

BOX

60

RESISTANCE



20373
R
—

committee of 100 bulletin

CONTENTS

Editorial - - - - -		page 3
They Told You So- - - (editorial) - - -		page 4
Release Uri Davis - - - - -		page 5
Berkeley Campus Report - - (Marvin Garson) - - -		page 6
Catterick Camp - - - (Jeff Clark) - - -		page 8
The Battle of North Audley St. (Peter Cadogan) - - -		page 9
The Labour Government - - (Richard Keell Wolfe) - - -		page 10
Anti-Conscription - - - (Steve Gordon) - - -		page 11
International Sub-Committee: list of file-holders - - -		page 12
Saturday School - - - (Barbara Smoker) - - -		page 13
Faslane & Foulness demonstrations - - - - -		page 14
London Committee Accounts - - - - -		page 16
Interview with an Editor - (Hazel McGee) - - -		page 15
Regional News - - - - -		page 16
Letters to Goodwin Street - - - - -		page 17
Points of Information ; advertisements - - - - -		page 19
Selling and Snowballing - (Philip Seed) - - -		page 20

FRIENDS OF RESISTANCE

will have been more than a little annoyed in the past few weeks. So were we! Our apologies for the late publication of the last issue - which was not intended - and no apologies for the late publication of this issue - which was deliberate! Although you will never believe it! Next month we will (?) be back to normal. we hope.....

Friends of RESISTANCE meeting to be arranged before Easter; phone the office ARChway 1239 for details. And don't forget - we need you on the march; look for the RESISTANCE vans and help us sell the magazine to marchers and public.

E
D
I
T
O
R
I
A
L

The Easter March this year is overshadowed by the tragedy of the war in Vietnam, Terror is met by counter terror. Brutality and torture become the order of the day. The Americans condone and support corrupt military regimes in their ruthless and bigoted attempt to defend the "Free World" from "Communism".

Apart from the actual carnage and suffering among the Vietnamese people the worst aspect of this war is the way in which photos in the Western Press blatantly portraying the use of torture by South Vietnamese troops have provoked little outcry.

Yet the use of gases, which cannot kill a healthy man (the underfed, aged and sick are not considered here by U.S. propagandists) trigger off an emotional response whilst the burning of people alive by napalm and phosphorous is accepted.

However, when the liberals and the "clean war" advocates have finished the question to be asked is why is this war being fought anyhow and how best can it be stopped. The war is nothing to do with "freedom" but is part of the global military conflict between the Western and the Communist power blocks. To this struggle the life and liberty of the Vietnamese people is being sacrificed. The role of the non-aligned peace movement in the West must be to cause as much trouble for their respective governments as possible in order to create an insurmountable international pressure that will bring the war to a close.

In Spain resistance to the Franco regime grows. At a London conference of the Committee for Amnesty in Spain an anonymous Spanish student spoke at length of the student demonstrations that are rekindling the lust for liberty which has been crushed since the Civil War. In Geneva hundreds of peaceable demonstrators were charged by truncheon wielding police as they attempted to march on the Spanish Consulate in support of Spanish students.

In the British Protectorate of Bahrein students have been on strike against the British backed autocratic regime. Six have died at the hands of the police, several are wounded and hundreds locked up. Their demands ... the right to form trades unions, student organizations and to a free press. Will the Easter marchers march against only a nuclear policy or will they raise their voices against tyranny wherever it arises? RESISTANCE will certainly endeavour to fulfill this role

RESISTANCE - 13 Goodwin Street, London, N.4. ARChway 1239
An independent magazine of the Committee of 100.
Vol. 3, No. 4, April 12th, 1965

They Told You So

EDITORIAL

It is six months since the Labour Party came to power for the fourth time. It had won the smallest parliamentary majority since 1847, but Harold Wilson didn't mind. "This will not affect our ability to govern", he said. It wasn't as good as 1945 or even 1950, but at least it was better than in 1924 and 1929, when there was no majority at all. No, he didn't mind how big - or rather how small - his majority was. The point was that he had a majority, and he was Prime Minister. He was going to clear up the Tory mess and get Britain moving again, and then he'd get a nice big majority. Or so he said. Anyway, the Labour Left kept quiet at first, to give him a chance, but now it is complaining, in *Sanity*, *Tribune* and the *New Statesman*, that the Government isn't doing what it was expected to do, or even what it was pledged to do. This is true, of course, but is it surprising? We are surprised only because anyone is surprised when a Labour Government doesn't do what it says. This is a conclusion we have drawn not from prejudice, but from history - the history of the three previous Labour Governments and of the Labour Party since it was formed. The present Labour leaders are only following in their predecessors' footsteps.

Do they spend more time running capitalism than introducing socialism? So did their predecessors. But do they still call themselves socialists? So did their predecessors. Are they nearer their right-wing opponents than their left-wing supporters? So were their predecessors, who supported Asquith and served under Lloyd George and Churchill, but would never take any notice of any left-wing group inside the Labour Party or have anything to do with any left-wing group outside it. Would they join their right-wing opponents rather than give in to their left-wing supporters? The second Labour Government fell because its leaders did so. Are they more concerned to fix the wages of the working-class than the salaries of the middle-class and the profits of the upper-class? So were their predecessors, who tried to "save the pound" by reducing unemployment benefits in 1931, and by imposing a wage-freeze in 1948.

Are they mean about increasing social benefits to relieve poverty? So were their predecessors, who first refused to raise unemployment benefit in 1929 and then actually reduced it in 1931. Do they oppose radical proposals for solving poverty? So did their predecessors, who drove out Mosley in 1930 and the ILP in 1932 for insisting on such proposals. Do they oppose direct action to remove poverty? So did their predecessors, who opposed the Poplarist movement in 1921 and the Squatters movement in 1946. But didn't they raise national insurance benefits by 18½%? They also raised national insurance contributions by 16½%. But didn't they abolish prescription charges? It was the third Labour Government which imposed them in the first place.

Do they let down and even attack their followers when they go on strike? So did their predecessors, who let down strikers when they were out of office, in 1921, 1926, 1955 and 1958, and attacked strikers when they were in office, in 1924 and between 1945 and 1951. Would they prosecute someone for appealing to soldiers not to break strikes? The first Labour Government fell because it first tried to prosecute a Communist for making such an appeal, and then got cold feet. But would they use soldiers to break strikes? The third Labour Government did in 1945, 1946, 1948, 1949 and 1950. Would they use the Emergency Powers Act against a strike? The first and third Labour Governments did, in 1924, 1948 and 1949. Would they use the RSG system? It was the third Labour Government which began its revival in 1951.

Won't they carry out Clause 4 of the Labour Party Constitution? Iron and steel may be nationalized, as many things were nationalized by the third Labour Government between 1945 and 1950, but the owners will get compensation and the workers won't get control. Nationalization means state ownership and bureaucratic administration, which can't be claimed "to secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, and the best obtainable system of popular control and administration of each industry or service."

Do they talk peace and wage war? So did their predecessors, who opposed war before but not after 1914, who opposed rearmament before and disarmament after 1935, who spoke against the Defence Estimates year after year but never voted against them after 1937, who supported multilateral disarmament but opposed unilateral disarmament. Have they kept the British Bomb, despite what they said about it? It was the third Labour Government which began making it, without saying anything about it. Do they uphold NATO? It was the third Labour Government which took Britain into NATO. Would they introduce peacetime conscription? It was the third Labour Government which did so for the first time in British history. Do they support the American war in Vietnam? It was the third Labour Government which took Britain into the Korean War.

Do they talk much and do little for the colonies? So did the third Labour Government, which freed India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, but killed rebels in Indonesia, Israel, Kenya, Uganda, Ghana, Nigeria and Malaya, imprisoned Kwame Nkrumah in 1948, and exiled Seretse Khama in 1950. Does the Colonial Secretary, who is a unilateralist, defend the British raids on villages in South Arabia? The Under-Secretary for Air in the first Labour Government, who was a pacifist, defended the British raids on villages in Iraq because bombers killed fewer people than soldiers did. Do they talk much and do little against the white Nationalists in South Africa? So did their predecessors against the White Russians from 1919 to 1921 and the Spanish Nationalists from 1936 to 1939.

**E
D
I
T
O
R
I
A
L**

The Easter March this year is overshadowed by the tragedy of the war in Vietnam, Terror is met by counter terror. Brutality and torture become the order of the day. The Americans condone and support corrupt military regimes in their ruthless and bigoted attempt to defend the "Free World" from "Communism".

Apart from the actual carnage and suffering among the Vietnamese people the worst aspect of this war is the way in which photos in the Western Press blatantly portraying the use of torture by South Vietnamese troops have provoked little outcry.

Yet the use of gases, which cannot kill a healthy man (the underfed, aged and sick are not considered here by U.S. propagandists) trigger off an emotional response whilst the burning of people alive by napalm and phosphorous is accepted.

However, when the liberals and the "clean war" advocates have finished the question to be asked is why is this war being fought anyhow and how best can it be stopped. The war is nothing to do with "freedom" but is part of the global military conflict between the Western and the Communist power blocks. To this struggle the life and liberty of the Vietnamese people is being sacrificed. The role of the non-aligned peace movement in the West must be to cause as much trouble for their respective governments as possible in order to create an insurmountable international pressure that will bring the war to a close.

In Spain resistance to the Franco regime grows. At a London conference of the Committee for Amnesty in Spain an anonymous Spanish student spoke at length of the student demonstrations that are rekindling the lust for liberty which has been crushed since the Civil War. In Geneva hundreds of peaceable demonstrators were charged by truncheon wielding police as they attempted to march on the Spanish Consulate in support of Spanish students.

In the British Protectorate of Bahrein students have been on strike against the British backed autocratic regime. Six have died at the hands of the police, several are wounded and hundreds locked up. Their demands ... the right to form trades unions, student organizations and to a free press. Will the Easter marchers march against only a nuclear policy or will they raise their voices against tyranny wherever it arises? RESISTANCE will certainly endeavour to fulfill this role

RESISTANCE - 13 Goodwin Street, London, N.4. ARChway 1239
An independent magazine of the Committee of 100.
Vol. 3, No. 4, April 12th, 1965

They Told You So

EDITORIAL

It is six months since the Labour Party came to power for the fourth time. It had won the smallest parliamentary majority since 1847, but Harold Wilson didn't mind. "This will not affect our ability to govern", he said. It wasn't as good as 1945 or even 1950, but at least it was better than in 1924 and 1929, when there was no majority at all. No, he didn't mind how big - or rather how small - his majority was. The point was that he had a majority, and he was Prime Minister. He was going to clear up the Tory mess and get Britain moving again, and then he'd get a nice big majority. Or so he said. Anyway, the Labour Left kept quiet at first, to give him a chance, but now it is complaining, in *Sanity*, *Tribune* and the *New Statesman*, that the Government isn't doing what it was expected to do, or even what it was pledged to do. This is true, of course, but is it surprising? We are surprised only because anyone is surprised when a Labour Government doesn't do what it says. This is a conclusion we have drawn not from prejudice, but from history - the history of the three previous Labour Governments and of the Labour Party since it was formed. The present Labour leaders are only following in their predecessors' footsteps.

