

LET'S ALL BE IN CONTEMPT!

THE GOVERNMENT has now used the Industrial Relations Act—a law which it made itself—against the Trade Unions. Railwaymen have been ordered by the Court to resume 'normal working' for a period of at least 14 days to 'cool off' and by normal working the lawyers have stated that they mean working overtime and rest days. As we stated in last week's FREEDOM, this is testing time for the Unions but, before seeing how they have stood up to the test, a few words first about the main villain in the piece—Her Majesty's Bloody Government.

The Government is not some abstract institution; it is composed of men and women made of flesh and blood. They are rich men and women, very rich. The average take-home pay which they get out of our taxes is around £300 a week—more than ten times the weekly wage of a railwayman who, it has been revealed, is working up to 50, 60 and even 70 hours a week. These rich men who have ordered railwaymen to continue this slavery, on pain of all sorts of penalties, possess cars, yachts, country houses, servants and all modern luxuries. Not one of them does a useful job in society, yet they live the life of Reilly. For

them to order railwaymen about is absolutely immoral, a sheer impertinence. It should have been answered with a gigantic 'get stuffed' from the entire working population. But alas—that didn't happen.

The Union leaders, as was to be expected, were dumbfounded at being faced with the almighty LAW. They whimpered a bit, but they complied with the order. As Sir Sidney Greene, the railwaymen's leader, said of himself and his colleagues, 'we are all law-abiding citizens'. Indeed they are! Not for nothing have governments doled out knighthoods to the august members of the TUC. These gentlemen are falling over themselves trying to prove to the Court that they are 'not in contempt', that they are doing their best to get their members to carry out the 'law of the land'.

We can now expect the TUC's noisy 'campaign' against the Industrial Relations Act to die an ignominious death. Already they are talking about 'making the best of it', 'acting within the law', 'defending ourselves in the courts', and all the rest of it. At most they will issue silly statements calling for another Labour Government pledged to repeal the Act. As once they urged

the workers to trust the General Council to put things right, so now they will urge us to trust the next Labour Government to put things right. Never will they urge us to trust only in our own strength to defy the Government and ignore the law. The idea is unthinkable.

So let us not waste our time in swearing at the 'leaders'. Leave that to the organisations of the would-be leaders who would like to take their place. All leaders are the same. They all use their authority to feather their own nests. Let's have done with them all. The real question which must concern us is what will the workers do about the new situation created by the Government's use of the law in industrial disputes.

Will we accept it—or will we resist it? There isn't, in my opinion, going to be any magical overnight transformation. It is going to take some time for workers to realise that the war is on, that the old easy days are done with, that what we get now will be got only by using our strength and our power as a class.

Right now it is railwaymen (and dockers) who are in the firing line

and whilst there has not been any explosion of anger, there has been sufficient already to indicate that the Government is not going to have it all its own way.

The overtime ban is continuing on the Southern Railway and, as we write, it has developed into a general stoppage following the Area Manager's statement that unless drivers worked overtime they would be laid off. Mr. Buckton, the train drivers' leader, is beside himself. He has accused the Area Bureaucrat of upsetting his (Buckton's) efforts to get the men back to normal working!

In some ways the Government's brutal intervention may have done some good. The Trade Unions—despite the protests of its leaders—are being forced into independence, are being forced outside the establishment. It will take some time for us to get adjusted to this new situation but, unless we believe that workers will all lie down and let the Government walk all over them, we can expect a new kind of trade union movement gradually and painfully to emerge in the coming months and years. A movement which will

reject the values of this corrupt society, which will place freedom instead of money as its objective. A movement whose members will not work all the overtime they can get in order to acquire what the TV ads say that they should want. A movement whose members will not spend their lives in useless toil for the mere sake of accumulating material goods. A movement which have a free and useful society in mind, where everyone takes his share, where no one has more than another, and where no one is a slave.

Finally, it is going to be a movement that will not jump out of its skin when a Judge dons his wig and talks about 'being in contempt'. Each and every one of us has got to play a part in building such a movement and right now our slogan must be: 'When one is in contempt—we are all in contempt'. An injury to one is an injury to all. Solidarity will wipe the grin off the faces of the slave-owners, and it is solidarity that we must have if ever we are to win through to freedom.

JOHN LAWRENCE.

Up Against the Law

THE NATIONAL Industrial Relations Court has now imposed fines of £55,000 on the Transport and General Workers' Union for contempt of court over the Merseyside container-handling dispute. Dockers on Merseyside, and at other ports, have continued to black containers belonging to Heaton Transport.

The container dispute is not just confined to Merseyside but is national, affecting all dockers. It involves the increasing use of containers for transporting goods. The employers claim that containers reduce unit costs and they can be easily handled. Over £400 million has already been invested, building the ships and the terminals specially designed for them. Containerisation also means that only about 30 per cent of the normal dock gangs are needed.

The Devlin Report in August 1965 recommended such redundancies. These recommendations are part and parcel of the need to reap the benefits of profits from the increasing use of containers. Although Devlin brought some benefits to dockers, it was the signal to employers to make more use of containers. All dockers fear for their jobs as more and more use is made of containers. To safeguard their jobs dockers have claimed this work. They have maintained that dockers should do the loading and unloading at the container bases.

ACTION WON ISSUE

When dockers have used the industrial tribunals to decide this issue they have lost. All twelve cases since 1966 have been found against them. However, when they took industrial action, in July 1969, over the new Aintree container base, they won the day.

When examining the present action by Merseyside dockers, the background of this national issue must be borne in mind. On the face of it, the dispute gives the impression that dockers are trying to grab more work for themselves to the detriment of their fellow trade unionists who are members of the commercial section of the same union. At times there has been rivalry between the two sections and although an agreement was drawn up in May 1968 it has con-

tinued at some ports. This rivalry has obviously served the employer.

But, essentially, it is a struggle to safeguard jobs and the strong rank and file trade union organisation created by dockers. It is a fight against every little haulage firm who tries to employ labour on the cheap and uses containers to make a big profit. Employers do not mind employing a few men at the container base if it means that about three or four times that number are made redundant at the docks.

On Merseyside the classic divide and rule tactic of the employer has not worked. Both dockers and road transport workers are united on a Joint Committee which is organising the present campaign against Heaton's. This Joint Committee tried to get employers to sign agreements on wage rates and conditions. Heaton's was one of those who refused. When the Joint Committee told Heaton's that their containers would be blacked from March 20 they made no effort to get in touch with union officials, but instead they decided, with the backing of the Road Haulage Association, to use the Industrial Relations Act.

Mr. Jack Jones, the general secretary of the T&GWU, is now faced with a £55,000 fine. The president of the NIRC has said that if further contempt charges were brought he might have to freeze the union's assets until 'the contempt was purged'. This means that either the union stops its members blacking containers or puts its case to the court.

TOLD TO END BLACKING

Both locally, and nationally from Jack Jones, instructions have been given to members to end the blacking. But they have continued to defy these instructions. In fact the dispute could spread. Jimmy Symes, chairman of the dockers' shop stewards, has said: 'The dockers are in a mood to strike. It could happen on Monday morning.' (When Heaton's are expected to test blacking again.)

