.

Yours fraternally,

Manchester, 21 DAVEY JONES.

LETTERS

Drugs

Dear Friends,

As an anarchist who publicly advocates the responsible use of certain chemical and non-chemical hallucinogenic techniques, to induce and guide mind-expansion, I feel obliged to answer J. Jack's criticisms of such propaganda and to clarify my own position.

I agree about the actual and potential dangers of drug addiction and its deeper authoritarian implications. Opiates are addictive and destructive. Alcohol is both to a lesser degree. Most junkies have obvious personality disorders. Others manage to control and contain their sickness at most levels of their beings. Drug abuse is often revolutionary in its motivation but unworkable, wasteful and without direction in its manifestations.

J. Jack, however, makes no distinction between addictive and non-addictive drugs, between stupefying and illuminating chemicals. In the light of known medical and scientific research, LSD, marijuana and related drugs involve no withdrawal symptoms upon disuse and are thus not physically addictive. I am interested to know what evidence or authority J.J. has for stating that LSD affects the liver.

Even these drugs are mostly abused by kick-seekers and Western psychiatry which uses LSD to brainwash relatively healthy neurotics into an acceptance of the values and aspirations of an unhealthy society. In both cases with tragic results.

I advocate such drugs as short-cut paths or vehicles for the attainment of deep revolutionary insight and a wider visionary wisdom. That is to realize the certainty of the inner-identity and solidarity of all. The global anarchist impetus. Yogic breathing and meditation is less open to abuse than chemical methods but is perhaps even more risky. Collapsed lungs the least worry. It is ultimately a personal decision. As such it must be based upon knowledge and not on irrational and emotive fears. As must any anarchist criticism, dissent and public warnings.

Best wishes,

Blackburn, Lancs. DAVE CUNLIFFE.

Political Protest Survey

Dear Friends,

There is a widespread assumption that in Britain political non-conformity is jealously protected, some would say over-protected, as is the right to protest. Yet the last decade has seen a wave of radical and anti-consensus protest—largely centred on the activities of the movement against nuclear weapons and offshoots from this—in direct confrontation with the Government and the law. The authorities have reacted time and again with ill-considered, hasty and often frankly repressive prosecutions and in doing so have used a host of obsolete or inappropriate weapons from the rusty armoury of the law including the Official Secrets Act, the Public Order Act, Sessional Orders, the Race Relations Act and common law provisions, and have even resorted to such anachronisms as the Justices of the Peace Act 1361. The result is that the recent history of protest may be charted by the prosecutions

it has inspired—the Pat Arrowsmith and George Clark cases, the Wethersfield 5, the Trafalgar Square arrests—to cite only a few.

The NCCL considers that the time has come to undertake a survey of recent cases involving political protesters. The immediate objective is to prepare a memorandum for submission to the Government in support of the introduction into the law of safeguards to guarantee the right of political protest.

To make the case as authoritative as possible it is important that the survey should be comprehensive. We, therefore, appeal to all those who could supply detailed information from their own experience to contact us. A questionnaire has been prepared and is available on application to the Secretariat. Needless to say that if you know of others who could help please put them in touch with us.

Yours sincerely,

National Council for
Civil Liberties, TONY SMYTHE,
General Secretary,
4 Camden High Street,
N.W.1

The Lamb & Flag: Not Individualists

Dear Editors,

I wish to make it perfectly clear to the readers of FREEDOM that the 'Heat-wave' Group who wrecked the 'Lamb and Flag' meetings are not individualist anarchists, but a cross between 'provos' and 'neo-marxists'. There is no need, therefore, to 'justify their behaviour' by a 'perversion' of individualist anarchist theory, as Philip Sansom and Frances Sokolov suggest.

I would appreciate the publication of this note. Individualists have enough misrepresentation to contend with, without being identified with groups having little, if anything, in common with them.

S. E. PARKER,
Editor, *Minus One*.

The Audience Wanted Chaos—not Anarchy

Dear Comrades,

As one of the speakers whose meeting was wrecked by Charles Radcliffe and his followers, I would like to participate in this correspondence. What I found most disturbing about the incident was the acquiescence of the audience, who, with some exceptions, did not attempt to silence the hecklers, or make any kind of reply to them. The chairman, Axel Hoch, did his best to control the situation, but practically no one backed him up.

A friend of mine said afterwards, 'I'm surprised you let them rattle you'. To tell the truth, I was not so much rattled by the heckling as by the behaviour of the audience, who seemed rather to be enjoying the performance. I felt that there was no reason to offer myself as a spectacle to people who want to make trouble, and to others who merely want to watch trouble being made for someone else, themselves remaining safely on the sidelines. For that reason I refused to go on, and later walked out.

I have no doubt that Jeff Robinson is right. These disorders are caused by disillusion with the failure of the anti-Bomb movement to develop into a social revolution, or even to get rid of The Bomb. The problem is, what are we going to do in the future?

Philip Sansom and Frances Sokolov have written a swashbuckling letter. It stirs the blood. The only trouble is that they were not there at the time. Indeed they haven't been coming to the meetings

for a long while. While it might save one particular meeting to throw the hecklers out, what are you going to do about a situation where a large part of the audience are enjoying the fight? They just get a kick out of it. Is it really worth running meetings for the benefit of such people? Wouldn't they be happier watching all-in wrestling?

It isn't as if this situation was recent. There has been disorder and a certain amount of petty bullying at the meetings for the past year and more. It was like this even before J. P. Schweitzer appeared upon the scene, and long before Charles Radcliffe started his crusade to reform the anarchist movement.

In fact the behaviour of one meeting, when a speaker from the Homosexual Law Reform Society addressed us, was so bad that I had to apologise afterwards to him.