Do they spend more time running capitalism than introducing socialism? So did their predecessors. But do they still call themselves socialists? So did their predecessors. Are they nearer their right-wing opponents than their left-wing supporters? So were their predecessors, who supported Asquith and served under Lloyd George and Churchill, but would never take any notice of any left-wing group inside the Labour Party or have anything to do with any left-wing group outside it. Would they join their right-wing opponents rather than give in to their left-wing supporters? The second Labour Government fell because its leaders did so. Are they more concerned to fix the wages of the working-class than the salaries of the middle-class and the profits of the upper-class? So were their predecessors, who tried to "save the pound" by reducing unemployment benefits in 1931, and by imposing a wage-freeze in 1948.

Are they mean about increasing social benefits to relieve poverty? So were their predecessors, who first refused to raise unemployment benefit in 1929 and then actually reduced it in 1931. Do they oppose radical proposals for solving poverty? So did their predecessors, who drove out Mosley in 1930 and the ILP in 1932 for insisting on such proposals. Do they oppose direct action to remove poverty? So did their predecessors, who opposed the Poplarist movement in 1921 and the Squatters movement in 1946. But didn't they raise national insurance benefits by 18½%? They also raised national insurance contributions by 16½%. But didn't they abolish prescription charges? It was the third Labour Government which imposed them in the first place.

Do they let down and even attack their followers when they go on strike? So did their predecessors, who let down strikers when they were out of office, in 1921, 1926, 1955 and 1958, and attacked strikers when they were in office, in 1924 and between 1945 and 1951. Would they prosecute someone for appealing to soldiers not to break strikes? The first Labour Government fell because it first tried to prosecute a Communist for making such an appeal, and then got cold feet. But would they use soldiers to break strikes? The third Labour Government did in 1945, 1946, 1948, 1949 and 1950. Would they use the Emergency Powers Act against a strike? The first and third Labour Governments did, in 1924, 1948 and 1949. Would they use the RSG system? It was the third Labour Government which began its revival in 1951.

Won't they carry out Clause 4 of the Labour Party Constitution? Iron and steel may be nationalized, as many things were nationalized by the third Labour Government between 1945 and 1950, but the owners will get compensation and the workers won't get control. Nationalization means state ownership and bureaucratic administration, which can't be claimed "to secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, and the best obtainable system of popular control and administration of each industry or service."

Do they talk peace and wage war? So did their predecessors, who opposed war before but not after 1914, who opposed rearmament before and disarmament after 1935, who spoke against the Defence Estimates year after year but never voted against them after 1937, who supported multilateral disarmament but opposed unilateral disarmament. Have they kept the British Bomb, despite what they said about it? It was the third Labour Government which began making it, without saying anything about it. Do they uphold NATO? It was the third Labour Government which took Britain into NATO. Would they introduce peacetime conscription? It was the third Labour Government which did so for the first time in British history. Do they support the American war in Vietnam? It was the third Labour Government which took Britain into the Korean War.

Do they talk much and do little for the colonies? So did the third Labour Government, which freed India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, but killed rebels in Indonesia, Israel, Kenya, Uganda, Ghana, Nigeria and Malaya, imprisoned Kwame Nkrumah in 1948, and exiled Seretse Khama in 1950. Does the Colonial Secretary, who is a unilateralist, defend the British raids on villages in South Arabia? The Under-Secretary for Air in the first Labour Government, who was a pacifist, defended the British raids on villages in Iraq because bombers killed fewer people than soldiers did. Do they talk much and do little against the white Nationalists in South Africa? So did their predecessors against the White Russians from 1919 to 1921 and the Spanish Nationalists from 1936 to 1939.

In the light of the background of the Labour leaders, is it surprising that they appointed more members of a Government than ever before, when they had previously demanded economies? That they gave MPs an immediate rise of £30 a week, and old-age pensioners a deferred rise of 12/6d a week? That they decided to strengthen restrictions on Commonwealth (i.e. coloured) immigration, when they had previously tried to prevent them? That they penalized imports (i.e. made consumers pay more), and subsidized exports (i.e. made producers pay less)? That they not only didn't reduce the Defence Estimates, but actually increased them? That they managed to deport Bert Bensen, when the Tories had failed to do so?

It has been said that the only lesson taught by history is that no lessons are learnt from history. But it is important to learn the lesson of the history of the Labour Party. There are Socialists and unilateralists in the Labour Party, but they have no power and little influence. When the Labour leaders are called socialists or unilateralists by themselves or by their enemies, it is simply as terms of praise or abuse - it has nothing to do with actually being socialists or unilateralists. In fact the Labour leaders are probably the main obstacle to socialism and unilateralism in this country. Since the Labour Party was formed it has been part of the parliamentary and capitalist system, and has been committed to the Warfare State as strongly as to the Welfare State.

But what about the Labour Left? The trouble is that it consists mainly of Fellow-Travelers who haven't got the guts to be Communists, or anti-Americans who haven't got the guts to be pro-Russians, or anti-whites who haven't got the guts to be pro-black, or anti-militarists who haven't got the guts to be pacifists. Some of them willing, but most of them are weak. There is no encouragement to be had from knowing that they come from the ILP, Common Wealth, CND, and even - in the case of Anne Kerr - the Committee of 100, for they all owe their seats to the approval of Transport House and their prospects to the patronage of the Prime Minister. In the present situation, their power to bring the Labour Government down has made them weaker, not stronger. Between 1906 and 1910, the Labour Party sometimes voted against the Liberal Government, but not after 1910; between 1945 and 1950, the Labour Left sometimes voted against the Labour Government, but not now. The reason is that the Labour Left wants to keep Wilson in office, just as their predecessors wanted to keep Asquith in office. They could make him do what they want by refusing to support him - but they won't rock the boat, they won't let their side down, they will play the game, they will stick together. They are Labour before they are Left, and members of the Party before they are representatives of the people.

We are people before we are voters (if we vote at all) and Left before we are Labour (if we are Labour at all). When we say we are socialists or unilateralists - or anarchists or pacifists - we mean it. We have opposed the Warfare State in deeds as well as words, whoever runs it. We oppose any Government that makes or keeps or tests or uses the Bomb, Labour or Tory, Democrat or Republican, Gaullist or Communist. This month we are taking part in the eighth Easter March. Our protest is the same in 1965 as it was from 1958 to 1964, and it will not end on Easter Monday. We shall resist the Labour Government at every time and in every way we can. We know they won't do anything about the Bomb (or houses or hospitals or prices or pensions) unless they have to. We needn't boast that we told you so - they told you so, if you were listening, by their history from 1900 to 1965. It is time the Labour Party retired and took its pension. It is time the Libertarian Left got together to help it on its way.

RELEASE Uri Davis

A small group of members and supporters of the Committee of 100, the majority of whom were themselves Jewish, picketed the Friends Meeting House in Euston Road, London, on Sunday last, to call for the release of Uri Davis, now serving a sentence of six months imprisonment in Ramleh Prison, Israel.

The Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Eshkol was speaking to a Zionist meeting and the Middle East Study Group of the Committee felt that this was an opportunity to publicize the fact that Uri Davis was serving a prison sentence for trying to bring about peace between the Arabs and Israelis. He was actually imprisoned for fasting outside the government building.

Posters were displayed saying "Release Uri Davis", "Against Racism Everywhere", "Fair Play for Israeli Arabs", "Uri Davis, Israeli Worker for Peace", "Arabs, Israelis- Unite in Deer el Assad" and "Committee of 100, For Peace and Human Rights".

A leaflet was given out explaining how Uri Davis had organized a work camp in Deer-el-Assad to get the Arabs to illegally pick the olives off the land that they had been dispossessed from. The leaflet called upon Zionists and Israelis to do everything possible to bring about better understanding between Jews and Arabs and to work for the release of Uri.

The police were out in full force, as was to be expected. They always are when the head of another state is about and at first it was felt that they would stop the demo., in fact they threatened to but in the end it was allowed:

Douglas Kepper.

THE WAGES OF SIN

The following excerpt is taken from an article, "The Philosophy of a Criminal", in a magazine called "New Era", produced by and for the inmates of Leavenworth Federal Prison, Kansas, U.S.A. The writer, "Earl A.", has been a professional criminal for more than fifty years

"But it is when the falls come that a criminal has to be best prepared. The vultures descend upon him from all directions; stool pigeons, lawyers, cops, judges, righteous citizens - they swoop down like ambitious locusts on a defenceless wheat-field. As soon as the word gets out that you're a pro, your troubles begin. Lawyers are probably the most predatory. Automatically your fees are tripled; they know - innocent or guilty - with your record you couldn't beat a bum-rap in heaven. Then come the cops - not all cops, just those who didn't have the integrity to be criminals. These are the ones who use their influence and position to bleed every individual who indulges in any practice near or beyond the fringe of acceptability. I've lived in some neighbourhoods where I paid the local police as regularly as I paid rent. And the price some detectives will demand to let you keep your freedom!"

More from Berkeley

The following article is based mainly on letters from Marvin Garson and others to 'Solidarity'.

Marvin Garson writes:-

"There is very little new in the free speech controversy, the campus still has no rules and we are all quite happy with this state of affairs. The Regents have established a committee, to investigate and report on proposed rules; it is not expected to report for several months. The campus looks like a permanent circus of political activity. There are tables without permits everywhere, displaying literature which sometimes calls for immediate action off-campus. There is a rally at Sproul Hall steps nearly every day, and often there is another rally going on in another location at the same time."

THE TRIALS

"The only remaining organized activity of the F.S.M. as such, is the legal defence of the 800 arrested at Sproul Hall."

"The legal ritual goes as follows our attorneys asked for a single trial. The judge denied their motion. We then appeared in court to waive our sacred right to a jury. Then the judge will re-examine the motion for a single trial (perhaps in slightly altered form), and grant it."

"The trials will begin about April 1st and might continue as long as four weeks. Our attorneys have assured us that we will be convicted on at least one charge, but that we have a fighting chance of reversing the conviction on appeal."