Such a strike could become national, despite local and national union orders not to take action against the three haulage companies already being blacked.

Continued on page 4

Might is Right

screams about the 'rule of law', and the alleged increase in crime, but the Government's own behaviour is so callous that it destroys the very respect for law which it urges upon its subjects. 'The rule of law' is a load of humbug anyway, but it would be in the Government's own best interests, one would have thought, to at least make some pretence of 'lawful', or at any rate civilised behaviour. In fact Lord Widgery's enquiry is nothing more than an admission that it is all right to commit murder, so long as you are strong enough to be out of the reach of punishment.

The British rulers still have a good army. They are no longer strong enough to wage war on other countries (unless they be small Arab countries on the

shores of the Persian Gulf), but with their army they are still strong enough to fight minorities within their own borders. This army has now been given *carte blanche*, and told in effect, 'Do as you like. We will cover up for you, whatever you do.'

However a civilisation based on a complex, urban technology, such as ours, cannot long survive on a basis of pure barbarism and rule by sheer force alone. If the whole structure disintegrates, with fighting, starvation and disease destroying millions, how many of our gentlemanly masters will survive? They are in the position of men who saw off the tree branch on which they themselves are sitting.

A.W.U.

Two Fingers for Boyle and Bonham

THE VOTE at the extraordinary general meeting of the Institute of Race Relations in favour of the stand taken by the director, Prof. Tinker, over his refusal to kill the institute's magazine *Race Today*, was unexpected and most heartening. All the official bigwigs of the race relations industry were shown two uncompromising fingers as it was the Establishment cronies like Bonham Carter, Boyle and Joan Lester, MP, who had been in a majority of the institute's council which had tried to both suppress *Race Today* and dismiss Prof. Tinker.

No small credit for this undoubted victory for the radical approach to race relations, which is epitomised by so many young people today, was the magnificent morale-boosting solidarity shown for *Race Today*'s editor, Sandy Kirby. Much of the letter-writing and message-delivering was done in order to keep spirits alive, the unexpected victory was a bonus. It is not often the right side wins in battles but it is a sign of our times that the forces of liberation

are winning significant battles.

An interesting message comes from the Establishment 'liberals' who lost the vote: 'If you don't see sense we'll see to it that you get no money for your journal.' It evokes the heart to thoughts of higher things—it is the last resort of the modern stranglers whose only refuge in times of stress is to wave filthy lucre in the faces of the poor. It reminds one of the distinction made by Patrick Keatley in *The Politics of Partnership* between Livingstone and Rhodes—the one who won the hearts of men, the other who ruled with riches. The battle between these distinctive approaches to life continues today in the battleground of the Race Relations Institute. It is appropriate that we have a neuter Prime Minister at such a time, for such was Rhodes' condition.

The attitude of those who will not now support the Institute of Race Relations with finance is instructive. In *Race Today*'s April editorial we learn that a

Continued on page 5

Origins of the Second World Waugh

LIKE MOST ANARCHISTS, I guess, I am suspicious of official histories and the work of 'historians' in general. I remember discovering that French school history books claim victories in battles I was taught to believe we'd won—and only just recently the *Sunday Times* revealed that the famous victory our jolly British tars won at Jutland was in fact a clear win for the Hun. What with my early childhood discovery that King George VI didn't lead the British Army into battle, my process of disillusion began before the end of sweet rationing. Since those days the official rewriting of 'history' with every change of regime has kept academics busy all over the world, and I long ago decided, that for all their special pleading and partisanship, novelists and poets were much more likely to get near the truth than the

celebrated 'detached' historians. 'History is bunk,' said that man who made motors (can't remember his name offhand and the *Britannica's* been reclaimed) and nothing I've read in history books has led me to disagree—but how about this for a piece of visionary writing put down while history was being made...

'The party left the restaurant and stood in an untidy group on the pavement, unable to make up their minds who was going with whom, in what direction, for what purpose. Ambrose bade them good-bye and hurried away, with his absurd light step and his heavy heart. Two soldiers outside a public-house made rude noises as he passed. "I'll tell your sergeant-major of you," he said gaily, almost gallantly, and flounced down the street. I should like to be one of them, he thought. I should like to go with

them and drink beer and make rude noises at passing aesthetics. What does world revolution hold for me? Will it make me any nearer them? Shall I walk differently, speak differently, be less bored with Poppet Green and her friends? Here is the war, offering a new deal for everyone; I alone bear the weight of my singularity.'

Well, that comes from *Put Out More Flags*, first published in 1942 and written by Evelyn Waugh during the first year or so of World War Two. When I came to that passage it really brought me up short, conditioned as I was to dismissing Waugh as an unspeakable right-winger, not to say fascist, and I strongly recommend it as a wicked piece of social observation of Britain during that time. My instincts tell me that Waugh's picture of a nation coming to terms with fighting a war is a far more truthful one than all the juggling with statistics and sociological analysis that you will find in the official histories. He delivers mighty blows against the posturings of left and right alike and the socialists and intellectuals at the centre of his story are stripped of all their pretensions, to reveal the selfish and frightened individuals they really are. His exposés of the wheeling and dealing involved in getting into a 'good' regiment and the fantastic old-boy network which operated within the Ministry of Information are a joy

to read and uproariously funny—and all the events of the book are tinged with a black surrealism which seems the perfect mode to adopt in dealing with those desperate times.

In a strange way the villains of the book are the poets Parsnip and Pimpnel (Auden and Isherwood?) who've fled to America to avoid the war, and they never actually make an appearance—equally strange, in view of Waugh's political views, is that Ambrose, a fellow travelling poet and critic, is really the hero. I don't know if the book is currently in print in Penguin but it should be easy to pick up secondhand. If nothing else it will make you laugh but as a piece of history I think it has many things to say of particular interest to Anarchists. And, in view of the social climate at the time it was written, it is remarkably bold and outspoken...

'It's going to be a long war. There's plenty of time. I shall wait until there's something amusing to do.'

'I don't believe it's going to be that kind of war.'

'This is all that anyone talks about, thought Ambrose; jobs and the kind of war it's going to be. War in the air, war of attrition, tank war, war of nerves, war of propaganda, war of defence in depth, war of movement, people's war, total war, indivisible war, war infinite,

war incomprehensible, war of essence, without accidents or attributes, meta-physical war, war in time-space, war eternal... all war is nonsense, thought Ambrose. I don't care about their war. It's got nothing on me. But if, thought Ambrose, I was one of these people, if I were not a cosmopolitan, Jewish pansy, if I were not all that the Nazis mean when they talk about "degenerates", if I were not a single sane individual, if I were part of a herd, one of these people, normal and responsible for the welfare of my herd, Gawd strike me pink, thought Ambrose, I wouldn't sit around discussing what kind of war it was going to be. I'd make it my kind of war. I'd set about killing and stampeding the other herd as hard and as fast as I could. Lord love a duck, thought Ambrose, there wouldn't be any animals nosing about for suitable jobs in my herd.'