Evidently what the public want is chaos, not anarchy. It is no use looking for individuals as scapegoats. This does not condone the behaviour of those who set out deliberately to wreck the last two meetings. But the fact remains that their action was merely the logical outcome of all that had gone before.

Nor will I refuse myself the pleasure of saying, 'I told you so'. I wrote to FREEDOM more than a year ago about what was going on at 'The Lamb and Flag'. The letter was not published. I have said on a number of occasions that it would all end in a free-for-all, and we should lose the meeting place. I have tried to do what I could by acting as chairman, although I am not good at it, and do not like doing it.

As far as I can see we live in an age of increasing chaos. It manifests itself in art, when people squash frogs and tear the heads off live chickens. The great thing is to be violent, to hurt, humiliate and destroy. In some way it is supposed to be good for you, to act as a catharsis. It makes its appearance in anarchist meetings too.

These meetings never seemed to me to be a prelude to a revolution. They were a social club for libertarians of all shades. I still think there are enough genuine libertarians around to make periodic meetings worthwhile, but I don't know how this is to be done without attracting the rowdies, and the kind of people who, while not intervening themselves, enjoy the rowdiness.

The subject on which I was speaking, although I did not get far with it, was curiously apt. I was attempting to develop the theme that it is not just what people say, it is also the way they say it that has to be watched. A revolutionary may preach freedom, peace and brotherhood in words, but the tones he uses are those of an authoritarian, a man of violence. He is therefore a dangerous man, who may, when put to the test, turn out a tyrant.

We had a beautiful illustration of this in the meeting, because the hecklers used 'Leftist' terms like 'bourgeois', but their behaviour was that of a Fascist group. I felt as the evening went on that physical violence was not far away.

Yours fraternally,

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Poetry & Anarchism

Dear Comrades,

Would you kindly write and tell me of any enlightening articles by anarchists on P. B. Shelley, Byron, and John Milton. I'm at work on these and other poets, and am keen to be aware of all valuation that's gone before.

Best Wishes,

South View, STUART MITCHEL.
Potters Heath,
Welwyn, Herts.

Anarchist Federation of Britain

(As there is no national secretariat for enquiries, speakers, etc., please contact local groups.)

ANARCHIST MEETINGS AT HYDE PARK EVERY SUNDAY AT 2 P.M.

OFF-CENTRE LONDON DISCUSSION MEETINGS

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.

3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald and Irene Room's, now at 13 Savernake Road, London, N.W.3.

REGIONAL FEDERATIONS AND GROUPS

ALTRINCHAM ANARCHIST YOUTH GROUP. Get in touch with Stephen Richards, 25 North Vale Road, Timperley, Cheshire.

ABERDEEN GROUP. Correspondence to M. Dey, 29 Springhill Crescent, Aberdeen, Kent.

BEXLEY ANARCHIST GROUP. Correspondence to Paul Wildish, 2 Cumbrian Avenue, Barnehurst, Kent.

BIRMINGHAM ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Dave Massey, 138 Church Road, Erdington, Birmingham, 24.

UNIVERSITY OF ASTON GROUP. Contact: D. J. Austin, 5 Kingsbury Road, Erdington, Birmingham.

CARDIFF ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Mike Gowley, 36 Whitaker Road, Tremorfa, Cardiff.

DUNDEE GROUP. Contact Bob and Una Turnbull, c/o Doctors' Residence, Stracathro Hospital, by Brechin, Angus.

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP ONE. Correspondence to Robert Lynn, 2b Saracen Head Lane, Glasgow, C.1.

HARLOW ANARCHIST GROUP. Enquiries to

Keith Nathan, 138 Pennymead, Harlow or John Barrick, 14 Centre Avenue, Epping.

HULL ANARCHIST GROUP. J. Tempest, 89 Fountain Road, Hull. Tel. 212526. Meetings 8 p.m. 1st and 3rd Fridays of month at above address.

IPSWICH ANARCHISTS. Contact Neil Dean, 74 Cemetery Road, Ipswich, Suffolk.

LEWISHAM, LONDON, S.E.13. 2nd and 4th Thursdays. Meetings at Mike Malet's, 61 Granville Park, Lewisham, S.E.13.

NEW HAM LIBERTARIANS. Contact Mick Shenker, 122 Hampton Road, Forest Gate, NOTTING HILL ANARCHIST GROUP. Correspondence to Brian Joseph, 1st floor, 27 Arundel Gardens, London, W.11. Meeting every first Thursday of the month at 8 p.m., Flat 3, Colville House, W.11.

NORTH-WEST ESSEX. Meetings on the first Saturday of each month at 7.30 p.m. at Robert Barrat's, The Old Vicarage, Radwinter, near Saffron Walden.

ORPINGTON ANARCHIST GROUP. Knockholt, Nr. Sevenoaks, Kent. Every six weeks at Greenways, Knockholt. Phone: Knockholt 2316. Brian and Maureen Richardson.

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

PLYMOUTH ANARCHIST FEDERATION. Contact J. Hill, 79 Underlane, Plymstock, Plymouth, Devon.

READING ANARCHIST GROUP. Contact Alan Ross, 116 Belmont Road, Reading, Berks.

SHEFFIELD. Regular meetings for discussion at the Foresters, Division Street, Mondays. Contact Robin Lovell, c/o Students' Union, University, Sheffield. Tel. 24076.

NORTH-WEST FEDERATION
NORTH WEST ANARCHIST FEDERATION.