"The trials should be interesting. It looks as if we will be able to introduce evidence relating to why we were in Sproul Hall, which means the entire history of the free speech controversy. As part of such evidence, we might be able to subpoena Kerr, Strong, a few Regents and perhaps Governor Brown."

TELL IT TO THE MARINES

"On Tuesday, a direct violation of the University regulations barring on-campus recruitment for off-campus political or social action occurred when the U.S. Marines set up a recruitment table in the Student Union Plaza."

"Nine or ten students paraded in front of the illegal table. Some worried picketers, attributing the violation to ignorance, gave the Marines the following advice: "Marines, Beware the Deans!"

"They pleaded with the administration: "Please Don't Arrest Them!"

"Others assuming direct support of the movement, held signs saying, "Thank you Marines for joining our Protest", and "Fight University Regulations, Join the Marines!"

"The picketers seemed concerned for the safety of these new allies. Aware that Marine experience with civil disobedience is limited, one sign advised, "If They Arrest You, Go Limp!"

By 5 p.m. Tuesday, the Marines had not been arrested. Does this mean the administration is wavering in its enforcement on the ban? Or could the most pertinent sign have been the one reading, "Behold the Consistency of the Administration!"?

CIVIL RIGHTS ACTIVITIES

Most of the energy of students in Berkeley (and indeed of students all over America) has been put into the civil rights movement.

In our fight against racial discrimination and injustice, Oakland CORE and Berkeley Campus CORE have been picketing restaurants which belong to the East Bay Restaurant Association. These restaurants are willing to hire Negroes only as cooks and busboys. Jobs 'up front' - as waiters, waitresses and bartenders - are for whites only.

The restaurant owners believe that no Negroes up front means more money in their pockets. Their dining rooms are lily white, and they are willing to fight to keep them that way.

CORE offered a plan whereby Negro citizens of Alameda County could get their fair share of the 3000 well-paying "up-front" jobs in the member restaurants of the Association without displacing any white workers. CORE tried to negotiate; the Restaurant Association wouldn't even discuss the problem. CORE decided to picket.

From the moment picketing began, it was clear that the police were working with the restaurant owners. Whenever a car carrying Negro passengers or a civil rights bumper sticker entered the area of the picket line, the cops would ticket it.

Then last Friday - Lincoln's birthday - they started arresting picketers for no good reason. They pulled two people right off the line and charged them with using profane language. They figured that in one step, they could scare off demonstrators and give the civil rights movement a bad name. Later, when a demonstrator told a cop about a bystander who was cursing him, the cop said: "I can't hear anybody but you". Profanity was allowed; picketing wasn't.

After the second arrest, a CORE member went to the paddy wagon to find out who was arrested, what the charges were, and other information he would need to make bail. They arrested him too. Then a second CORE member went over to get the information, and he got arrested. Then a third. Finally we realized what the cops were doing, and we all stayed away.

The cops were ready to keep on arresting people until they scared us off. They were trying to kill our right to picket the restaurants. We decided we weren't ready yet to stand up to them, and called off the picket line. We called it off, but not because we were scared. We called it off so that we could have a whole week to let everybody know what was happening. We called it off so that we could come back a week later with thousands of people.

Within a few days we distributed 25,000 leaflets (reproduced) calling for a mass picket at the same place in defiance. We were going to show the Oakland cop that he couldn't scare off the civil rights movement. He has been running Oakland too long; he had become too arrogant.

3,000 turned out for the second picket and the police backed down completely. No one was arrested; no one was even shoved - the police were occasionally even polite.

**WHAT
DOES
HE
THINK
ABOUT
CIVIL
RIGHTS ?**



HE WANTS TO STOP THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT.

LAST FRIDAY NIGHT, HE ARRESTED FIVE PEOPLE ON A
PEACEFUL, LEGAL CIVIL RIGHTS PICKET LINE IN JACK LONDON SQUARE.

HE THOUGHT HE COULD SCARE US SO WE
WOULDN'T COME BACK TO PICKET JIM-CROW BUSINESSES.

BUT THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT IS HARD TO INTIMIDATE.
THIS FRIDAY WE'RE HOLDING ANOTHER LEGAL, PEACEFUL PICKET
---THE BIGGEST ONE HE'S EVER SEEN.

HE'S HOPING YOU'LL STAY HOME THIS FRIDAY NIGHT.

An interesting comment on the attitudes of the Berkeley students was made by A.H. Raskin in the February 14th supplement to the New York Times who said:-

"The Berkeley mutineers did not seem political in the sense of those student rebels of the turbulent '30's, they are too suspicious of all adult institutions to embrace wholeheartedly even those ideologies with a stake in smashing the system. An anarchist or W.W.W. strain seems as pronounced as any Marxist doctrine... all the old labels are out; if there are any orthodox Communists here, they would be a moderating influence."

There is a very perceptive article on the relationship between the free speech movement and the civil rights movement in the current issue of 'Solidarity'. It is written by Jack Weinberg who sparked off the whole Berkeley struggle when his arrest led to a mass sit-down which immobilized the police car in which he was being removed for 36 hours.

Clark Kerr will be coming to Scotland soon to receive an honorary Doctorate from Strathclyde University at Glasgow. It is hoped to organize a worthy reception for him. Anyone interested should write to 'Solidarity Glasgow', c/o P. Tobin, 11 Mingulay Street, Glasgow, N. 2., Scotland.

CATTERICK:

TODAY'S REGULAR ARMY

Catterick Camp; the scene of the recent mutiny trial. Here Jeff Clark describes the pressures and inhumanities which lie behind the bland official face and the "information office" lures; the pressures which led men like Sykes and his friends to choose lunch in a pub rather than do an exercise. Wouldn't you?



Even if you've never been in the Army at some time or another you must have heard of Catterick Camp, the infamous stronghold that reigns over the Yorkshire Moors. Like Aldershot and other established camps it has its legends of suicides, hard discipline, excessive bull and toilet-seat warning that are told and retold by its ex-lodgers in pubs all over the country. But Catterick is somehow special and stands out from the rest. Even its name sounds like a spatter of machine guns. And yet with all the legends young men are still volunteering to go there, to live in huts condemned since 1918 or like some regiments under canvas, giving up all their democratic freedoms and Civilian Rights to become soldiers. I did, but managed to get out in time for £20 and now write what I learned.

The most intriguing thing about Catterick is how in an atmosphere of decay analogous to an old wooden toilet it can transform almost any entrant into a stereotyped soldier in three months. This is even more fantastic which one realizes that the entrant, in a good proportion of cases, has been subliminally shanghaied by the Recruiting (renamed Information) Centres and by ridiculous but effective TV advertisements to start with.

The topographical situation of Catterick is very conducive to conditioning. The nearest large town is Darlington about twelve miles away and although there are plenty of amenities there, the attitude to soldiers is decidedly cool, so most recruits put up with Richmond which at least has a cinema. (invariably showing war films.) Otherwise there is the Harewood Club, a lush NAAFI with several bars and a bowling alley, under strict military supervision. So the first step is to channel the lonely recruit into Army atmosphere and make him feel rejected by civilians. At arrival the recruit's only link with his past life is his suitcase and his clothes. The latter immediately single him out as a newcomer and therefore he is only too relieved to find the anonymity and acceptance he receives when he gets his uniform. In uniform he is a soldier - without it, nothing.

The next step is the actual training which depends on exhaustive physical exercise, pep talks and films and harsh illogical discipline. Most emphasis is on physical training which ostensibly makes a soldier fit but also knocks out all superfluous energy and resistance. Several hours

a day are assigned to PT and square basking and these periods are usually followed by films and talks at this time the soldier is most receptive. I must mention that when talking about Nuclear Warfare the officers talk in terms of kiloton bombs and refuse to answer questions on megaton bombs.

The discipline is extremely severe. A recruit who sneezes or accidentally drops his rifle can find himself on NAAFI fatigues for a week. A recruit may be charged if he faints on parade even if at the time he has acute appendicitis. Illness is forbidden. Any rebellious traits are quickly cured by guard duty. This is a most effective punishment as it not only deprives the recipient of his spare time but also of his night's sleep, so next day he hasn't any energy to resist. (In his book "The Techniques of Persuasion", J.A.C. Brown states in a chapter on brainwashing, "Loss of sleep is perhaps one of the most important factors in breaking a man down").

All activities are slanted towards making the soldier obey any order immediately without question. This is necessary of course as later he may be ordered to run at a machine gun post, and it would be disastrous to the Army if he were allowed to think before he acted. So during training one is ordered to sit on toilet seats to warm them for the NCOs and to dig holes and then to fill them in, and to sweep the parade ground of snow when lumps as big as white mice are still falling. It is all for a purpose.

Crude as it is, this basic training is effective and it does produce a definite result. However it also has its side-effects. Imitation and conformity are approved at the expense of spontaneous creativity, thinking for oneself and free expression. This leads to mental squalor and degradation. A walk round Catterick's seedy Married Quarters or an enquiry into the state of alcoholism in the Army would confirm this. At this moment thousands of young men are being changed into nondescript cogs to keep the antiquated War Machine running. These men will kill and maybe forfeit their own lives to protect some millionaire's oil well, under the delusion that they are "fighting for their country".

Jeff Clark.

the BATTLE of north audley st.

There were in effect two demonstrations over Vietnam on Sunday April 4th. There was the rally in Trafalgar Square called by Christian Action and the subsequent march on Downing Street and the American Embassy.

The march developed a spontaneous quality from the moment Canon Collins and the platform party left it to deliver a letter to No. 10. It continued to the bottom of Whitehall, went round Parliament Square and came back into Whitehall. By this time a feeling had grown in the ranks that an attempt should be made to enter Downing Street itself. When the head banner reached the end of Downing Street it stopped. The entrance was heavily cordoned. The police moved in among the demonstrators to insist that they keep walking. There was a minute or two of confusion and scuffle and the police got their way. The march moved on in the direction of the U.S. Embassy.

The march, perhaps 250 strong, was by no means entirely composed of Communists and members of Left sects but they were certainly there in strength. The B.P.C. and the Y.P.C. had been official sponsors of the rally. No message other than theirs was audible in the streets.

"U.S. Imperialism Out, Out, Out!" Straight anti-Americanism was an early indication that things were not as they should be. If the message of a demonstration is wrong it will soon have consequences in action.

Although many of us don't particularly like shouting slogans it is certainly true that in a crisis situation 'the message' needs to be heard. The problem is to be intelligently audiogenic. The pseudo-militancy of a leftist chant may be poor but in a vacuum it will certainly triumph.