To read *Put Out More Flags* now is to read history—but it's a view of history that no academic historian can write. Ambrose is still a contemporary figure—his suspicion of revolution well founded in view of, say, the treatment of homosexuals in post-revolution Cuba—his views on war anticipating those of black Americans with regard to the war in Vietnam. History is to do with casualties—the statistics of death; the anonymity cloaks the individual tragedy. The novelist and poet are concerned with feelings as well as facts and so Waugh reveals to me how it was in those days when me Dad was making aircraft and I was in me pram—too innocent to put out flags for any cause.

JEFF CLOVES.

Book Review

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

PREJUDICES AND ANTI-PATHIES. A Tract on the Library of Congress Subject Heads Concerning People, by Sanford Berman (The Scarecrow Press Inc., Metuchen, New Jersey).

A VERY GREAT DEAL according to Mr. Berman. The system of classification used by the Library of Congress influences that of other libraries, and not only in the United States. Therefore the racist, sexist, chauvinist, ageist and other forms of bias which emerge in the system by which subjects are classified have world-wide influence on the way people think.

This book rather resembles another, published in this country some years ago, and attacking another hallowed institution, *The Myth of the Britannica*. This more or less disembowelled the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, showing how inaccurate, misleading and out of date a lot of the material in this stately work is, or was then. All I can remember of it now was the quoted statement that the poet Swinburne was one of the major influences on modern youth!

The purpose of *Prejudices and Antipathies* is rather different however. Here we are not dealing with antiquated pieces of misinformation. These are up to date prejudices, although, goodness knows, they are of ancient enough lineage.

For example, why have as subject headings such expressions as 'Jewish question' or 'race question'. The Jews do not pose any special question to anyone. Instead substitute 'Genocide', 'Holocaust, Jewish (1938-1945)', 'Jews—Persecutions', 'Jews in Germany, Argentina, Poland, Russia, etc.' For 'race question' substitute 'racism'. Headings such as 'Yellow Peril' could be dropped altogether, as not only offensive but as anachronistic as the statement about Swinburne. Substitute 'East and West' and 'Pan-Pacific Relations'.

The author wants to get rid of the word 'Negro', an OK expression, provided it was spelt with a capital 'N', until recently, and substitute 'Afro-American'. I look forward to the day when these distinctions will become as outdated as those between the Mercians and the West Saxons, and someone born or settled in England or America will simply be known as English or American, the colour of his skin will no more be

thought worthy of classification than the colour of his eyes or hair. No one thinks to describe as a brown-eyed Englishman or an East Anglian the writer of these lines.

Things are just as bad with regard to religion as they are with regard to race. 'There can be no great quarrel with the fact that Christian entries preponderate in a scheme based on the actual holdings of a Western (i.e. religion-wise: Christian-oriented) library. The problem thus does not revolve about the number or extent of these entries, but rather with the manner of presentation. If the scheme is to be truly disinterested in tone and universal in applicability, there must be a parity in approach toward all the various faiths that compose the earth's religious landscape.' In fact the system of classification is based, or appears to be based, on the dictum of Parson Thwackum, 'When I mention religion, I mean the Christian religion...'

And so it goes on. The anarchists of course are coupled with terrorism. Women get poor treatment. 'Women as accountants' is a 'bias phrase', because it suggests that normally women would not be expected to be accountants. Archaic horrors such as 'Idiocy, Idiot Asylums' appear and are linked by cross reference to epilepsy!

This book is an absolute mine of absurdities. It is a sort of map of the undergrowth of Western culture. It shows how unconscious prejudices come out in the way people arrange their words. Thus we get 'Jews as Seamen', suggesting that Jews are not normally tough enough to go to sea, but 'Jewish Criminals', suggesting that to be a criminal is exactly what you would expect a Jew to be.

'The Fall of Man' comes under the heading 'Man/Woman/Sex', showing both anti-woman and anti-sex attitudes derived from ancient Mesopotamian religious fantasies, transmitted to us via Judaism and Christianity and still dominating the minds of people living in a culture capable of sending men to the moon.

It's good fun, this book. It is scholarly, but not at all dry. It's amusing to read — or tragic, according to your point of view. 'Life is a comedy to he who thinks, and a tragedy to he who feels.'

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

Revolutionary Pacifism

Dear Friends,

The idea of 'revolutionary pacifism' has shown itself in the pages of FREEDOM; I find the name a contradiction. Pacifism implies non-violence while a revolution is the seizure of power by one group of people from another, it is the culmination of a period of war between two or more classes. War is political violence, revolution is always violent, no class gives away its power, its control over society without a fight, thus even if a non-violent seizure of power was attempted, the ruling class would react violently to stay in power.

Letters

Revolution is therefore a matter of war, of killing. I respect a pacifist who feels he could not kill another human being but I find his dreams of 'revolutionary pacifism' misleading and suicidal—you can't have the cake and eat it. A pacifist can be a rebel against the violent society he lives in, he can convert others to his way of thinking, but there is no point in indulging in utopian schemes.

No revolution has ever created a society based on co-operation and mutual aid for any length of time, possibly no revolution, being violent, can; but revolutions have occurred while pacifism remains an individual rebellion. Accept violence as necessary to change society or live according to pacifist ideals, but although an anarchist society would be non-violent, the way of establishing it is not.

Yours fraternally,

London K. BRYHZYNSKI.

Clockwork Orange

Dear Sir,

I have only just seen the review—'Clockwork—but no Orange'—by N.W., published in your issue of January 29, 1972. This comment is then perforce belated, but I hope that it is of some general use or interest. I'm not concerned with N.W.'s judgement of Kubrick's film, *A Clockwork Orange* (though, borrowing his own summary technique, I would say it was jejune and unconsidered), but I can't really accept without a growl his summation of my own work: 'Burgess is a writer who has more breadth than depth, who writes too fast and too much, who says so much that he often has nothing to say, but *A Clockwork Orange* is one of his better books.'

I ignore the breadth-depth comment, which is probably meaningless, but who is N.W. to say that I write 'too fast and too much'? I mean, how much is one permitted to write? I should be grateful to have a limit prescribed. As for 'too fast', what the hell does he know about how fast or slowly I write? I usually write about 1,000 words a day. Is this too much? I only want to know.

Big Business Take-Over

ANARCHISTS ARE forever pointing out the part that trade union bureaucrats play in perpetuating the exploitation of workers. The apparently never-ending drama about whether or not the EPTU will merge with the AUEW or the GMWU has all the hallmarks of a big business take-over bid. Indeed, the whole boring affair sent the economist journalists of the Sunday papers scrambling for their typewriters. There is revealed a complicated web of intrigue with each union leader trying to pull a fast one over his 'brother' bureaucrats and, of course, also trying to kick the legs from under the up-and-coming bureaucratic contenders within his own union! The quest for power can invariably explain the inexplicable, and certainly explains the improper suggestions passing between 'left-wing' and 'right-wing' union leaders.

No doubt to the politicians of the Left the possible outcomes will be riddled with 101 subtle shades of Left and Right, and the sacred scrolls will tell us which merger under whose leadership will advance the cause of the Revolution. However, to anarchists the devious schemes

A Clockwork Orange, which I don't consider personally to be one of my 'better books', was admittedly written in the same year—an alleged terminal year, according to the neurologists who were looking after my alleged cerebral tumour—as five other novels. It was written in five weeks, which may be a little too quick for anyone, let alone N.W. It was, in other words, the fruit of my worst faults. And yet it's one of my 'better books'. N.W. is in the right ventral region to know a hawk from a handsaw, or is it the other way round?