Regional Secretary: J. Bromley, 44 Doncaster Avenue, Manchester, 20. Buxton: Chris Berrisford, 10 Byron Street, Buxton. Chorley: Alistair Rattray, 35a Devonshire Road, Chorley, Manchester. Mike Mitchell, 3 Bakewell Road, Droylesden, Manchester. Brenda Mercer, 6 Brecksdale Park, Liverpool, 6. Rochdale: Ian Heywood, 16 Mansford Road, Bamford, Rochdale. Stoke-on-Trent: Bob Blakeman, 52 Weldon Avenue, Weston Coyney, Stoke-on-Trent.

EAST LONDON FEDERATION

WALTHAM FOREST ANARCHISTS. Contact Lionel Donnelly, 322a Hoe Street, Walthamstow, E.17. Meetings every Thursday at above address.

WEST HAM ANARCHISTS. Contact Stephen Higgs, 8 Westbury Road, Forest Gate, E.7.

WEST LONDON FEDERATION

NORTHOLT ANARCHISTS. Contact: Jim Huggon, 173 Kingshill Avenue, Northolt, Middlesex. Meetings first and third Wednesday of the month at Jeannie's, 6 Epsom Close, Northolt Park, Middlesex, at 7.30 p.m.

EALING ANARCHIST GROUP. Get into touch with Adrian Derbyshire, 2 Oakley House, Oakley Avenue, London, W.5.

LIBERTARIAN TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION. Meetings—discussions—activities. Contact Peter Ford, 82 North Road, Highgate, N.6. (Tel.: MOU 5702.)

PROPOSED GROUPS

BRIGHTON. Anyone interested get in touch with R. Miller, 2 Percival Terrace, Brighton, 7.

SWANSEA. Any interested in Anarchist group please contact Ian Bone via the University, Swansea.

HERTFORDSHIRE. Contact Stuart Mitchel, South View, Potters Heath, Welwyn.

MANCHESTER PROVOS. All interested contact David Stringer and Dave Tugbeh, 35 Granton Street, Cheetham Hill, Manchester, 8.

CAMBRIDGE. Contact Wallyjon Illingworth, c/o Richmond House, Devon Road, Cambridge.

MID-MIDDLESEX. (Harrow, Wembley, Edgware, Hendon.) Anyone interested in forming a libertarian group for discussion and possible action write to Nicolas and Ruth Walter, 4 Vane Close, Kenton, Harrow, Middlesex.

SOUTH COAST, BRIGHTON, ETC. Eastbourne, Hastings, Lewes area contact Alan Albon. The Stable, Glynlleugh Farm, Pevensey, Sussex. Phone Hailsham 358.

WATFORD. Anyone interested please contact Alan Pritchard, 81 Bedford Street, Watford, Herts.

MEDWAY TOWNS AREA. Proposed Group: Erroll Davies, 22 St. Margaret's Street, Rochester, Kent.

ABROAD

U.S.A. NEW YORK CITY. N.Y. Federation of Anarchists, c/o Torch Bookshop, 641 East 9th Street, N.Y., 10009. Meets every Thursday evening.

AUSTRALIA. Anarchist Group, PO Box 4389, Sydney South. Public meetings every Sunday in the Domain, 2 p.m. and Mondays, 72 Oxford Street, Paddington, Sydney, 8 p.m.

DANISH ANARCHIST FEDERATION. 52 Mindevej, Soborg-Copenhagen, Denmark.

VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA. Anyone interested in forming anarchist and/or direct action peace group contact Derek A. James, 1844 Grand Boulevard, North Vancouver, B.C., Canada. Tel.: 987-2693.

U.S.A. VERMONT/NEW HAMPSHIRE. Discussion/Action group anyone? Contact Ed Strauss, RED 2 Woodstock, Vermont 05091, USA.

SWEDEN. Stockholm Anarchist Federation. Contact Nadir, Box 19104, Stockholm 19, Sweden.

CANADA: Winnipeg. Anybody interested in Direct action/anarchy contact G. J. Nasir, 606 Matheson Avenue, Winnipeg, 17, Manitoba.

BELGIUM: LIEGE. Provos, c/o Jacques Charlier, 11 Avenue de la Laiterie, Sclessin-Liege, Belgium.

Friends of Freedom

WITH THE DEATH, last month, of Osvaldo Maraviglia, the international anarchist movement has lost one of its most internationally-minded comrades, and we at Freedom Press a dear friend and a staunch supporter of our many initiatives over the past thirty years. Yet most of our readers have probably never heard of Osvaldo, and what is more we of the FP group knew him only through correspondence!

Osvaldo Maraviglia was born in Italy in 1894, and at the age of seventeen emigrated to the United States where he joined two brothers in Newark, New Jersey, where he was to spend the next forty years. He worked in a clothing factory, and took part in all the early agitations among the clothing workers. And in 1922, when the Italian speaking comrades founded the anarchist weekly *L'Adunata dei Refrattari*, undertook the onerous task of looking after the administration of the journal, and this he continued to do until 1954, when owing to a heart complaint he had to give up his job and with his wife moved to San Francisco where he lived with his married daughter. There he was always more active than his heart would allow, and it was at a counter-demonstration to one organised by the American Nazi movement in San Francisco last month that our comrade collapsed and died a few minutes later.

Another Italian friend of freedom died earlier this year, in London. He was Vittorio Taborelli, who came to London probably in 1922 or 1923 as a political refugee, and was over 80 years of age when he died. Though he was sceptical as to the effectiveness of our kind of propaganda (he belonged to the old propaganda-by-the-deed tradition), he was always among the first to support any new initiative of ours. During the inter-war years, when all but a few socialists and anarchists among the Italian colony in London were rabid fascists, Taborelli was always in trouble, always involved in discussions, which not infrequently ended in his being assaulted by Mussolini's supporters. When war was declared Taborelli remained faithful to his anti-militarist principles and supported the anarchists in this country in their anti-war stand and was always generous with help for comrades who were 'on the run'.