The object then is to turn the independent anti-war case into slogans: "Stop All Bloodshed in Vietnam"; "Cease Fire in Vietnam"; "Vietnam Talks Now"; "Start Talking - Without Conditions"; "Geneva, Geneva, Geneva!"

From Oxford Street the march turned down North Audley Street in the direction of Grosvenor Square and the U.S. Embassy. On this first occasion the police admitted it to the Square but by means of a cordon turned it to the left away from the Embassy. The aim, as in Downing Street, was to keep the procession moving by such physical 'persuasion' as might be necessary. The demonstrators were pushed off the road and on to the pavement to make sure that they would depart by Duke Street and not continue round the Square. The marchers resisted enough to stay for a while by the railings and for a few minutes there was a token slogan chanting protest.

Back in Oxford Street and starting the second time round there was a fleeting moment of indecision then the plunge was taken. Back to Grosvenor Square!

It was on this second time of asking that the police changed their tactics. Their chief decided that it was now time to break the whole thing up. He used a funnel technique reminiscent of 1961. (The demonstrators walk into a tapering trap. When they are into it the police link arms and force the march on to the pavement). This time the technique was used on the spur of the moment and forcibly.

The police linked arms and shoved. The demonstrators shoved back. The rough stuff began. Some marchers, just too late, tried to outflank the cordon but they were met by police reinforcements. The action spread right across the road. Fights broke out, people fell and were trampled on, girls screamed. The police singled out individuals and took them away - some struggled, others walked under protest. Fifteen were loaded into police vans. In five minutes it was all over. Physically at least the police had won the battle of North Audley Street. Who may be said to have won it in the long run will depend upon who learns most from it. It is on an occasion like this that people learn more in a few minutes than they do in months of discussion.

It is not good enough, it seems to me, merely to decide to go to Downing Street or to the U.S. Embassy. The purpose, methods and options of a demonstration have to be properly worked out. As to the message, non-alignment with any violence East or West is surely the essential starting point. In the action itself the values and techniques of non-violence are the first conditions of success. These two things taken together are the centre of the problem. We have nothing of consequence to say about war if we are supporting any form of it or using violence ourselves.

Given insight into the political crisis that is the occasion of action the next thing is individual and collective forethought about every aspect of the demonstration. As far as is humanly possible every single person should know exactly what is involved. This is the precondition of effective individual initiative. It is, for example, quite possible to outflank a cordon without starting any fracas but this requires quick individual observation and decision. If the head of a procession gets into difficulties the middle and rear need to be prepared to take the initiative.

A demonstration should limit itself to what its numerical strength is capable of. To get near enough to an objective to chant slogans is not good enough. The form of a demonstration has to be intelligently and imaginatively conceived. It must above all command the conviction of those who take part in it.

A demonstration is a statement of values and policies translated into deeds. In the course of the action the deeds need to be retranslated into words by leaflets and impromptu speeches.

Downing Street and the U.S. Embassy are about the biggest and toughest objectives in London. Small scale, imaginative actions (like that of the group that chained themselves to the Embassy) are still possible but to get to or seal off these places for a token period is quite impractical without a very large number of people.

Non-violence is not just a question of not hitting people. It includes the question of collective responsibility in action. In North Audley Street fifteen people were arrested and 150 went home. If people are going to involve themselves in the risks of civil disobedience they should be prepared to act in whatever way is best calculated to ensure that the thing is shared as equally as possible. Sitting down is not an end in itself but it is the effective non-violent answer to a police charge. It also gives people time to think. The action may be only beginning. After the first hour or so a demonstration develops an unpredictable character peculiar to itself, unique. To creative people it presents a vast opportunity.

Peter Cadogan

Labour Pains

Harold Wilson and the Labour Party have now been in power for six months. The first question that one must in all fairness ask is "Is this time enough to judge the results of a programme that was in the words of George Brown a phased one, timed to last the five years of an administration?" The answer is no, but certain trends can be seen from the amassed legislation and executive acts already executed. We were presented with a programme at the election which was, to say the least, ambitious. We were promised all kinds of renewals and reforms in the Welfare State, ranging from the OAP's to the National Health Service - we were promised a new and invigorated economy; a new approach to foreign policy. And it is with the last that we must be most concerned. Though it may be corny to state, it must be restated that the world is in a dangerous position, one that it has known for only ten years, that is since the US H-bomb test in 1954 on the Bikini Islands. It may seem pointless to stress this in RESISTANCE, but it seems to me that the position needs restating more and more as the anti-nuclear movement in Britain loses sight of its original ends.

So to return to the topic: We are about to embark on an analysis of the achievements of the Labour Government, most especially in the field of foreign affairs. But it might be of value first to discuss some of the topics of home affairs that touch on this field; especially with reference to the aircraft industry. The row that this created, both with the "capitalists" of this industry and with the workers, was in many ways most alarming. In these days to talk in the way that the Labour administration has about the need to plan for "defence" was most alarming. Of course the Tory Press made all the hay it could over the affair of TSR-2. But what are the facts? We were faced with the need of bringing "defence" up to date, with the problem of the balance of payments (the "Gnomes of Zurich", nor indeed the whole farce of international economic organisation, may not be as harmless as the Tory Press would have us suppose), and also the whole aura of the "special relationship" that is supposed to be the cornerstone of our "defence" set-up. The outcome is still uncertain, but it is to be supposed that the TSR-2 will now be carried on, on a limited programme. This attitude of appeasement seems to be the whole of the Labour administration's policy of defence. We are to continue to produce certain aircraft, to continue to develop others, to buy others from the US (at no minor cost to our recently improved balance-of-payments position), all geared to the new White Paper on Defence.

It is of course this policy document that is the cornerstone of the Labour defence programme, as battered out over the years at the various party conferences which have aroused so much passion both within the party and without. The White Paper proposes as the Government's policy a two-pronged programme - the Atlantic Alliance, and the "East of Suez" commitments. And it represents a complete about-turn from the programme placed before the electorate only six short months ago, to make no mention of the programme as outlined by successive Labour Party Conferences. We are as we were promised to have nothing to do with the MLF; it will be replaced by the more far-reaching Atlantic Nuclear Force, of which the MLF is a minor part. The ANF is a proposed "common market of nuclear weapons", controlled in theory by the political forces of Western Europe and the US. Much of our nuclear potential is to be given over to this control. But the old arguments that the ND movements have been pressing for years over Polaris and so-called political control of nuclear forces apply in even greater strength to this pipe-dream: if the force is to hold any credibility as a deterrent, the military must be able to command its use. Can one imagine the political forces of Europe - de Gaulle, Wilson, Erhard, Johnson etc. etc. - coming to a speedy decision? Where is the credibility of this?

And the commitments East of Suez are in direct contradiction to the defence "row" that preceded the election; we are to retain a section of our Independent Deterrent to fulfil this role, that only we in Britain can fulfil - according to the White Paper. And this all a result of the election-day announcement of the Chinese Bomb. We must be able to guarantee India against a nuclear attack from China. Perhaps we must also guarantee South Vietnam? Anyway all the "experts" have predicted that it will be some years yet before China has any means of delivering her very "crude" nuclear potential. It would seem that Wilson and the defence boys are grasping rather at straws. Why has the Labour Party done this about-turn? Why, in the face of repeated conference resolutions on sending Polaris packing, has the government announced that we will retain this, and extend it into the ANF? What has happened to the pre-election pledges to attempt to bring the Chinese into UNO? Why have they been replaced by an attitude that must make the situation in the Far East, potentially at least, a major "hot spot" in the East-West conflict?

Why did the Labour Party of 1914 come to the conclusion that the war against Kaiser Billy was after all a patriotic war and not a war of no value to the working-classes of Europe? And where was the tradition of "international working-class solidarity" at the time of the Korean conflict? And of "brotherly love" when the orders marked "top secret" went out that started Britain off in the nuclear race in the late forties? And why was all that pressure needed to bring the official party into line with the rank-and-file over nuclear testing? One could carry on like this and fill all the pages of this edition.

Is it not time that we all realised that a government of any colour can only act within certain prescribed limits? We are given fresh evidence of this year after year, and yet many people even in this movement cannot see this. It must be realised that certain forces are always at work preventing a person in the position of Harold Wilson from acting in the way that we have been trying to persuade him to over the last seven years. He has to give way to certain interests within the country, both financial and status interests. This is of course even more true when his present delicate parliamentary position is taken into account. He has also to give in to pressures from our transatlantic "allies", our European neighbours, and our Commonwealth cousins. What chance a truly independent foreign policy under these conditions alone?

Add to these pressures those that come from our potential "enemies". Every time a move is made over Berlin, or one of "their" generals makes an aggressive sounding noise, our Harold is forced to make a noise back. If he doesn't he is very much in danger of "losing" a round in the cold war. And another Cuba (remember the official party line on that issue?) will place him and present him to the British public in a position so similar to that of Macmillan that we in this movement at least will see little difference. And it is only too clear that this position might easily develop over Vietnam. Where is Labour's independent policy on that one? Even the use of gas has aroused little more than a squeak.

So it would seem that we must not put our faith in Wilson. Then in whom? Certainly not Home, Grimond, Jordan or Gollan. What about ourselves as individuals? That surely is what the Committee is all about. We alone are responsible for our actions and nothing is done "in our name" - we do it.

But I fear that the human race is by no means ready for this kind of responsibility. When we can be duped into the position that we are in now, how can we accept this responsibility? But I leave the alternative to your TV/Rank/Tory/Labour-inspired imagination.....

Richard Keell-Wolfe.

CONSCRIPTION

Whenever politicians talk, they delight in stating their decisions in the name of the people. The Russians do it. The Americans love it. De Gaulle revels in it. Wilson assumes it. Such is the case with conscription.

The Russian worker bosses don't even acknowledge that any of the good working class masses under their domination might have a conscientious objection to military life. As everyone is equal, they say, each is equal in having to do conscription from the age of 19. The penalty for deviationism stands in defence of equality if not liberty. Prison sentences for refusing to serve range from one to five years. The greater a man's political objection, the greater the sentence.

Russian equality goes astray when it comes to the length of conscription. It varies from two-four years depending on the conscription qualifications. The more use someone is to the country's industrial efforts, the shorter time he has to spend in playing the macabre role of a professional killer.

Equality is also missing between men and women in the communist utopia. The girls aren't expected to go into the forces. (Which is one way of ensuring that the good comrades adhere to the ban on free love.)