Yours, etc.,
ANTHONY BURGESS.

'Please Teachers...'

Dear Comrades,

David Brown in his article 'Please Teachers, You Forgot the Children' completely misses the point when he criticises the NUT and NAS for their lack of interest in children. The interest is there, but a trade union annual conference is not the place where the representatives of the members should talk about consumer affairs.

The function of a trade union is to protect the interests of its members, to see that their wages are adequate and working conditions are the best possible, plus to further the interests of the trade or craft.

It is not the function of a trade union to indulge in party, or even non-party, politics, most especially when these do not concern the above factors. Nor is it the function of a trade union annual conference to be dominated by those who wish, whilst acting as members' representatives, to put over their private political views. In any case there are many pressure groups and journals within, and concerned with, teaching where this can be, and often is, done.

of union bureaucrats—whether 'right-wing' Frank Chapple or 'left-wing' Hugh Scanlon—cannot advance the struggle for freedom. We are all for solidarity between workers in different unions, different industries and different lands but union mergers engineered by union leaders for their own interests will not increase that solidarity. The existing unions show that when the chips are down rank and file workers cannot count on the support of their own union bureaucrats, whatever 'left' platitudes they mouth. We must fight our own struggles for ourselves and count on the solidarity of our fellow-workers.

T.P.

Are you a university student?
Get your professor to recommend for the university library a set of

BOUND VOLUMES
ANARCHY Vols. 1-10
(Nos. 1-118)
1961-1970 complete
Price £40.00 per set
(p. & p. £1)

Were workers' control to be achieved in teaching some of the representatives might find that the 'right of recall' quickly put paid to internal pressure group practices. In any case, and this is what a lot of libertarian teachers fail to see, if workers' control were achieved in education it would mean workers' control by the staff, that is, in most cases, the teachers. It would not mean pupil participation or 'pupil power' whatever that is. It may well be that consumers should have the right to participate but is this the pupil or the parent? It may be that consumers' control is more important for some than workers' control, however if this is so would they please indicate and not waste their time and ours by confusing syndicalism with communism.

As a teacher and an anarchist I would like to go down on record as saying, whilst I am in favour of workers' control I do not advocate pupil control. By this however I would clarify that whilst I do say this, I do not feel I wish to interfere with their private views, life styles, sex life, dress and the like. But when I teach, I am in control of the learning situation. I prepare and develop the syllabus. If class members interfere with others who wish to work or bully others then I will come down on them like a ton of bricks. I adopt a simple rule. I assume pupils are there because they want to be there, and are willing to participate. If they are not, I am willing to mediate but in the last analysis the final decision rests with me, as a trained teacher and craftsman of the art. Let me draw up an analogy. Would you let the wiring of a house or factory be done by an amateur or a craftsman? It is the teacher who says when a person is qualified to do the job, not the apprentice.

Fraternally,
PETER NEVILLE.



Secretary:
Peter Le Mare, 5 Hannaford Road,
Rotton Park, Birmingham 16

**ANARCHIST
FEDERATION
of BRITAIN**

AFBIB—To all Groups.

The next AFBIB will be produced in Sheffield at 4 Havelock Square, Sheffield, 10. Send material to Secretary, Peter Le Mare. Also needs offers of help from Groups to bring out further issues.

The Contact Column in 'Freedom' is also available for urgent information. Groups should send latest addresses to Birmingham. New inquirers should write direct to them or to the AFB information office in Birmingham.

AFB REGIONAL GROUPS

There are now anarchist groups in almost every part of the country. To find your nearest group write to:

N.E. England: Mick Renwick, 34 Durham Road, Gateshead, Co. Durham.
East & E. Midlands: P. Newell, 'Aegean', Spring Lane, Eight Ash Green, Colchester. (QM, FL)
Surrey: G. Wright, 47 College Road, Epsom.
Yorkshire: Trevor Bavage, Flat 3, 35 Richmond Road, Leeds, 6.
Manchester: Mat Cunningham, 9 Briar Hill Avenue, Little Hulton, Worsley, Lancs.
Scotland: Secretary, Mike Malet, 1 Lynnewood Place, Maryfield, Dundee.
Wales: c/o P. L. Mare (address above).
N. Ireland: c/o Freedom Press.
The American Federation of Anarchists: P.O. Box 9885, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55440, USA.
S. Ireland: 20 College Lane, Dublin, 2.
University and Student Groups: c/o P. L. Mare.

On the Need to Abolish Money

SOME WEEKS AGO we were having a guided tour, on the Early Middle Ages, at the British Museum when our attention was caught by two remarks from the lecturer: 'During this period every city in Europe, except Byzantium, was a heap of rubble. This destruction was not primarily due to enemy action but to inflation.' This is something worth thinking about, since inflation is one of our most pressing problems today, and we suggest that a cause of inflation is the abuse of money.

No one will disagree that money is useful as a means of exchange. No one would expect to carry round, say, a sack of flour until he found someone who needed it, and was willing to trade a sack of coke. The use of money would do away with this, and this is money's correct use. Money's incorrect use is firstly a social, economic, and political weapon which, in our present state of society, must be used against the majority of the people, and secondly as a measure of how much we mistrust one another. It is these two abuses that may be the cause of the mess that the country is in today.

Policies depend on money. Over and over we hear the argument 'We should like to do this, but it would cost too much' or 'Doing it this way would save money'.

Hence, until very recently, we tip crude sewage into rivers instead of converting it to fertilizer, we pollute the atmosphere instead of removing sulphur from fuel oil, we dump mine spoil in heaps as at Aberfan, instead of burying it where it

belongs—all for short term financial gain, never mind the country or the people in it. And, who knows, such measures may be more expensive in the long run. The fiasco of the building of the *Queen Elizabeth II* was caused by human error. Had three-quarters of the shipyard workers been given a two years' paid holiday and the ship built by automation this might have been eliminated. But the workers needed the money so they 'worked' for it with the results we know. Money interferes with production. Had the *Jervis Bay* been built automatically, would she have been delivered a year late?

When society is controlled by people who live for making money it is noticeable that the quality of production falls. Many people have had experience of, say, cars, leather suitcases, furniture, made many years ago that never, given reasonable maintenance, seem to wear out, simply because they were well made. Today with all the technological advances made since then, it should be possible to make goods that would last almost indefinitely. But do they? We all know how shoddy are many of today's goods. Why are they shoddy? Obviously so that they will wear out quickly and a profit can be made on new ones. Added to this, of course, is that workmen who make shoddy goods are themselves after as much money as they can get, and in making rubbish can have no pride in craftsmanship. It should not be forgotten that this suits the politicians too, for if one has to buy two articles where one would do, twice as much tax is

paid. An objection to, say, clothes lasting a long time is that they would go out of fashion, but our opinion is that fashion is one of those things, 'Made . . . by knaves to set a trap for foods'. After all, many people admire the Grenadier Guards on parade, and their clothes are not exactly 1970. If people had more important things to think about, fashion would worry them less. In the same way do we really need so many types of car, and so many new models annually?