A third friend of freedom, who died last month, was Charles Duff, probably best known as the author of the *Handbook of Hanging*. It was the rebel in Charles which made him always have a soft spot for the anarchists and many friends in the movement, but he was never a declared anarchist. If one could give him a political label it would be that of a Popular Frontist. This was his position in the Spanish Civil War, the experience of which, however, left him feeling much more sceptical about the possibility of working with Communists. But Duff was not a man to label; like so many freelancers he was strongly individualistic and resisted any attempts at being tied down, politically speaking. But when it was a question of civil liberties, Charles Duff was always on the side of freedom.

The death of Laurie Hislam in a road accident in France in August came as a shock to his many friends. He was not yet 60 years old and was full of energy and one cannot doubt that he still had many schemes for demonstrations up his sleeve. Laurie was another

of these freelancers for whom it became more and more difficult to participate in joint activities of propaganda. This was a shame because he was such a versatile man and efficient in whatever job he was engaged.

Our association with Laurie goes back to 1940, at a time when the official pacifist movement was too respectable and muddle-headed for him and many other pacifists to go on working for it. It is surely a compliment to the integrity of the anarchist movement during the last war that so many pacifists should have joined forces with us and/or written for our journal *War Commentary*, bearing in mind that though we were anti-militarists, we were still unrepentant revolutionists (in spite of the collapse of the revolutionary movement in Spain). Outstanding among the propagandists who came to us from the pacifist movement in 1940 were Fredrick Lohr, John Hewetson, George Woodcock and of course Laurie Hislam, whose first article for *War Commentary*, 'Enemies of the People', appeared in the December 1941 issue, and it is significant that he was even then thinking in terms of the individual—as opposed to the class—struggle. Thinking of John Pilgrim's recent article in the October issue of *Anarchy* ('Salvation by the Working Class: Is it an Outmoded Myth?'), it is perhaps worth while quoting from Laurie Hislam's article which was written a quarter of a century ago in *FREEDOM's* predecessor:

The time must come when conditions will compel serious thought on social problems, and, in preparation for that occasion, the direction of our efforts must be carefully considered. By all means let us expose the repressions and tyrannies contained in a class-society, but beware of holding out false hopes to the oppressed (most of whom alas are not aware of it) in the manner of political parties who are, in effect if not by intent, working for a mere change of oppressors. In striving for the removal of all governmental and repressive institutions and the liquidation (used in its old sense) of the ruling class, let us always be vitally aware that this can only be achieved by the willing acceptance of entirely new values by the individual. This paragraph is too provocative of thought to be discussed now, though it serves to illustrate the complexity of a personality such as Laurie Hislam's.

There is no question, in this writer's mind, that he was dominated and influenced in the worst sense by Fredrick Lohr, a propagandist of outstanding abilities (who was in his fifties when he died some six years ago), a man who, in 1939, gave up a profitable job as a car salesman in Great Portland Street, with huntin' and fishin' at weekends, to further the cause of the oppressed. Fredrick Lohr was a great personality. So far as the anarchists were concerned he was an asset whenever he spoke from their platforms or at mass meetings, even, for a short time, after his conversion to the Catholic Church. Laurie Hislam followed in his footsteps; he even confirmed this by sporting a beard like his Master! Yet both Lohr and Hislam were also of this world. Those who attended the former's outdoor meetings in Lincoln's Inn Fields in the 50's can vouch for the sound commonsense arguments with which Fredrick countered the solicitors' clerks' objections to his anarchist, anti-capitalist point of view. And Laurie was just as provoking! But did it matter, from the point of view of

'Indians Told to Share Out Their Food'—Guardian

A SO-CALLED GYPSY informed on Harry Roberts and intends to claim the £1,000 reward. The *Express* asserts that Harry Roberts said to Sergeant Peter Smith, 'Please, please, don't shoot me.' This item does not appear in any other paper. Meanwhile the Wooden Shoe Bookshop (42 New Compton Street, W.C.2) has produced a poster saying, 'Thank you Harry Roberts for acting out our Fantasies'.

SEVEN UNIFORMED POLICE CONSTABLES of W Division of the Metropolitan Police have been suspended from duty pending investigations into theft allegations against the officers. The Judge in a case at the Old Bailey will request the Commissioner of Police to investigate the alleged bribery of police-officers (during the case) in order that they would not oppose bail too strongly. It was alleged that £150 was paid and a further £450 'so that the police would not give false evidence'. In a letter in the *Guardian* on behalf of the Council of Civil Liberties, Benedict Birnberg and Cedric Thornberry referring to the recent proposal to make majority verdicts operative on a jury refer to the 'contamination of juries, not only on behalf of the accused, but also on behalf of the police. These latter practices,' they say, 'tend to go unsung; but they are known to the Council and to many lawyers practising in the criminal courts.'

THE PRIME MINISTER (on behalf of the Home Secretary) assured the House of Commons, 'I feel it right to inform the House that there is no tapping of telephone numbers [of MPs], nor has there been since this Government came into office.' The Opposition immediately took umbrage at the innuendo but does not the innuendo apply to the previous (also Labour) Government? Chapman Pincher of the *Daily Express* (who should know) says, 'Most of the tapped phones belong to suspected spies, criminals, Customs evaders, Communists, Fascists and Nuclear Disarmers.' He also mentions a figure of 11 million microphones [installed?] waiting to be abused. 'Any relevant parts of the conversations help to swell police files,' says Pincher, 'or the two million dossiers in the registry at M.I.5.' A writer in the *Guardian* states that 'clicks' are no indication of phone tapping, an efficient tapper can eliminate 'clicks'. In fact the *Guardian* reports a well-known political activist who said that one of the benefits of using a tapped (US bugged) phone was that abusive calls were cut off by the monitor. In a cartoon on the phone tapping debate the ex-directory number

propaganda, that they were so critical to one's face and yet such good anarchist propagandists with the non-anarchists?