Only in East Germany and Bulgaria are conscientious objectors listened to. In each case, they still have to do alternative service. The probable reason for this generosity is to find men to make up the shortage of volunteers for unpleasant civilian jobs. Yugoslavia now has the most brutal approach to war resisters. At least one man is having to rot in prison for ten years for his beliefs.

So the repression goes on. It's as much in the West as in the East. It's strange that the politicians can still claim that their decisions are in the name of the people.

At the moment, Britain ranks with Canada as the only NATO countries without conscript armies. For some reason, many peace campaigners feel that a Labour Government which is just clinging to capitalist power would not dare upset all the mum and dad voters by reintroducing conscription.

But anyone who thinks that Her Majesty's loyal opposition would not quickly join forces with the Government in the call for service to Queen and country is misguided. Rule Britannia is a good vote-catching cry for any politician.

As fewer and fewer regular soldiers fail to sign on for more tortuous years in the services and as more and more young men realize that all those attractive adverts. in life in the army are as lying as the soap powder ads., so Britain steps nearer the brink of conscription. Even the WRENS are being given more attractive uniforms. But it is doubtful if the lure of an off-duty love life will boost the Navy's seamen ranks.

As the services' strength dwindles, Wilson happily pledges more troops for Germany and Malaysia and advisers for Vietnam. We were fooled not so long ago that Wilson would pull troops out of Germany to relieve his shortages elsewhere. The obvious truth has now been revealed. He was more concerned with money than human beings. All he wants is Germany to pay for the troops' upkeep.

It was through a distaste for forced soldiering in all countries and a shocking disbelief in Wilson's love for peace and freedom that the London Anti-Conscription Committee was formed several months ago after several attempts at a common front with all the left-wing organizations.

The Committee's one policy is opposition to call-up everywhere, a policy which has withered away the communist band-wagon riders. They didn't mind resolutionizing. But to them, some conscription was good and they had no real intention of resisting conscription once the Government decreed it.

Like Gerry Healy of the Socialist Labour League, Communist boss John Gollan has no intention of letting his members take actions which would land him in prison and spoil his pleasant affluent life.

The London Anti-Conscription Committee has produced several leaflets, a pamphlet and persuaded CND National Council to take the threat of call-up seriously enough to arrange weekend discussion schools and to try and promote local action committees. It's a little in the right direction.

But the main work of the committee is to keep pounding out the message that only local initiative will spell disaster for any Wilson war plan. I hope it won't be too late before the message gets through.

Steve Gordon.

Choosing Freedom today does not mean ceasing to be a profiteer of the Soviet regime and becoming the profiteer of the bourgeois regime. For that would amount, instead, to choosing slavery twice and, as a final condemnation, choosing it twice for others. Choosing freedom is not, as we are told, choosing against justice. On the other hand, freedom is chosen today in relation to those who are everywhere suffering and fighting, and this is the only freedom that counts. It is chosen at the same time as justice, and, to tell the truth, henceforth we cannot choose one without the other. If someone takes away your bread, he suppresses your freedom at the same time. But if someone takes away your freedom, you may be sure your bread is threatened, for it depends no longer on you and your struggle but on the whim of a master. Poverty increases insofar as freedom retreats throughout the world, and vice versa. And if this cruel century has taught us anything at all, it has taught that the economic revolution must be free just as liberation must include the economic. The oppressed want to be liberated not only from their hunger but also from their masters. They are well aware that they will be effectively freed from hunger only when they hold their masters, all their masters, at bay.

Albert Camus

from a speech on May 10, 1953, and printed later in RESISTANCE, REBELLION & DEATH (Knopf, 1961.)

INTERNATIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITIES ON THE SUB-COMMITTEE

ALGERIA	Brian McGrath, 27 Arundel Gardens, London, W. 11.
AUSTRALIA	Alan Jackson, c/o Dickson, 62 Church Road, Bristol 7.
BELGIUM	Martin Spillman, 40 Bergholt Avenue, Redbridge, Essex.
CANADA	Neil Collins, 4 Falmouth Gardens, Redbridge, Essex.
FRANCE	Susan Hall, 32 Elm Park Mansions, Park Walk, London, S.W. 10.
GERMANY	Peter Cadogan, 5 Acton Way, Cambridge.
GREECE and CYPRUS	John Chambers, 49a Hillfield Park, London, N. 10.
INDIA	Neil Collins, 4 Falmouth Gardens, Redbridge, Essex.
IRAN	Martin Spillman, 40 Bergholt Avenue, Redbridge, Essex.
IRELAND	Francis Hetherington, 9 St. Paul's Road, Colchester, Essex.
ISRAEL	Manny Blankett, c/o 13 Goodwin Street, London, N. 4.
ITALY	Angela Aspinwall, 43 Gordon Mansions, Torrington Place, W.C. 1.
JAPAN	John Clarke, c/o Mrs. Leech, 39 Gascoigne Gardens, Woodford Green, (Home: The Cottage, Monsieur's Hall Lane, Bromsgrove, Worcs.) Essex.
MIDDLE EAST **	(John French, 53 Millbank, London, S.W. 1. (Manny Blankett, c/o 13 Goodwin Street, London, N. 4.
NETHERLANDS	Peter Cadogan, 5 Acton Way, Cambridge.
NEW ZEALAND	Chris Stray, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge & 129 Fordell Road, S.E. 6.
POLAND	John Edmunds, Top Flat, 120 Holland Road, London, W. 14.
SCANDINAVIA	Chris Cowley, Fjellie 38, Sweden.
SOUTH AFRICA **	Brenda Jordan, 32 Elm Park Mansions, Park Walk, London, S.W. 10.
SOUTH AMERICA	John Edmunds, Top Flat, 120 Holland Road, London, W. 14.
U.S.A.	John Papworth, 22 Nevern Road, London, S.W. 5. Peter Moule, 17 Knights Park, Kingston, Surrey.
WEST AFRICA	Peter Allen, Avenue House, Chestnut Avenue, Wokingham, Berkshire.
YUGOSLAVIA	Ian Clegg, Queen's College, Cambridge. Dick Willcocks, 142 Brentwood Road, Romford, Essex. Michael Taylor, 106, Regent's Park Road, N.W. 1.
Chairman	Peter Cadogan, 5 Acton Way, Cambridge.
Vice-Chairman	Peter Moule, 17 Knights Park, Kingston, Surrey.
Secretary	Mark News, c/o 13 Goodwin Street, London, N. 4.
Assistant Secretary	Susan Hall, 32 Elm Park Mansions, Park Walk, London, S.W. 10.
Field Secretary	John Papworth, 22 Nevern Road, London, S.W. 5.

** A study group has been formed on these countries.

We need volunteers to accept some responsibility in connection with East and Central Africa, particular countries in Latin America, and particular Communist countries. The amount of work involved depends very much on individual initiative. The ultimate aim is to create study (and action) groups in connection with every country. Committee supporters interested in the movement and problems of the various countries listed are asked to inform whoever holds the file of their interest.

The Sub-Committee meets in London between meetings of the National Committee. The specialist groups also meet in London, but there is no reason why international groups should not be founded all over the country to study international conflict situations and consider forms of action. Already, a number of sub-groups have been formed quite independently of the Committee. We should like to make contact with these groups in case we can be of mutual aid.

SATURDAY SCHOOL

The Schools Working Group was formed a couple of months ago with the idea of supprting Duane at Risinghill School, where, within the framework of the State educational system, he has challenged the concept of violence in relation to the teaching of children. The possibility of getting the children there involved in direct action on their own behalf was discussed at the first meeting of the group. However, this was shelved, and the first actual project of the group was a one-day Peace School for fifth and sixth formers, as a pilot scheme, in the hope that Committee of 100 groups all over the country might consider it worth trying in their own localities. The idea was originally inspired by the Freedom Schools for negro children in the United States, where ordinary school is boycotted for a day in favour of the Freedom School. But it was felt that here this would be needlessly getting the participants into trouble and that it would be better to hold the school on a Saturday. The date chosen was the last Saturday in March, and the school was held in Charlton, S.E. London.

A duplicated circular was prepared, beginning "Young people like yourself are 'got at' today from all sides", and going on to ask why, if we really believe in peace, we go on preparing for war, why history books dwell on the glories of battle, and why some schools still use the cane while rightly condemning the cosh. It went on to invite the children to our one-day school to "discuss these ideas with us" though "we do not want you to accept what we say just because we say it, any more than what anyone else says". In addition to informal talks, the circular promised films, a song session, and lunch, all for an inclusive fee of 1/-.

A dozen copies of the circular were sent, with a personal letter, to the secretaries of the debating societies in eight local grammar and a comprehensive school; then several hundred copies were distributed at the gates of the same schools at 4.p.m. Eighteen youngsters turned up for the school - mostly girls. None of them had heard about it through their debating societies. About half had been handed circulars at the school gates; the other half had heard about it from friends. Two girls had decided to come because their headmistress, during school assembly, had forbidden it! She said they were "too young for politics".

When we asked whether they had ever had any contact before with "this sort of thing - CND or the like", one boy replied, somewhat regretfully, "Never had a chance". All seemed quite eager to hear what the peace movement had to offer, and they were far more interested in listening than in talking themselves. This rather threw us off balance, for we had expected more give-and-take. We divided them into two groups, to facilitate full informal discussion; but this proved to be a mistake: one of the groups particularly was very quiet, and it was not until later in the day when the two groups were amalgamated, that they found their tongues. Consequently, our own people did most of the talking, and some of us were very conscious of choking the kids with propaganda - doing, in fact, what we had accused the Establishment of doing. But they were far less critical of us than we deserved. In fact, the more we presented our own views and the less we tried to get them involved in heart-searching, the better they seemed to like it. Perhaps it was too much to expect them to start thinking for themselves right away.

The theme of the first discussion session was "Violence and Society". In one of the two groups, the discussion leader gave a brief introduction on how brute force is replaced by centralised systems of law, which themselves are corrupt and rely on force; then he suggested non-violence as a means of achieving positive ends. But this was too big a step. When asked what they thought was the best thing to do if someone hit them, they all said "hit him back". They thought it cowardly, idiotic, and only asking for more violence not to retaliate. It was suggested (by us of course) that an exchange of blows would solve nothing; but one boy caused a laugh by saying that when he hit someone, that put an end to it! They all agreed, however, that conflict between nations did nothing but harm. But it was not very encouraging, at the end of the first session after a description of the Porton Germ Warfare Centre, to hear the comment "But places like that are necessary, aren't they? - as long as the others have them, I mean".