We would consider that this devotion to the cash nexus may cause psychological harm. If both parents are out working overtime to make enough money to buy inferior goods their children may suffer. We have heard of schools where children, dressed raggedly and dirtily, have brought large, expensive dolls to school. It would surely be better if the mothers were to stay at home, and the children would probably be happier, dolls or no dolls. And as to being in fashion, and 'Keeping up with the Jones's', we know what situation, on an international scale, that can produce.

An example of money being a measure of mutual mistrust is a railway journey. We buy tickets, and at the end of the journey hand them to a ticket collector. So the railway has to pay the salaries of hordes of clerks and collectors, possibly inspectors too. But to handle their salaries—and their own—there has to be an accounts department. And people to check the accounts department. And banks to handle the accounts department's money. And inspectors to check that the bankers are honest. And police to protect the banks. The argument against having automated, free, crewless trains is that they would be abused. Bona fide travellers would be unable to find seats, because they would all be taken by homeless tramps. If it were unnecessary to build for money there

would be houses for all, besides, as will be seen, in a moneyless society there would probably be far fewer of such people. In many cases it is our present form of society which creates them.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the cash nexus is the way it encourages crime. It is said that big-time gangsters control gambling in the USA, and this may spread here. We have big business controlling advertisers who deliberately use applied psychology to make the public think that they are being deprived if they cannot obtain the product. This is putting temptation in people's way. Weak people, unable to afford to buy, will either steal the product or the money to buy it. So the system encourages crime in order to make rich people richer, and more powerful.

So that if money were abolished, except as a means of exchange, the quality of life would improve. Work could be done, not because it paid, but because it would be worth doing. Pride in workmanship could return, and shoddiness be despised. Relief from the rat race would make us less selfish and society would be better to live in. It is not unfair to say that the reason that so many valuable young men have rejected our society is that they have seen the cash nexus for the fraud that it is. And if the acquisition of the largest possible sum of money is the most important thing in life—and it seems that many adults believe that it is—then, surely, we as teachers should instruct our pupils how to be successful bank robbers.

A. JENKS.

NALGO SAYS NO!

THUS SAID our banners on the great TUC-organised demonstration against the Government's Industrial Relations Bill last year. But our executive voted for registration.

The National Local Government Officers Association organises almost all 'white collar' local government workers, including principal officers, architects, sewerage engineers and social workers. Many members earn over £2,000 a year. Some get as much as £5,000. NALGO is considered, quite naturally, to be the most right-wing and unmilitant union in Britain.*

But times are changing. It is also the fastest growing union in the country. It is also the fourth largest, and will soon have 500,000 members. Hundreds of thousands of NALGO's membership, including many principal officers, would not have even joined a union ten years ago. Three years ago, the word 'strike' was considered almost obscene—but not now! Even senior architects in the Town Hall mumble the word. NALGO, of course, has its 'Action Group', an unofficial pressure organisation within the union—comprised of International Socialists, Maoists and Anarchists,† mainly operating in London and other large cities, but also in some smaller towns—which has achieved considerable success. Many 'actionists' are former

university students who are now local government social workers and psychologists (in my town one of them was formerly a member of York University Anarchist Group).

All this activity, together with the ever-rising cost-of-living, the anti-social (in the 'welfare' sense) policies of the Government and the increasing crises of our present capitalist system, are forcing (slowly but surely) local government employees—and the NALGO leadership—into a more aggressive and militant frame of mind.

Last week NALGO executive reversed its decision to register under the Industrial Relations Act—by 54 votes to 2. Conference later in the year is expected to endorse the decision.

Subservience to 'betters', councillors and authority generally is breaking down—even in the Town Halls.

NALGO MEMBER.

*The Sunday Observer (12.3.72) reports that 'many members were furious that it (NALGO) gave £1,000 to help the miners'. This is not true. Public Service, our paper, reported only 12. †There are a few Communist Party members in NALGO, including, it is said, a few on the executive, but they are about as militant as the Archbishop of Canterbury!

Referendum or Revolution?

THE LABOUR PARTY has at last decided to enter into a not-so-unholy alliance with right-wing Tories in order to demand a referendum on the issue of Britain's entry to the Common Market. Only the most naive of observers would suggest that this is indicative of a great breakthrough in the Labour Party for the principle of consulting the people on their own future.

The Labour Party politicians in true form are prepared to use any gimmick in order to try and get themselves back into power. Wilson and Co. had hoped to exploit the apparent public hostility to the Common Market in order to force and win a General Election. In the event the British working class has not, to its credit, dirtied its hands with the sick, xenophobic ravings of the flag-waving nationalists, and has found the theoretical debate about possible higher prices in the Market pretty insignificant in comparison with the only too obvious attacks on its living standards by recent Labour and Tory Governments. Furthermore, the public attitude to the Common Market appears to be one of bored indifference rather than crusading opposition. However the Labour Party still has a trump card in the call for a referendum. Whether voters are in favour

of the Common Market, against it or merely bored stiff, the Labour Party can pose as the loyal servant and respecter of the popular will.

The choice anarchists demand is the choice no politicians' party-trick referendum or election will ever give us. We do not want to choose between the government of Tweedledum and Tweedledee—we want NO government. We want to be free to control our own lives as individuals. We believe that we could all build a better society on the anarchist principles of voluntary co-operation and mutual aid rather than compulsion by the State and the profits of capitalism. We want our own dreams not the plastic fantasies of the consumer society. We want to be free from the boredom of a lifetime of futile work and instead we want to experience the joy of useful, creative work. We KNOW that the good life could be; we have tasted it in our loving personal relationships and in the joy of doing freely something we believed to be worthwhile.

But freedom is not on the agenda for any politician's referendum or election manifesto. The State stands for legalised terror and exploitation. The destruction of all authority is the first step towards creating a free society. TERRY PHILLIPS.

Two Fingers

Continued from page 1

headline on the cover of a recent issue of *Race Today* 'Five Million Africans say NO' to the Goodman/Smith/Home terms in Rhodesia cost the institute 'between ten and twenty thousand pounds in withheld donations'. So now we see the sort of race relations the institute was supposed to adopt, we see the underlying trend behind all official thinking on race. In a superb and moving article by the West Indian writer Hal Austin in April's *Race Today* (verbally a jazz solo to equal Armstrong or Parker) the *raison d'être* of the official race industry is pinpointed: 'The main purpose of (their) existence is to sugar-coat with statistics the heinous crimes daily committed against black people; (they are) forces that need a clear way to perpetuate the lie that we are primitive cannibals who must be taught the "civilised" British way of life—forcefully but tactfully.' These were policies completely negated by *Race Today*. Their negation, however, lives on and breathes the life of a different approach which captures the enthusiasm of the best, if not the richest, in our midst.

J.W.

Rights of Ulster Protestants

The following letter appeared in 'Tribune', April 15.

Nine members of the Workers' Association protested peacefully in Dublin on April 4 against the chauvinist ambition of the 26-county state to incorporate a people into a nationality to which they do not belong and which they reject.

The nine were thrown into Mountjoy prison to await trial on April 11. Bail and surety were set at a total of £2,790 and a magistrate refused to accept sureties for five of the accused. These are ordinary working men; seven of them, including a member of the British National Graphical Association, face the loss of their jobs in the north. Several have already suffered at the hands of the rival chauvinism in the six counties. They can expect little help from the British Left which is committed, in varying degrees, to support for the IRA.