Long ago this writer had said to Laurie: 'To hell with your politics and your Pope; I love you as you are' and presumably he thought likewise because whenever we met (generally at a demonstration) we were both happy to see each other and exchange notes. It was sad to learn from one of the obituary notices that he had joined the Labour Party but on reflection it probably meant that as a result he would be more critical, publicly, of the Labour Party than of the anarchists. What is really important is that Laurie Hislam was a character, a personality in his own right, who at the same time had no ambitions to dominate. And to the extent that this assessment of his personality is valid, it is difficult to link it to his attachment to Fredrick Lohr who, in this writer's opinion was, on the whole a negative, destructive influence so far as intelligent people were concerned.

Young people don't have to write obituaries. It is a job for the middle-aged, a difficult job, because they are talking about something which is part of them. But if we have anything to communicate to the young people of today it is the spirit of adventure and independence of these friends to whom we have wanted to introduce readers of *FREEDOM*: an Osvaldo Maraviglia who at the age of 17 crosses the Atlantic, earns his living and at the same time furthers anarchist propaganda not only in the United States but everywhere; a Vittorio Taborelli who, rather than renounce his ideas, chooses exile; a Charles Duff who as a Press Officer in the Foreign Office had a career ensured for him, but prefers 'exile' over the issue of the Spanish Civil War; and... well, how does one explain Laurie? He was the dearest of them all, because this writer feels he knew him more intimately, and as a contemporary. But all of them will be remembered because they contributed something to enrich and justify the life of

V.R.

of 10 Downing Street was given (WHI 4433) and the switchboard was flooded with calls, the number has presumably now been changed. However when ringing REN 3736 it would be as well to assume (although this may be delusions of grandeur or persecution-mania on our part) that the phone is tapped so therefore do not say anything which you would not be prepared to stand by, and most important, do not involve third parties. A party of Labour MPs think that phone tapping should be made a criminal offence.

ACCORDING TO *The Times* the vote for Her Majesty's foreign and other secret services was increased by £1 million this year to a total of £10 million. In 1947 it was a mere £2½ million and £7 million in 1960. Purely by coincidence of course, following the events in the last paragraph, the retirement is announced of the head of Scotland Yard's Special Branch on December 6. He was Commander Evan W. Jones who will be succeeded by Detective Chief Superintendent Ferguson G. D. Smith.

THE INTERNATIONAL WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL sponsored by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation called a press conference at the end of the Tribunal's preliminary sitting. Historian Isaac Deutscher 'emphasized,' according to the *Morning Star* (on Thursday), that rumours of resignations from the Tribunal were completely unfounded. On the preceding Monday the *Morning Star* printed a 'rumour' (?) that Presidents Kaunda of Zambia and Nyerere of Tanzania have joined President Senghor of Senegal in withdrawing from sponsorship of the Tribunal. Diplomatic pressure by the USA is alleged.

GENERAL FRANCO PROCLAIMED an amnesty for 'political offences' committed during the Spanish Civil War. On Tuesday the *Morning Star* denounced this as 'white-

wash' and points out that Grimau was judicially murdered by military law for crimes allegedly committed during the Civil War. On Wednesday, in the *Morning Star*, Sam Russell commends the Communists in Spain for entering the elections for the Workers' Commissions and says, 'The extent of the victory surpassed even the most optimistic forecasts and put to shame those Spanish Socialist and Anarchist leaders abroad who preached a policy of abstention, while the Communists, by their work in the factories, ensured a triumph for the Workers' Commissions' candidate.' On Thursday the *Morning Star* reported the Organisation Appeal for Amnesty in Spain that reports of a 'general amnesty' in Spain convey a false impression. The Organisation said it 'by no means puts an end to the political repression which has followed the civil war, nor does it mean there are no political prisoners left in Spain'. The same issue reports a forthcoming trial of six students for having taken part in an illegal meeting. On Saturday the *Morning Star* published under the heading 'Russia Praises Success of Spanish Workers': 'The Soviet Communist Party yesterday sent a telegram to the Spanish Communist Party congratulating it on the "big successes achieved by the working-class of the country in the elections to the official syndicates". The message also noted with satisfaction last Friday's announcement by the Franco authorities of an amnesty for those accused or convicted of political acts against the fascist regime during the Civil War, which it said was a result of the struggles of the Communist and progressive forces of Spain. "We hope," it said, "that this decision of the Government will permit all the exiled Spanish democrats to return home freely". Come home Passionaria, all is forgiven.'

JON QUIXOTE.

Cathy Come Home

EVERY now and then, the BBC has a fit of conscience and stages a programme of value rather than the usual crop of addictive rubbish which would seem to be their normal standard.

Such a programme was, in my estimation, Jeremy Sandford's 'Cathy Come Home', screened as one of the Wednesday Play series.

I will not attempt to paraphrase the script now but for those who missed the play it concerned the descent of a family through a succession of varied lodgings until they are forced, through hardship, to enter a home of the old King Hill pattern where, due to the various pressures they are subjected to, the family eventually disintegrates.

The film successfully captures the misery and degradation of a family trapped in the cul-de-sac of existence in this state without property to cushion themselves against sickness and the resulting poverty and praise must go to author Sandford for his honest, perhaps brutal, study of a coercive and inhuman system

and the effect it has on the individual.