One of our difficulties was that some of our speakers had been unable to come, and unprepared deputies had to fill the breach. One group's session, however, on the history of the peace movement, had the advantage of a leader who had done her homework, and by the end of his 45 minutes, he had not only persuaded the youngsters that non-violence is practical, but had captured their imagination with descriptions of the Marham and Porton demonstrations and the Factory for Peace. The somewhat Puckish attitude of the Committee of 100 towards authority obviously appealed to them.

A guitarist led a session of peace songs until lunch was ready. The afternoon began with a film show. The most successful films were "Science for Life", "Attention" and "The Magician", in that order. The other two ("It's a Grand Life" and "Direct Action at Harrington") had no clear message and judging from the discussion which followed, the youngsters did not get anything out of them. All the films came from Concord Films Council. Discussion was still almost entirely in the hands of the organisers, so when Peggie Denny suggested that those who had had enough might like to push off while those who wanted to continue left the rather bleak atmosphere of the church hall for her drawing room, we expected most to take the opportunity to go, and were surprised when they all came along to the house. There

they went on listening (a lot) and talking (a little) and after another hour I was still more surprised when several of them enthusiastically asked for a repetition of the one-day school and promised to bring friends with them next time. They also asked for details of the next YCND meeting, and obviously intended to go along. So our experiment was far from being a failure - though with more preparation and more experience, we could certainly have done much better.

Barbara Smoker

It is hoped to produce a brochure on the Schools projects, and in the meantime anyone interested should write to the convenor of the Schools Action Group, John Papworth, 22 Nevern Road, London SW5, or the National Secretary.

FOULNESS: THE PROHIBITED CHURCH

We are taught that one of our cherished English liberties is the freedom of each man to worship without hindrance according to the dictates of his conscience - unlike Soviet Russia, where churches have been used as anti-God museums or otherwise profaned. Yet here in England, only a few miles from London, there is an Anglican village at which one can worship only with an official military permit.

Saint Mary the Virgin's Church is the Parish Church of Foulness Island, off the Essex Coast between the Thames and Crouch Estuaries. The whole of the island and a portion of the mainland is a "prohibited place within the meaning of the Official Secrets Acts" - because it includes an Atomic Weapons Research Establishment and a military weapon proof and testing establishment. This means that everyone of the 300 people living there has to have a permit to get home after a day out, and each visitor the invites needs a permit as well. Ordinarily a stranger cannot go to the village unless he has been invited by someone living there.

Readers of RESISTANCE will have their own views as to whether this is an infringement of ordinary civil liberties. The Christian Group of the Committee of 100 has become interested in two particular aspects of this question - the inclusion of a Christian church in an establishment which has been set up to contradict everything that we believe Christianity stands for; and the arbitrary restriction of entry to a House of God.

As a first step, to test whether the regulations meant what they said, some 70 people formally applied for permits to worship at the ordinary 11.0 a.m. service on Good Friday. After some six weeks' consideration by the military authorities, we have now been officially informed that six "representative Christians" will be permitted to attend. The notion of "representative Christianity" is an interesting example of military theology - if you can worship vicariously, perhaps you can also love your enemies by proxy whilst you yourself get on with blowing them up.

Even if most of us cannot get to the village church itself on Good Friday, we shall still be worshipping in spirit with the people of Foulness, by holding a service at the Gates, calling to mind the Saviour who resisted evil with love, even unto death. Non-Christians will also be showing solidarity with us by holding a silent vigil during the service.

We understand that personnel will be on duty at the AWRE on Good Friday. We hope that some of them may come to see the contrast between faith in the Bomb, which the AWRE represents, and faith in the Cross, for which Saint Mary's was built.

William Hetherington.

June 21st-26th 1965 - Faslane, Scotland.

In one of the most beautiful parts of Scotland, a lethal and highly expensive installation is in the final stages of construction. Yet another addition to the Warfare State is rearing its £45,000,000 head in the form of a "British Polaris Base" and "Cadet Training Centre" at Faslane. It is located at the Gareloch near the town of Helensburgh, some 25 miles from Glasgow. On June 26th the Scottish Committee of 100 will hold an action at Faslane. Objectives are as follows:-

WORK FOR PEACE

Alternative employment for one worker at Faslane will be offered at The Factory for Peace, Glasgow. The form of industrial democracy practised by the factory will be depicted by a film showing it in action. The film show will be followed by discussion, where speakers will put the Anti-War case, and the need for individual industrial consciousness. People previously employed on War-Work will be present to give their reasons for ceasing it, and the need for others to do likewise.

INTERNATIONAL OIL TERMINAL

An economist is drafting a technically feasible plan for the conversion of Faslane (proposed International Death Terminal) into an International Oil Terminal. This will be presented to the Government and Trade Union Bodies as an alternative to the War Effort and a positive contribution to International Co-operation Year.

DIRECT ACTION

On June 26th the Scottish Committee of 100, with international contingents of war resisters intend to prevent Saturday work taking place on the base, by physically blocking work proceedings for the whole day. If Saturday work is discontinued, the base will

be inspected, to see how suitable the set-up is for conversion. It is hoped that a maximum of individual initiative and tactical thinking will be used by those taking part in the end action, and that non-violent direct action will take up an offensive position at Faslane.

ON THE BEACH

Stretches of the beach from Helensburgh to Faslane are littered with rubbish and contrast harshly with the surrounding scenery. Constructive action will take place on the Saturday morning by teams of people "cleaning up" the beach. Transport will be available in the afternoon to take people on a tour of the Nuclear War Complex surrounding Faslane.

GLEN DOUGLAS, COULPORT, GLEN FRUIN, ROSNEATH

Saturday's programme will be brought to a finale by an Anti-War International - Open Forum, Folk Song Concert to be held on the beach at Helensburgh. Being the holiday season, trippers will be plentiful providing an excellent opportunity for the integration of ideas.

The four previous objectives are the backbone of the demo. which we think provide a practical and creative basis. In past actions emphasis has been placed on what we are against. At Faslane we will attempt to offer in realistic terms what we are for. We hope that this will be the beginning of a more flexible and creative approach to future demonstrations.

Success will largely depend on your support. A detailed timetable will be published at a later date, meanwhile we need cash to get the demo. on the road. Please send your donation or enquiry to The Scottish Committee of 100, c/o Munro, 89 Elderslie Street, Glasgow, C. 3. Telephone: Glasgow Central 2130.

THE FACELESS ONES

There has been a good deal of internal backbiting about the anonymity of the editors of RESISTANCE. So we asked Hazel McGee to interview one of us for the magazine, to try to clear up some of the points of contention. This is her report.

INTERVIEW WITH AN EDITOR.

I had half expected a whole paraphernalia of passwords, armed guards and secret codes when I met the editors of RESISTANCE. At any rate, this is what I had been led to believe by the way some people talk these days about "secrecy". So I had a pleasant surprise when we sat in a perfectly ordinary cafe surrounded by perfectly ordinary workmen and drank tea. This was not exactly in the best James Bond tradition. I suppose the fact that this particular editor was a girl could have been said to be so, although I doubt she would have considered it a compliment.

Me: We might as well take the bull by the horns straight away. Why can't I print your names?

She: Far too much has been made of the openness v. secrecy issue. We are presented as a secret, self-perpetuating clique, trying by a series of cowardly tricks to avoid answering for our actions in Committee and in the Courts. Ourselves, we just see it as plain common sense. We are trying to publish a magazine which is completely outspoken on some of the most controversial issues of our time. If something should be said we will say it, whether it is against the law to do so or not. Few people realize just how far the liberty of the press is maintained only by gracious favour of the police and the Government; the laws to restrict it are all there for the using when they deem it necessary, even without such charming diversions as the Official Secrets Acts and the Incitement to Disaffection Act. Most of us have seen too much of the insides of prisons and do not want to see any more too soon. Call it cowardly if you like, but we see no point in deliberately making martyrs of ourselves. Our secrecy is not very efficient, by the way, and we make no great effort to cover our tracks; nobody kids themselves the SB don't know who we are, when most of the Committee could make a pretty shrewd guess and we use the telephone all the time. This does not worry us. We are not running a secret society. We just aim to make it a little more difficult than it has been in the past for them to prove the responsibility of a few people.

Me: Wouldn't it be better to collect a group of say 50 people who would declare themselves responsible for the magazine, like the Hampstead Committee did with their forces leaflets?

She: Unfortunately, no. Collective responsibility of this kind is a very pleasant fiction, but it is only a fiction. We should have learnt this at Wethersfield. Pat Arrowsmith and Brian learnt it at Ruislip, and there have been many other cases. It just makes it easy for the State to pick off the few people who are really responsible.

Me: Does this mean you are in favour of running secret demonstrations?

She: No, of course not, a secret demonstration is a contradiction in terms. If your purpose is to openly challenge the structure and machinery of the Warfare State then secrecy is pointless and inefficient. You just have to be prepared for the consequences of your civil disobedience as the Wethersfield Six, and Pat and Brian and all the others, were. We are not running a campaign of deliberate civil disobedience, we are running a magazine. Our purpose is not so much to openly challenge the State ourselves, but to provide the background material and ammunition by which people can do so. If we happen to break the law of the State then that is too bad, but it is not our prime function to deliberately do so.

Me: You just ignore the law?

She: You could say that, yes. We publish what we think should be published, if we are to fulfil our role of encouraging people to active resistance to war. If we happen to come up against the laws made to defend the Warfare State, then too bad for the laws.

Me: To change the subject a little from principle to practicalities. Can you give me some idea how many people are on the editorial board, and their qualifications?

She: The so-called editorial board is in fact a flexible body, as people drop out and others come on, but there are usually between four and eight at the meetings. At present five attend pretty regularly. As to qualifications, I am afraid we lack any formal journalistic qualifications, which may be apparent in the amateurish mistakes we make. (I hope it also shows itself in an occasional refusal to be bound by accepted ideas and conventions, however.) On a quick estimate I would say this current five had spent a total of 3½ years in prison, if you could call that a qualification. We've all been in at some time or another, and we've all been active in the Committee since 1961 or '62.

Me: RESISTANCE grew naturally out of a circular which the London Committee Secretary used to send to Working Group convenors, and which in Spring 1963 started to be stapled together and called "Action for Peace". We changed the name in early 1964, and absorbed the National Bulletin at the same time. How do you see the future development of the magazine? Is it still primarily a "house journal"?

She: We hope not. Although it must of course contain news and comments of prime interest to Committee activists we are trying to make it the sort of magazine which will interest the complete outsider too, and thence naturally increase the number of Committee activists. We must be partly succeeding, or the Welsh Committee for example would not be able to sell so many in the streets of Cardiff. If only we had better material we could do much better. The amazing success of the journal in its first year shows that it fulfilled a great need, and we hope to go on doing so.