It is apt that the blunt legal instrument used against (the Prohibition of Forcible Entry and Occupation legislation, whose constitutionality is under challenge) should be that employed by the 26-county regime against the homeless anger of squatters, in a society in many respects as unequal and unjust as Derry under Unionist exploitation.

It is no less apt that land speculators should figure so prominently among those ornaments of the regime who financed and subsidised the Provisional IRA in the first instance. Most apt is the contrast between the regime's treatment of these men and its delicate handling of the Provisionals. Such threat as the Provisionals pose to the 26-county state is a merely political threat to the careers of its directors; the Provisionals, after all, simply carry to their logical conclusion the ideologies and mythologies which inform the regime.

In the long run (all too long a run regrettably) the threat from the Workers' Association will be more serious since it tries to eradicate the national division among working people by tearing up the root of conflict, that claim to the north which has been a prime cause of the paranoia which has for so long perverted and paralysed political life in the six counties.

The Association calls for the full recognition and implementation of the right to self-determination of the Protestant nation in the six counties, for full and equal rights and opportunities for Catholic people in the six counties and for the full secular emancipation of society in the 26 counties.

This struggle for the unity of working people will be long, lonely and heart-breaking, but struggle on they must, to prise free the working classes of Ireland from the grip of the twin monstrosities of mystifying and murderous nationalism which offer them nothing but lies, betrayal and defeat.

Heslington, York GLYN WILLIAMS.

PRESS FUND

Contributions

April 13-19 inc.
Corby: T.P. £1; Lanarks.: Anon 72p;
Glasgow: A.J. 6p; British Columbia: B.P. £1; Wolverhampton: J.L. 40p; J.K.W. 10p.
Total: £3.28
Volunt. Sales: £8.00
£11.28

(1) INCOME FROM POSTAL SUBSCRIPTIONS AND SALES (Target for 1972—£4,500)
Amount received to April 19 £1,334.13
(2) PRESS FUND CONTRIBUTIONS (Target for 1972—£1,500)
Amount received April 13-19 inc. £11.28
Previously acknowledged £476.93
TOTAL TO DATE £488.21

Down Again!



- Any book not in stock, but in print can be promptly supplied. Please add postage & cash with order helps.
- The State Randolph Bourne £0.10 (2½p)
 - The Art of Loving Erich Fromm £0.45 (4½p)
 - Celebration of Awareness Ivan D. Illich £0.95 (8½p)
 - The Poor and the Super Poor The Beginning of an Epoch Two Pamphlets published by 'Create Situations', New York each £0.30 (3½p)
 - Survival Scrapbook I: Shelter Unicorn Bookshop £1.25 (15p)
 - No Treason Lysander Spooner £0.60 (4½p)
 - The Russian Anarchists Paul Avrich £4.50 (21p)
 - Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist Alexander Berkman £1.50 (21p)
 - Men against the State James J. Martin £1.05 (14p)
 - French Utopias: An anthology of Ideal Societies (ed.) Manuel & Manuel £2.20 (21p)
 - The Parts are all around us Parts 1 & 2 (Published by Friends of Malatesta, US) Bob Dickens £0.16 (2½p)

Please send foolscap (9" x 4") S.A.E. if you would like to receive regular booklists.

Freedom Press

publish
FREEDOM weekly
and distribute
ANARCHY monthly

84b Whitechapel High Street
London E1 01-247 9249
Entrance Angel Alley,
Whitechapel Art Gallery exit,
Aldgate East Underground Stn.
SPECIMEN COPIES ON
REQUEST

Bookshop

Open Afternoons
Tuesday to Friday
2 p.m. to 6 p.m.
Open Evenings
Thursday close at 8.30 p.m.
Saturday 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, 1972

FREEDOM		
Inland, and Surface Mail abroad		
for one year	£3.00	(\$7.50)
six months	£1.50	(\$3.75)
three months	£0.80	(\$2.00)
Airmail		
Europe & Middle East	1 year	£4.00
The Americas	6 months	£2.00
	1 year	\$12.50
	6 months	\$6.25
India, Africa, &c.	1 year	£4.50
	6 months	£2.25
Australasia & Far East	1 year	£5.00
	6 months	£2.50
ANARCHY		
Inland, and Surface Mail abroad		
12 issues	£2.25	(\$6.00)
6 issues	£1.13	(\$3.00)
Airmail		
USA & Canada	12 issues	\$11.00
	6 issues	\$6.00
Australasia & Far East	12 issues	£4.50
	6 issues	£2.25

UNIVERSAL Direct Mail Services are an advertising firm occupying several buildings on Cromer Street, near Kings Cross. Every week, envelopes numbering into the hundred thousands are addressed for them by outworkers for £1.50 per thousand (typewritten) and £1 per thousand (handwritten).

The most you can earn at these rates, working uninterruptedly on an electric typewriter, is 22½p per hour. Average earnings for typists are probably closer to 15p per hour, less if you are trying to mind children at the same time or are doing the work at night. I don't like to think of what hand-addressers earn.

Efficiency is further cut down by the fact that the lists of addresses are a mess—fistfuls of scrawled self-addressed coupons which won't stay in a pile; lists, in tiny print, of company mastheads out of which you are supposed to pick the relevant executive's name, etc. Among the many 'regulations' with which the aspiring employee is presented upon her first visit, is that lists must be kept in their original order, so that UDMS can spot-check them against the envelopes. The chutzpah. I put the word 'regulations' in quotes because it seems so absurd that these sharks should attach conditions to the privilege of working for them; yet there the regulations are, Roneo'd for all the ages, and the horrible thing is that maybe some workers are impressed by them.

UDMS doesn't collect or deliver the work or pay fares. On their own statement, not all the workers live nearby; many come from as far away as I do, a 17½p, 45-minute journey each way. The firm claims to try to keep down the number of journeys you make, allowing you to take as much or as little work with you as you like: which is fine for those 15p-an-hour workers who own cars; two thousand envelopes are an arm-breaking load, impossible with and impractical even without a child in tow. So if you are trying to earn anything at all by it, you have to make repeated trips back and forth. Oh, and the first time you work for them, they'll only give you 500, to make sure you're good enough.

I Actually Saw an Outworker!

Another reason why journeys cannot be kept to a minimum is that according to the regulations, Monday (or Tuesday or Wednesday if you prefer) is payday, but only work brought in by the previous Friday will be paid for on a given Monday. If the work is not brought in until Monday, it won't be paid for until the Monday after that. This means that if you've done a batch during the week, and can't or don't want to do more over the weekend, but do want to be paid on the nearest payday, you must make an otherwise unnecessary journey on Friday. (Deferred-payment fiddles of various kinds are common on ill-paid, casual jobs, as is paying less than you expected, or even withholding pay altogether on some excuse. What's the worker going to do—hire a lawyer?)

A BRUSH WITH UDMS

I've done a total of three jobs for UDMS, at times when the manuscript work which I usually do at home wasn't coming in. I brought back the second batch on a Wednesday and collected the third, telling the toady who gives out the work that I didn't want to make an extra trip on Friday so could I be paid for the new batch, as well as for the second, on the Monday. He said yes.