The play ends with what is probably its most powerful scene in which Cathy, played extremely well by Carol White, is turned out of the hostel into the streets, ostensibly for having overstayed the time allowed her but in reality for having talked to the press about conditions in the hostel. She is followed out by the welfare officer, who having turned her out of the hostel, then proceeds to take away her children, because they have nowhere to stay, in much the same way as a bailiff would repossess an unpaid television set.

And so the film ends on a note of despondency, if not despair, and one is left wondering if there can be any hope of a full life for everybody in a system which allows such things to go on. I imagine that this is the impression that the author intended to give and as Anarchists we should, I think, be grateful to him for preaching for us.

BILL BENFIELD.

Indecency in Church—by Whom?

Continued from page 1 that he had left the main body of the church to help bring Nicolas Walter down from the gallery, though he still swore he hadn't left the building. It was more fully explained when he suddenly remembered after being shown some photographs that he had actually been outside for several minutes when Nicolas Walter was arguing with the police. Incidentally, his was the only evidence against Derek Russell and Heather Russell.

The only evidence against Derek Russell and Heather Russell was that of Det-Sgt Osborne. The only evidence against Sue Abrahams was that of Donald Lain, who had seen her walking down the church aisle and identified her from some blurred photographs as someone who had been taken out of the church. The only evidence against Bernard Miles was that of Margaret Savage, who had seen him standing up but hadn't been able to hear what he was saying.

The defence case began by submissions that Bernard Miles, Sue Abrahams and Nicolas Walter had no cases to answer, but these were all overruled. Then the defence evidence began on November 16. Of the four people represented by Ben Birnberg, Heather Russell and Derek Russell gave evidence for themselves, while Bernard Miles and Meg Walsh will not be giving evidence. Heather and Derek both stated on oath that they had not taken part in the interruptions of the second lesson, though they had argued with church stewards and Labour Party

delegates who attacked the interruptors and had protested when they were taken out of the church.

This week evidence should be given by the four people who are defending themselves and by defence witnesses—including Donald Soper at 3 p.m. on Tuesday. After that there will be the closing speeches by the defending solicitor and by the self-defenders. A notice of appeal has already been prepared for the expected conviction of all the demonstrators, so the case will be going on for a long time yet.

One reason why the case has gone on so long already is that it is being heard by lay not stipendiary magistrates—i.e. unpaid part-time magistrates who are not qualified lawyers and only sit on one or two days a week, rather than paid full-time magistrates who are qualified lawyers and sit every day of the week. Another is that every witness has been liable to be questioned by six people—the prosecuting and defending solicitors and the four who are defending themselves. Yet another is that dozens of photographs have been put in evidence by both sides. And a final one is that ever since the trial began the demonstrators have been treated with extreme courtesy and leniency, and have therefore been able to say a great many things that would not normally be admissible. The trial should come to an end within a couple of weeks now.

Don't forget the appeal fund: Felicity Crump, Glynleigh Farm, Pevensey, Sussex.

PRICES & INCOMES BOARD AND ALL OUR READERS—Please Note

STARTING JANUARY 1967 the price of *FREEDOM* will be raised to 6d. It will continue to be published on each Saturday except the first in each month, when *Anarchy* comes out, but the last issue of *FREEDOM* in each month will be of eight pages. We hope in these extra four pages to deal in greater scope with current important matters, and to include some theoretical material, as well as giving more attention to cultural matters beside our regular art column.

The increase in price entails an increase in subscription. Existing subscriptions will be honoured at the old rate. Readers whose subscriptions fall due up to the end of October will by now have received renewal notices. These will be accepted for a whole year at the old rate if paid before the end of November for subscriptions in the U.K. and Europe, and before the end of the year for other places abroad.

In order to relieve ourselves of burden-

some book-keeping, all subscriptions falling due during November and December will be filled to the end of the year on the existing subscription, and will be renewable at the new rates from January 1, 1967. You can help us a great deal by renewing without waiting for a renewal notice, and by paying subscriptions separately from other accounts.

The new rates are:—
FREEDOM only (per year)
 £1 10s. (\$4.50) surface mail
 £2 16s. (\$8.00) airmail
ANARCHY only (unchanged) (per year)
 £1 6s. (\$3.50) surface mail
 £2 7s. (\$7.00) airmail
COMBINED SUBSCRIPTION
FREEDOM & ANARCHY (per year)
 £2 10s. (\$7.50) surface mail both
 £4 15s. (\$12.50) airmail both
FREEDOM (airmail) & ANARCHY (seamail)
 £3 17s. (\$10.50) (per year)

TUC & Employers Gang Up

IF THE LABOUR Government cannot claim anything else, it can claim that it can run capitalism better than the Tories. Certainly capitalism needed a Labour Government to get it out of its crisis and one that would 'get tough' with the trade unions. The Tories might have preached this, but would have been unable to achieve the comparatively smooth transformation that has taken place in trade unions over the question of free collective bargaining and an enforced wage freeze.

When *The Economist* told its readers in 1964 to vote for a Wilson Government, it was right for it knew that this Government, because of the special relationship between the Labour Party and the trade union leadership, would be able to bring in a statutory incomes policy. Of course those who control industry in our society are wary of Government intervention. Their attitude has always been that 'if we can get along without you, we will'. Nevertheless they have at all times been quick to ask for any assistance when the going got tough for them.

Workers and their trade unions have, of course, done the same, but now the Party that they brought into being is in fact destroying free trade unionism. However the trade union leadership do not see it this way. They see themselves as part of the leadership of the country, serving the interests of the country. This leadership might have come

from the working class, but now it is part of and serving the interests of the ruling class.