Me: Now you are getting it printed, after a year of duplication. Why did you make this move?

She: It was getting too big for us. With circulation approaching 3,000, duplicating stencils would not run the course. Also, surprisingly, it works out cheaper to print it. And previously the editorial board had been spending most of their spare time typing and working the duplicator; we want to do a bit of editing for a change.

Me: Surely there is a danger in having a radical magazine printed by an ordinary commercial firm?

She: Naturally. The police can warn printers that they will be closed down if they print a certain article.

At the moment there are teething troubles; we are still smarting with shame at the delay in publication of the first printed issue (which was not our fault); but we hope they will soon be over.

Me: Despite the better production the standard of content of RESISTANCE seems to be lower than it was.

She: We know, and of course we are to blame, but not entirely. Blame it partly on the fact that we are very busy people trying to do a full-time job in our spare time; we all have other jobs and some of us have families too. But blame it chiefly on the fact that the material just is not there. We have to scrape the bottom of the barrel, and what is more, do it at the last moment because people are so late with contributions. If people would write for us, and send us pictures and photographs - remember we can publish photos now with no extra cost and no loss of quality - ; if they would send them at the beginning of the month and not at the end, then perhaps we could start to improve standards. We still have to type the material ourselves, it is not typeset but produced on a special electric typewriter. When we have mastered it we hope to improve the layout and re-introduce the justified right-hand margins and other refinements that will greatly increase the attractiveness of the magazine. It maddens us more than it does you, to see the journal so mediocre. The scope must be there, but this magazine more than any other depends on its readers for its quality.

Me: One last question. Would you have published the "Spies for Peace" disclosures, in full, if they had been sent to you?

She: Of course.

Me: Would you have done it over your own name?

She: No. And I know I speak for the whole editorial board in saying that.

Interview recorded by Hazel McGee.

Regional News

BEDFORD COMMITTEE'S "WEEKEND FOR PEACE"

The Bedford Committee of 100 held a weekend of peace discussion and activity on 6th-7th March. The Saturday afternoon was devoted to a forum on "The Future of the Peace Movement", at which the speakers included Peter Cadogan, Tony Smythe and Wynford Hicks. Then followed a discussion of possible direct action to be taken at Chicksands Early Warning Station, some 12 miles from Bedford, the next day. It became clear that of the some 40 persons present less than a dozen were prepared to take direct action to the extent of civil disobedience, and the original form of the demonstration proposed by the Bedford group was accordingly modified.

On Sunday the demonstrators set out from the centre of Bedford with the intention of marching about five miles to the outskirts and then being ferried to the base. After about two miles, however, heavy fog reduced visibility to a few yards, and police advice to continue by transport, to avoid the danger of accident, was accepted. An advance party went ahead to explore the situation at the entrance to the base, and was met by a reception committee of three RAF officers and a police inspector, who pointed out the perimeter of Defence Ministry territory and an area within it alongside the road where they would permit a meeting to be held. Leaflets were accepted and a friendly exchange of views took place.

When the main body of demonstrators arrived an attempt was made to march right up to the gates, but the police formed a cordon across the approach road. A standing public assembly was held in the road in front of the cordon for about 30 minutes, and then the police gave permission for a delegation of six to go right to the gate to hand in a letter for the CO. On reaching the gate these six, Douglas Helton, Philip West, Robert Bell, John Beyar, Robert Dobbie, John Mackie and a juvenile, sat down and refused to move until all the demonstrators were allowed to see the CO. After an hour and a half they were arrested by the civil police for obstruction and taken to Biggleswade police station for the night. The remainder of the demonstrators made an abortive attempt at solidarity by sitting in the road, but soon got up and went home. The following day the six appeared in court and were fined £3, except John Mackie, who was given a conditional discharge, and the juvenile, who was remanded to the juvenile court.

It was encouraging that 40 people took part in a local activity of this kind, but the need for more detailed and reasoned preparation for such a demonstration was made apparent.

LONDON COMMITTEE OF 100

ACCOUNTS for period ending 12th March, 1965.

Income

	£	s.	d.
Sales: Badges, Lit etc, Feb	71	9	10
Donations inc. offset fund	66	7	10
Collections	7	12	0
Sundries inc. balance	55	8	7
	£ 200	17	5

Expenditure

	£	s.	d.
Wages, expenses & NI	50	0	0
Stamps	16	9	0
Sundries inc. money to R & old a/c paid	57	10	0
Stat. & office expenses	35	19	5
	£ 165	5	1

Balance in hand: £35 12s. 4d.

(Apologies for omitting these accounts from last issue of RESISTANCE - Eds.)



To Goodwin Street

ABORTION

William Hetherington's letter typifies the attitude of those working in the specifically "peace" groups, which repels people like me who are sympathetic, and will ensure that such groups remain a shrinking minority fringe unable to communicate with the majority of the people they hope to influence. I have had examples before of this kind of attitude: the lady who criticised my writing in the Guardian about old people dying of cold as "the only thing that matters is nuclear war", the Committee of 100 people who came down to Cornwall talking about Fallex-63 to a population where one in five was in the dole queue, and the ladies in a peace group who would not support a campaign for the prevention of cervical cancer.

The position governing abortion is involved and I have no space to detail the legal position here (I would refer Mr. H. to my article in the New Statesman of 13th Nov. last and the Lancet editorial of 12th December.) The toll of human suffering caused through illegal abortions is appalling and if real, concrete suffering is not sufficient to move Mr. H. to compassion then he is as removed from reality as nuclear strategists like Kahn: he prefers his suffering to be hypothetical. What ghastly arrogance, what utter, crass lack of imagination is shown by the phrase "a gratuitous insult to people like myself". It is a gratuitous insult to a person of compassion such as Dr. Tellam that he should be spoken of in such a way by someone who so conspicuously lacks such a quality. What is Mr. H. in peace work for? So he can feel a splendid self-righteous glow every time he thinks what a wonderful person he is?

If he really cannot tell the difference between the death of a foetus from fallout and death by termination I will spell it out for him. No one has a choice whether or not they should bear a deformed or still-born child through fallout, but no-one is going to force any woman to have an abortion against her will. Such is the state of the law at present that many women bear unwanted babies, die bearing babies; they should never have had or die or become seriously ill through illegal abortions because they cannot get this operation safely done although they have decided they need it of their own free choice. There are thousands of examples of this but I will merely quote my own. After 3 miscarriages and 4 pregnancies in eight years I became pregnant again, although I was taking "the pill". Having suffered from toxæmia and high blood pressure on previous occasions and also having just had a major operation my doctor tried to get the pregnancy terminated as he considered the risk to me was too high. The only consultant here being Catholic, this was refused and my husband and I nearly went out of our minds with worry. (If Mr. Hetherington thinks this is an easy choice then he is talking out of the back of his neck). Eventually after finding out illegal safe ways of having it done in Harley Street for £150, we were put in touch with a London teaching hospital and I was finally admitted, really ill, exhausted and off my head with worry towards the end of the fourteenth week of pregnancy. I have no sense of guilt at having had this operation as the alternative risk, that of leaving my husband to bring up four motherless children under the age of nine, seemed an ample and sufficient reason for having it done. Dr. Tellam, no doubt, had patients who in another part of the country, would have been able to have such an operation in a hospital, although under the law as it stands no termination is strictly legal by Statute Law. No-one would advocate abortion as a means of family planning but what kind of "pacifist" would condemn a woman to death because contraception has failed?

If Mr. Hetherington had troubled to find out anything about the Tellam case he would have discovered the grave civil liberties issue raised, the way in which witnesses allege they gave evidence under false pretences and were not told of their legal rights.

The self-righteous attitude of those who see every issue through the narrow blinkers of the nuclear bomb has done untold harm. After working hard to the point of exhaustion in CND for several years, I am finding it refreshing and heartening to give my time to some of the groups concerned with improving present-day society - they are so much more in touch with reality. They have more humility too.

Judith Cook, Ding Dong Cottage, Newmill, Penzance, Cornwall.

William Hetherington's letter in the last issue of RESISTANCE contains several inaccurate and misleading statements. In an area of discussion as thickly studded with rival definitions and imprecisely formulated concepts as violence and non-violence, it is neither helpful nor sufficient to state that something is not non-violent and leave it at that. Does Mr. Hetherington mean that abortion is violent? - and if he does, what does he find in it to distinguish it in this respect from other surgical operations? Does he think he has the right to condemn illegitimate children to unhappiness? Even the law is not foolish enough to regard a foetus as an accomplice before the fact to its own abortion. What is more, it is simply untrue to say that abortion contains "inherent dangers to the health of the mother" without qualification. Abortion carried out under proper conditions in the first twelve weeks of pregnancy is at least as safe as tonsillectomy.

The way in which Mr. H. puts his statement about death by fallout and by abortion obscures the issue, which is "who makes the decision is it their decision to make?" The decision to take actions which result in fallout have been made by States, and are of the same type as Home's announcement that "the British people are prepared to be blown to atomic dust". This is the way of running lives to which direct action is opposed. The decision to have a foetus aborted ("murder of an unborn child" is an emotional and question-begging phrase which should be kept out of the discussion) is made by the woman who is pregnant with it. Certainly medical advice should be available; but this is a moral, not a medical, decision. Perhaps contraceptives should have been used; but it is not much use telling that to a pregnant woman. One does not have to be a mental contortionist to distinguish between the two cases. One does have to believe in the right of individuals to run their own lives.

Last but not least is Mr. Hetherington's apparent assumption that children who ring doorbells and run away are "maladjusted". This extends the meaning of maladjustment so much that it becomes meaningless. A six-months-old baby is not house-trained; is it to be labelled "maladjusted"? We cannot escape unwelcome facts just by categorising them; to call behaviour of which one disapproves "maladjustment" is usually employed as a substitute for positive remedial action.

Chris Stray, 129 Fordel Road, London, SE6.

I would like to answer William Hetherington's remarks about the inclusion of Dr. Bill Tellam's name in the list of Prisoners for Peace. I entirely agree with the editors. The fact that thousands of his patients, friends and well-wishers supported him seems to indicate that he was a respected and trusted member of the community, performing a service that should be entirely legal.

In fact the dangers of abortion, when performed by a skilled doctor under hygienic conditions during the first few weeks are very much less than those of childbirth, and it is only the antiquated laws which drive women in desperation to ignorant and dirty back-street abortionists, which cause terrible suffering and misery, and in some cases death. These laws are all of course made by men who know they will never have to suffer under them.