When I turned up on Monday he paid me for the second batch only—duly bringing out a receipt for me to sign, for these people have a horror of being cheated by ungrateful employees; they take your address in finest detail at the outset of your relationship. I reminded him that he had said I would be paid for the third batch also; he denied this, invoking the regulations; I argued; he summoned the manager—a hollow-eyed, evil specimen, to whom I said, 'I know your regulations but he said I'd be paid today as I didn't want to make an extra trip on Friday.'

Underling denied this with a sick smile

—'Oh no, I couldn't have said that; I haven't the authority.' The manager set his lips, disappeared, and returned with the money and another receipt.

'I'll pay you this time,' he said, 'but I warn you —' At this point (having the money in my purse) I told him, not too coherently, what I thought of him, and left, relieved at the occasion for not doing any more bloody envelopes.

WOMEN'S LIB?

It seemed to me that a demonstration was in order, so I approached the Women's Lib outworkers' group about leafletting the place on a payday. Their response showed the bourgeois attitudes which infest the left-wing, giving the workers little choice between it and overtly capitalist institutions.

The group leader said that, although later they might want to use UDMS as the focus for what she delicately termed 'a leafletting experience', at present they had a research project on. They wanted to take questionnaires from door to door in a section of Finsbury Park where they believed a lot of women did outwork, and get some information on the subject.

I went to a questionnaire-planning meeting, a typical dithery business. They wanted to include a question about collection and delivery of work, and couldn't decide how to word it: should they say, 'Do you collect and deliver the work for yourself?' or 'Does the firm collect and deliver the work?' or 'Who collects and delivers the work?' or 'How is the work collected and delivered?' You wouldn't believe how much ambiguity can be found in a simple question if you really look for it. I don't remember how or whether this problem was solved.

ALIENATION

Another question was: in cases where the work was collected and delivered by the firm, did the boss himself come or

was it a member of his family or a driver or what?

'Why, some of them may never even see their bosses!' one woman lamented. 'There's the impersonality, the alienation . . .' I said in polite language (such being the effect of the group) that I didn't give a monkey's fuck whether I ever saw the boss or not, and didn't think other outworkers did either; after some discussion they omitted the question, one of them remarking with rare insight, 'It wouldn't change their position.'

Later they got onto a prospective question which was so knotty that at first it was hard to tell, from the widely differing versions suggested, what they were driving at all.

'What kind of work did you do before you started outwork —?'

'What kind of school did you go to —?'

'Did you used to work in a factory —?'

'Have you always done unsk—?' This dirty word was immediately bitten off.

I said, 'Why don't you ask them what class they belong to?' Looks of horror. 'Or, "what educational level have you achieved?"'

A PILOT SURVEY

Tact was a big concern in planning the interviews—naturally, as there was so much contempt to conceal. They saw the need to make clear that they weren't welfare pigs (something interesting emerged at this point; besides the National Insurance and Social Security reasons for keeping outwork secret, council tenants can have their rents raised if they use the premises for making money) and one woman suggested that an even more reassuring measure would be to dispense with paper and pencil and just have a friendly chat. However, several people objected that they wouldn't be able to

keep all the questions, not to mention the answers, in their heads, so rather regretably this interesting scheme of research collated from memory had to be dropped. I've heard of people employed as market research interviewers who would do the first few interviews, then invent the rest in the comfort of their own homes, but I don't suppose that idea would have been well received either.

Finally they decided to postpone finishing the questionnaire until their next meeting a fortnight later. No one actually had to leave or do anything else, but they felt 'pressured' and expected they would do a better job when their creative powers had rested. As you may have guessed, this project was only a pilot survey, to be followed by something more intensive.

During the informal conversation that followed, one woman said, 'You know, I was walking through the area [in Finsbury Park] the other day, and I saw some people carrying big boxes in and out of the factory gates, and then I looked in a window and I saw someone working: I,' she said, arching and bristling with laughter, 'actually saw an outworker!' She was joking, but didn't see the point of the joke: why are these people bothering about outworkers anyway? Why don't they cure their own ills?—always the hardest task for anyone who considers herself political.

A MEANS TO INDEPENDENCE

Meanwhile, if any workers would like to have a leafletting experience on Cromer Street, their support would be welcome. I don't see outwork as a second-rate alternative to factory or office jobs, which only needs to be brought under the umbrella of union rates and rules to be acceptable. If well paid, it can be a positive means to independence. Outworkers, individually or in groups, should see themselves, like gangworkers, as contractors setting certain prices, rather than employees asking certain wages. The Department of Employment say they can do nothing about low rates for outwork, as it's a matter of agreement between employer and employee. Fair enough, but let's make it clear that we're part of the agreement too. It's with this object in mind that I'd like to demonstrate at UDMS—and also, *pace* the god of pilot surveys, because I'm angry!

K. PERLO.

This Week in Ireland

THE WIDGERY REPORT, written in the best whitewash, is published. It is in many ways an odd report. He admits the soldiers 'fired in a reckless way' and then goes on to exonerate and praise them. He dismisses the doctor who un-

Up Against the Law

Continued from page 1

Continuing, Jimmy Symes said: 'We have taken note of this, but we don't agree with them. We are not defying the union—we are the union. The only way evil can succeed is if good men stand by and do nothing.'

There is a world of difference between the defiant attitude of the rank and file and the cautious approach of Jack Jones. Mr. Jones and his officials are very worried men, since they are now placed in a very invidious position. The officers of the union will either have to back their verbal opposition to the Industrial Relations Act by supporting the dockers and have the union's assets seized, or recognise the law by appearing before the NIRC. Jack Jones is seeking a way out by going to the TUC for advice, but if his members continue their action he may well have to discipline or even expel them.

The trouble with the union leaders, both 'left' and 'right', is that they want it both ways. They are not willing to take the consequences of a principled stand against a law they say they abhor. The assets and the union come first, like a business interest rather than the principle itself.

Some union leaders see a union as money in the bank, office buildings and full-time officials. But the reality is that given by Jimmy Symes. The members, 'we are the union'. A union does not need full-time officials, flash office buildings and a big bank balance. It needs men of principle, who are willing to take on the boss and the law and fight for justice. If the law has to be broken, then it must be.

But union leaders, in common with all those in authority, want to remain in control. They might talk about shop floor decision-making, but they don't want it when it jeopardizes the union funds and their comfortable lives.

If the working class decide to disobey the law, there isn't a thing the state can do about it. Having taken such a step workers could decide to take over completely.

dressed and examined a youth who later died and who swore the said youth had nothing in his pockets. 'There are photographs showing four nail bombs sticking out of his pockets.' He could not even entertain the idea that these had been planted. The two priests and the many reporters from abroad and other people who swore the army fired first are also dismissed. He is certain the army were fired at first by the IRA, and eventually comes to the odd conclusion that if the march had not been held no one would have been killed and it was all the fault of the Civil Rights. Once again justice has been seen NOT to be done by the English. Heath purrs so loudly we can hear him over here and the Unionists are cock-a-hoop and talk of the explosion of lying myths. But they may have to pay for these 'lying myths' this weekend and in the future. Any chance Whitelaw had has been aborted before birth by this report.