'MUST GOVERN'

When the Labour Party won the General Election in 1964, Wilson and his Ministers promised a new industrial revolution, one of efficiency and technological advance. British industry had to be strengthened and streamlined and this is precisely what the Government's present economic measures are intended to do. Wilson told the TUC General Council to 'accept the incomes policy or have two million unemployed'. They did accept; they might have had regrets, but they have gone along with the Government. They also accepted that the Labour Party 'must govern' a capitalist system, and from this acceptance follows the fact that they will comply with the plans of the Government.

The TUC General Council seems, in fact, more intent on taking a hand in this governing. The Economic Committee of the TUC is to recommend to the General Council that they draw up annual wage 'norms' after the conclusion of the period of severe restraint in July. They also propose that there should be regular consultations between themselves and the Confederation of British Industry. Both of these would have to be more centralised, and have more control over the constituent bodies.

The coming together of the TUC and CBI closely resembles what has already happened in Sweden. The reasons for it are probably the same. Mr. A. J. Stephen Brown, President of the CBI, has suggested, 'But of one thing I am convinced — that unless between us (TUC and CBI) we can devise some workable alternative, assuredly the Govern-

ment will step in and justify a continuance of control over matters which should essentially be the responsibility of industry.' Both are prepared to work together for fear of State intervention and control and wish to see an end to free individual union wage bargaining. They want to provide the 'norms' and to do away with the industrial disputes that now take place.

This type of 'voluntary' regulation of wage increases will be of even more importance if Britain is to enter the Common Market. Competition will be strong and a regulation of wage levels will be an asset for those competing in the Market. Mr. Wilson said at the Lord Mayor's banquet that British industry should emerge strengthened and streamlined from the present economic difficulties. But in order to do this there must be increased investment. 'For years,' he said, 'we have lagged behind Europe in the proportion of our national income devoted to productive investment. We have to rid ourselves of the destructive doctrine that when times are good we do not have to modernise and invest, and when times are bad we cannot afford to.'

Investors are, after all, only interested in the return and appreciation on their capital and are therefore cautious. When a good stock comes on the market, like the recent Imperial Chemical Industries' loan stock, then they are ready to oversubscribe too. Mr. Wilson is trying to instil confidence. More investment is needed to modernise industry and to take advantage of the slack capacity of labour and machinery.

ON THE DEFENSIVE

Where do working people fit into all this? The measures taken by the Government have weakened the power of the workers and their organisations. With 700,000 expected to be out of work by the end of the year, the struggle now is a defensive one of maintaining employment. Employers have taken the opportunity to attack the union organisation and their shop stewards. Where these attacks are successful, the management will reassert their full prerogative to manage. Even the trade union leaders who oppose the Government's policies have been unwilling to call any really effective opposition. Isolated official support and court actions are not going to smash the wage freeze or the statutory powers.

The power of organised labour could do this, but Cousins and Jenkins are both afraid of the consequences of action of this sort. If any industrial action did start and spread, it might prove difficult for the trade union bureaucrats to contain. The initiative would soon pass into the hands of the rank and file. So far the main impulse for direct action has come from them, but if workers are going to maintain their wages, conditions and shop floor organisation, only direct action can do it. It is no good relying on the trade union leadership or politicians. Only the efforts of those directly affected will ensure that these policies of the Government are defeated.

P.T.

SWF Conference

A WELL ATTENDED conference of the Syndicalist Workers' Federation unanimously supported their comrades under persecution in Spain, Bulgaria and now in the Argentine. The Eighth National Conference raised £24 towards the defence of the five members of the FIJL arrested recently in Madrid (FREEDOM, 12.11.66). Most of the conference business was of the nature of an internal discussion, but all delegates agreed that the Prices and Incomes Bill should be smashed and co-operation will be sought on this issue with other liber-

FREEDOM For Workers' Control

NOVEMBER 26 1966 Vol 27 No 37

Another Para of Part IV in Action

STEWART has used a new section of Part IV of the Prices and Incomes Act, he has signed an order to prevent pay increases, which have not yet taken place. He has previously made orders, under a different section, which stopped employers from continuing to pay their workers increases they had received, such as Thorn Electric and the print workers' cost-of-living bonus.

On September 27, Rockware Glass, at Greenford, agreed to pay their maintenance engineers an increase of 4½d. an hour, when working in exceedingly hot conditions in the areas around the furnaces. Shop stewards at the plant maintain that this type of payment did not come under the Wage Freeze, and have, therefore, encouraged the men to refuse to do 'hot work' for the past two weeks. Staff workers have carried out the necessary essential maintenance. The management claim that, if normal working is not resumed, they may have to face the possibility of closing the plant.

This is a classic example of the viciousness of the Wage Freeze, where workers have negotiated an agreement with management and a third party has intervened. This is the whole basis of opposition to the Wage Freeze, where agreements have been made, and then been blatantly broken by Government intervention.

The 25,000 print workers in the Newspaper Section have had their 2s. cost-of-living bonus frozen. Many will cry that 2s. is not very much and not worth the bother, but this is just plain stupidity. The cost of living has risen far more than 2s. in any case.

The Newspaper Proprietors Association have stated publicly that they wished to honour the 'cost-of-living agreement' but, nevertheless, complied when Stewart slapped on the order. Their honour soon shrank when faced with the Law. After all it is their protection.

SHIPYARD WORKERS DISARMED

Fairfields is the Clyde shipyard which has been run for the last ten months as a trade-union-Government-private-enterprise consortium. It was to be the show piece of British shipbuilding. Management and worker acting together for the good of all, no more disputes or industrial trouble of any kind. Shipbuilding workers at Fairfields were given a choice ten months ago: the 'sack' or sell the 'Rule Book', it was decided to do the latter. Three weeks ago boilermaker apprentices struck work in support of their demand for inclusion in a productivity agreement affecting iron and working tradesmen in the yard. The Boilermakers Amalgamation district delegate maintained that in all negotiations with the management they were assured

that benefits for the apprentices would follow on as a matter of course.