Meanwhile Joseph McCann was called to stop by soldiers. He ran and they shot him. He fell, so they went up to four feet and pumped him full of machine-gun bullets. He was an IRA leader but was totally unarmed at the time and could have been arrested without any gunshot. So on Monday James

Elliot of the UDF was abducted and brought across the border. Yesterday his dead body was laid just across the border. He was booby trapped. Others on both sides have been cold bloodedly murdered as the 'Ten eyes for an eye and ten teeth for a tooth' ideology goes unabated. 'What have I to do with peace,' as Joshua cried.

The budget came out yesterday. It is giving tiny rises in social security benefits, but not until next October by which time the rise in prices will have cancelled it out. The rich are getting income tax relief but this will not help the poorer members of the community. Anyhow once we have been bullied into the EEC an autumn budget will be issued. This is just a vote catcher.

I was shocked to my heart's core yesterday by a piece of government dishonesty. On May 10 a referendum is being held as to whether or no we go into the EEC. On May 1 a new 4p stamp is being issued marked 'Europe'. I went to buy two 4p stamps and was given four 2p ones as 'the old ones are not being printed any more in view of the new one out on May 1'. So the public without any regard for their opinions are to be used to advertise for the government. Well this member of the public will not be so coddled, and is buying a vast quantity of 4p stamps and will plaster her letters with them.

Is there an honest politician anywhere in the world?

H.

Anyone for Hemlock?

I WAS ARRESTED by a policeman in uniform in Portobello Road on Saturday, August 28, 1971, and later that day at Notting Hill police station I was charged with 'wilfully exposing to view in the street an obscene print'.

The allegedly 'obscene print' was a leaflet advertising the religious services of the Church of Aphrodite.

The Marylebone court decided to hear the case on October 10—but I couldn't appear in court because I was in Pentonville prison doing three months for speaking about the great goddess of love at Speakers' Corner, Hyde Park.

On Monday, February 7, three plain clothes men, one of them with a truncheon in his hand, came to the Temple of Love in Tooting and arrested me for having failed to appear in court.

The following day, Tuesday, February 8, the officer in charge of this case, Det. Insp. Rootes from Scotland Yard, asked me at the Notting Hill police station if

I knew it was illegal to corrupt public morals.

In Marylebone court the following day I told the Judges in the public gallery that Socrates was accused of corrupting the morals of the people and he was tried by five hundred judges chosen by lot from the ordinary people of Athens.

I too have been accused of corrupting the morals of the people and I too wish to be tried by five hundred judges chosen by lot from the ordinary people of London.

The court adjourned the case till March 29—but when I appeared there for the hearing Det. Insp. Rootes told me the matter is now in the hands of the Director of Public Prosecutions and that he will ask the court to adjourn the case again.

The case is now going to be heard in Marylebone People's Court on May 24 at 2 p.m.

P.P.

Contact

Contact Column is for making contact! Use is free, but donations towards typesetting costs are welcome

Help Fold and Despatch 'FREEDOM' Thursdays from 2 p.m., followed by discussion at 7.30 p.m.

Anarchist Syndicalist Alliance National Conference to be convened in Manchester/Salford on May 13/14. Details and items for agenda, enquiries: A. Portus, 116 Gilda Brook Road, Eccles, Lancs.

Will Jake Jenkins, believed to be in South Shields, get in touch with Maurice, Alison and Kiki, 107 St. Pauls Road, Jarrow.

'Roadrunner'—revolutionary Christian monthly—issue 34 has special feature on education and articles about Namibia, the Harrisburg Eight and the 1838 Act plus regular items, Tiny Mines, etc. £1.25 for 12 issues, or 65p for six from 28 Brundrefts Road, Manchester, 21.

S.E. Groups Monthly News and Information Bulletin. First production meeting in Brighton, April 30. Would groups send delegates and/or reports with addresses of local organisations, publications, etc. Production on rotating basis. Details from c/o Flat 3, 26 Clifton Road, Brighton.

Leeds Free School and community trust. A free school project is being organised in Leeds. Money and materials are urgently needed. All donations and enquiries to: M. Silver, 7 Hessele Mount, Leeds 6.

Arts Festival in Bickershaw (Lancs.) (Theatre, Poetry, Pop, etc.) May 5-6-7. Comrades participating and willing to sell literature, leaflet, etc., 'phone Bob Lees 061-652 4047 or write Brian J. Banks, 553 Liverpool Road, Platt Bridge, Nr. Wigan, Lancs.

Nihilistic Luddites interested in forming an agricultural commune contact M. Phillips, 26 Uckfield Grove, Mitcham, Surrey.

'A Flight of Silver Birds', original poems by Tina Morris. Send 24p for 6 cards

(3 different designs) to 18 Pemberton Street, Blackburn, BB1 9AB.

Iberian Centre, Holy Trinity Church Hall, 125 Kingsway, London, W.C.1. Cycle of Films: Sunday, April 30, 7.30 p.m., 'The Exterminating Angel'. (directed by Luis Buñuel, English subtitles); Sunday, May 7, 7.30 p.m., 'The Executioner' (directed by Luis G. Berlanga, English subtitles).

Free School Must Get Started! Need small East London room for office to start ball rolling. Pay reasonable rent. Tel. Joe, Orpington 25223.

Harringay and District Anarchists meet every Thursday from 8 p.m. in the Saloon Bar of the Osborn Tavern, Stroud Green Road, Finsbury Park.

Anarchist Meetings. Wednesdays 7.30 p.m. 271 Commercial Road, E.1 (1st floor).

London Anarchists meet socially at 'The Marquis of Granby', Cambridge Circus, Charing Cross Road, Sundays from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

Oxford. Anarchist meetings every Friday 8 p.m. Clarendon Press Institute, Walton Street, Oxford.

Corby. Public meeting on 'Anarchism and Workers' Control' planned for June 29. Green Room, Civic Centre at 7.30 p.m. Local help with publicity appreciated. Contact Terry Phillips, 70 Blenheim Walk.

Help! Stoke Newington 8 Fund. Comrades now on remand in Brixton and Holloway need financial aid urgently for meals, fruit, papers, books (which must be new) and cigarettes. Please send donations to the Stoke Newington 8 Fund, c/o Compendium Books, 240 Camden High Street, London, N.W.1, a.s.a.p.

Free Valpreda Campaign needs help, not just by way of support, but also involvement in planning and organising. Please contact c/o N. & E. London Group ORA.

Libertarian Book Club. Spring Lectures Series. Thursday evenings, 7 p.m., 369 Eighth Avenue, New York City. April 27, Sam Dolgoff: Bakunin and Nechaev. May 11, Murray Bookchin: Marxism and Anarchism.

Would Box 001 please send Freedom Press his address as we have mislaid it. We have a number of replies from your ad.

London School of Non Violence. Series of Lectures—Man and his Environment. May 1, 7 p.m., Tony Mills: 'The Citizen and the Environmental Crisis'. May 8, 7 p.m., Dr. Prichard: 'Alcohol—an Environmental Drug in Society'. The Crypt, St. Martins-in-the-Fields, London, W.C.2.