The management in their reply are flashing the new Apprentices' Charter which, they claim, will benefit the apprentices more than their inclusion in the productivity agreement. The boilermakers and their apprentices do not accept the position of 'one and not the other'. At one stage the boilermakers decided on a token stoppage in support of the apprentices, but this was called off about a week before it was due to take place, but to date the apprentices are continuing their strike.

Workers at Fairfields have the threat of closure hanging over their heads all the time. It is claimed that a contract with Norway is in the balance unless 'no strike' guarantees given earlier in the year by the unions will be honoured. It is also claimed that a Royal Navy order was lost because Fairfields' chairman felt unable to promise delivery within four years. The 'no strike' guarantee is a millstone around the workers' necks. They have no other weapon with which to fight. Take away the right of 'withdrawal of labour', and the employer can do what he likes, how he likes, when he likes. Joint consultation at Fairfields is a farce, the management can make demands backed up by the threat of closure. The workers, for their part, have nothing—they have handed over the only weapon they had.

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

A clerical worker at a Cardiff steelworks got the sack for distributing trade-union leaflets. The district secretary of the Clerical and Administrative Workers' Union stated that they had 150 members in the plant and were trying to interest the other 450. Brian Evans, the worker concerned, dished out the leaflets in his own time. The leaflet was of a very revolutionary character—it was advertising a union meeting. The personnel manager refused to discuss the matter. The company headquarters said it was a labour problem for the local company to handle. The union is to fight for Evans's reinstatement.

For some employers, to have their clerical workers organised means the day of bloody revolution is near. They prefer the 'company staff' system, whereby workers and management can discuss the staff Christmas party and, if they disagree, they can all stamp their feet with no great harm done.

THE LAW GRINDS EXCEEDING SLOW

Thirty-nine workers at the Square Grip factory in Lanarkshire have been on official dispute for eight months. The company secured an interim interdict preventing the extension of the dispute. The court case dealing with this matter will not be heard until May, 1967, 13 months after the dispute began. Details of the dispute have been covered by P.T. in previous issues of FREEDOM.

The basic argument is the desire of the workers for full trade-union recognition by the management. The management claim that it has no objection to its workers belonging to a union. That is all very democratic until the union attempts to improve the workers' lot—then trade-union recognition is conveniently forgotten. The T&GWU cannot allow this to develop into a miserable defeat, as happened with the bleachers' and dyers' dispute, in Yorkshire, last year. Eight months is a long time to struggle to gain a defeat.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Libertarian Teachers' Association. Meeting to discuss organisation/future activities/publications, 7.30 p.m. Friday, November 25, 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

Accommodation. Twenty-year-old girl with five-month-old baby wants accommodation (with or without work) where she could take care of baby. Box 41.

Vietnam. Open-air Protest Meetings held every Saturday in North Hanover Street, Glasgow at 3 p.m. Glasgow Anarchist Group and USM platform. All libertarian groups invited to attend and participate.

Accommodation. Young couple (with two small sons) urgently need 3-room s.c. flat at reasonable rent. Willing to decorate, baby mind, help in house, garden, etc. Box 42.

Soho Football Club. Footballers needed for Sunday mornings. Contact Harry Marsh, TUD 1615. Evenings.

Accommodation. Martin and Sue Gilbert seek unfurnished accommodation in Greater London area — consider sharing — phone PARK 4701.

Accommodation wanted. Tourist accommodation wanted. Australian woman, travelling in Europe needs CHEAP accommodation in London for approximately four weeks in February, 1967. Prefer relatively central location. Would also like companion for travels in March. Box 43.

Sleeping Accommodation Wanted. Three libertarian Dutchmen want tolerant London accommodation for a few days Dec-Jan. Cheap. Albert Rynberg, Casa Academica, Room 652, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Concord Theatre Group. 'A Night Out' (Pinter) and a revue both directed by Shirley Newman. Wednesday 30th November, Thursday 1st December, 7.30 p.m. Kingsway College, Sidmouth Street, W.C.1. 5/- Students 2/6.

Accommodation: Bristol anarchist sympathiser, studious, responsible, teetotaler, needs bedsitter in Bristol. Clifton, Redlands, Hotwell area preferred. Large house. Box No. 43.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

Of First Importance

Dear Brothers,

Every now and then well-intentioned persons associated with anarchism get upset with its semantics. Some dislike the very name 'anarchy' (it gives offence to others!) and want us to use other terms. Some, like Francis Ellingham in *Anarchy* 63, want us to cease using the word 'society', replacing it with 'milieu'.

Now, 'Workers' Control' has upset Peter E. Newell. He tells us that we 'can still support working-class militancy and the class struggle without it'. The latter, as pursued by our unions today, consists of seeking higher wages and improved conditions for the workers—commendable goals in themselves but purely reformist also. The workers' position in society (as a paid slave) remains unchanged.

Colin Ward in his excellent article in *Anarchy* 62, 'Anarchism as a theory of organisation', quotes Stafford Beer's *Cybernetics and Management*: 'Our whole concept of control is naive, primitive... control to most people (and what a reflection this is upon a sophisticated society!) is a crude process of coercion.'

Workers' control, in terms of participation by the worker in the control of his own life at work, is obviously an anarchist activity of the first importance. Admittedly there are dangers of non-anarchist workers thus functioning as capitalists but even this would be an improvement on the present position. Even in an anarchist society—which some utopians seem to think will come without organisation, sacrifice, and steady social change—workers' control (the term, then, would probably have lapsed) would only be one manifestation of the anarchist principle of individual autonomy and self-organisation.

Fraternally,

N.S.W., Australia BILL DWYER.