Is it really better to force a woman to have a child she does not want as a punishment for her sins? Perhaps some may say she deserves it, but what of the child? I believe that it is unfair to bring into the world a child who is not loved and wanted. In mediaeval times the position was perhaps different, but now most people agree that the problem of over-population is acute, so it cannot be considered a service to mankind simply to have more children, especially unwanted ones.

The nominal £10 charged by Dr. Tellam was probably not much more than the costs he incurred. It is more than likely he saved his patients from much worse experiences with quacks or poisons taken in the vain hope that they would 'do the trick' without harming the woman. To regard a foetus in the third or fourth month of pregnancy as a human being is quite arbitrary; it is just something that might one day become one. The law as it stands is forcing the moral code of a few people on the community as a whole. The estimated figure per annum of illegal abortions in England varies between 50,000 and 100,000, mostly it seems on married women who already have as many children as they want or can look after properly. The answer of course is foolproof contraception which is not harmful, but we have not reached this stage yet, so the law should be changed.

Lydia Vulliamy, 154 Corbyn Street, London, N4.

INFILTRATION IN SCHOOLS

More power to your elbows with the infiltration of the schools. (p.6, March RESISTANCE.) It might be a good idea to distribute the leaflets direct to the children at the school bus stops, as well; where they walk to and from school, the leaflets could be handed to them en route, perhaps preferably on their way home after finishing school for the day. It is as essential to "get at" day pupils as boarders.

The rot starts at birth: the child is subjected to continuous indoctrination from then on, some of the ideas that are instilled into a child's originally clean mind being so foul (as well as inconsistent) that I wouldn't like to call it brainwashing. One very glaring example of this is the idea that our bodies are indecent; yet in the same breath we are told that God made us in His own image, thus implying that He Himself is indecent. Another idea dinned into us as soon as we can understand anything is that of "original sin", which is as bad as telling the child that he or she has done wrong by being born!

John Ormsby, Parrocks Lodge Caravan Site, Tatworth, Chard, Som.

ON THE RUN

EM Chris East, who was reported in February RESISTANCE as being in cells after being arrested for absence without leave on conscientious grounds, was given a short sentence and is now back on duty whilst deciding whether to proceed further in obtaining release.

EM Paul Valentine would like to thank all those who have given him moral and material support during his extended period of French leave.

BRICKBATS.....(WELL DESERVED)

I attended your non-meeting at Porchester Hall. (Points of Information, last month). Congratulations on this excellent new tactic. I expect you have taken to heart Peter Simple's advice in the Daily Telegraph, i.e. that racism is merely stimulated by being resisted, since protest against it calls attention to it, and decided to have a non-meeting on the same principle that some charities sell tickets for a non-dance.

I suggest this process be taken still further. When a crisis develops don't demonstrate at embassies, stay at home and watch the telly. Don't participate in marches at Easter and so on. Before you know what has happened the H-Bomb will have been abolished and all the world will be at peace. This is the Taoist principle of active inaction. Of course it's rather hard (in the early stages, before people become used to the new tactic) on those who alter their arrangements in order to attend a meeting, and then arrive to find the doors locked and all in darkness, and have to wait around in the cold and finally give up in despair and go and sit in a cinema because there is now an empty evening to be filled. Still for The Cause one is prepared to Sacrifice All!

Arthur Uloth, 30 Arundel Gardens, W11.

(Some wrecker, saboteur, Trotskyist.....what we mean is, sorry! We'll check the "Points" better in future and see that when someone tells us about a meeting, there really will be one. - Eds.)

.....AND BOUQUETS

This is to congratulate you on the wonderful bulletin you are publishing. We are confident that since you represent sanity in a period of history in which man is still very much a barbarian, your efforts and achievements will outlast the date of bombs, racial hatred and exploitation.

Raymond Kunene, African National Congress of South Africa, 3 Collingham Gardens, SW5.

Congratulations on the new RESISTANCE. The layout and offset-litho printing are excellent. One criticism: I do not agree with the articles on "Telephone Sabotage" mainly because they express views contrary to the aim of a nonviolent, free society. I consider openness to be one of the Committee's great weapons in this struggle. Some of us say that nonviolence has failed. Never! It is us who have not been nonviolent enough. Nonviolence plus truth is invincible.

David Flude, Oakwood Cottage, 13 Bolsover Road, Eastbourne.



To Goodwin Street

ABORTION

William Hetherington's letter typifies the attitude of those working in the specifically "peace" groups, which repels people like me who are sympathetic, and will ensure that such groups remain a shrinking minority fringe unable to communicate with the majority of the people they hope to influence. I have had examples before of this kind of attitude: the lady who criticised my writing in the Guardian about old people dying of cold as "the only thing that matters is nuclear war", the Committee of 100 people who came down to Cornwall talking about Fallex-63 to a population where one in five was in the dole queue, and the ladies in a peace group who would not support a campaign for the prevention of cervical cancer.

The position governing abortion is involved and I have no space to detail the legal position here (I would refer Mr. H. to my article in the New Statesman of 13th Nov. last and the Lancet editorial of 12th December.) The toll of human suffering caused through illegal abortions is appalling and if real, concrete suffering is not sufficient to move Mr. H. to compassion then he is as removed from reality as nuclear strategists like Kahn: he prefers his suffering to be hypothetical. What ghastly arrogance, what utter, crass lack of imagination is shown by the phrase "a gratuitous insult to people like myself". It is a gratuitous insult to a person of compassion such as Dr. Tellam that he should be spoken of in such a way by someone who so conspicuously lacks such a quality. What is Mr. H. in peace work for? So he can feel a splendid self-righteous glow every time he thinks what a wonderful person he is?

If he really cannot tell the difference between the death of a foetus from fallout and death by termination I will spell it out for him. No one has a choice whether or not they should bear a deformed or still-born child through fallout, but no-one is going to force any woman to have an abortion against her will. Such is the state of the law at present that many women bear unwanted babies, die bearing babies they should never have had or die or become seriously ill through illegal abortions because they cannot get this operation safely done although they have decided they need it of their own free choice. There are thousands of examples of this but I will merely quote my own. After 3 miscarriages and 4 pregnancies in eight years I became pregnant again, although I was taking "the pill". Having suffered from toxæmia and high blood pressure on previous occasions and also having just had a major operation my doctor tried to get the pregnancy terminated as he considered the risk to me was too high. The only consultant here being Catholic, this was refused and my husband and I nearly went out of our minds with worry. (If Mr. Hetherington thinks this is an easy choice then he is talking out of the back of his neck). Eventually after finding out illegal safe ways of having it done in Harley Street for £150, we were put in touch with a London teaching hospital and I was finally admitted, really ill, exhausted and off my head with worry towards the end of the fourteenth week of pregnancy. I have no sense of guilt at having had this operation as the alternative risk, that of leaving my husband to bring up four motherless children under the age of nine, seemed an ample and sufficient reason for having it done. Dr. Tellam, no doubt, had patients who in another part of the country, would have been able to have such an operation in a hospital, although under the law as it stands no termination is strictly legal by Statute Law. No-one would advocate abortion as a means of family planning but what kind of "pacifist" would condemn a woman to death because contraception has failed?

If Mr. Hetherington had troubled to find out anything about the Tellam case he would have discovered the grave civil liberties issue raised, the way in which witnesses allege they gave evidence under false pretences and were not told of their legal rights.

The self-righteous attitude of those who see every issue through the narrow blinkers of the nuclear bomb has done untold harm. After working hard to the point of exhaustion in CND for several years, I am finding it refreshing and heartening to give my time to some of the groups concerned with improving present-day society - they are so much more in touch with reality. They have more humility too.

Judith Cook, Ding Dong Cottage, Newmill, Penzance, Cornwall.

William Hetherington's letter in the last issue of RESISTANCE contains several inaccurate and misleading statements. In an area of discussion as thickly studded with rival definitions and imprecisely formulated concepts as violence and non-violence, it is neither helpful nor sufficient to state that something is not non-violent and leave it at that. Does Mr. Hetherington mean that abortion is violent? - and if he does, what does he find in it to distinguish it in this respect from other surgical operations? Does he think he has the right to condemn illegitimate children to unhappiness? Even the law is not foolish enough to regard a foetus as an accomplice before the fact to its own abortion. What is more, it is simply untrue to say that abortion contains "inherent dangers to the health of the mother" without qualification. Abortion carried out under proper conditions in the first twelve weeks of pregnancy is at least as safe as tonsillectomy.

The way in which Mr. H. puts his statement about death by fallout and by abortion obscures the issue, which is "who makes the decision is it their decision to make?" The decision to take actions which result in fallout have been made by States, and are of the same type as Home's announcement that "the British people are prepared to be blown to atomic dust". This is the way of running lives to which direct action is opposed. The decision to have a foetus aborted ("murder of an unborn child" is an emotional and question-begging phrase which should be kept out of the discussion) is made by the woman who is pregnant with it. Certainly medical advice should be available; but this is a moral, not a medical, decision. Perhaps contraceptives should have been used; but it is not much use telling that to a pregnant woman. One does not have to be a mental contortionist to distinguish between the two cases. One does have to believe in the right of individuals to run their own lives.

Last but not least is Mr. Hetherington's apparent assumption that children who ring doorbells and run away are "maladjusted". This extends the meaning of maladjustment so much that it becomes meaningless. A six-months-old baby is not house-trained; is it to be labelled "maladjusted"? We cannot escape unwelcome facts just by categorising them: to call behaviour of which one disapproves "maladjustment" is usually employed as a substitute for positive remedial action.

Chris Stray, 129 Fordel Road, London, SE6.

I would like to answer William Hetherington's remarks about the inclusion of Dr. Bill Tellam's name in the list of Prisoners for Peace. I entirely agree with the editors. The fact that thousands of his patients, friends and well-wishers supported him seems to indicate that he was a respected and trusted member of the community, performing a service that should be entirely legal.

In fact the dangers of abortion, when performed by a skilled doctor under hygienic conditions during the first few weeks are very much less than those of childbirth, and it is only the antiquated laws which drive women in desperation to ignorant and dirty back-street abortionists, which cause terrible suffering and misery, and in some cases death. These laws are all of course made by men who know they will never have to suffer under them.

Is it really better to force a woman to have a child she does not want as a punishment for her sins? Perhaps some may say she deserves it, but what of the child? I believe that it is unfair to bring into the world a child who is not loved and wanted. In mediaeval times the position was perhaps different, but now most people agree that the problem of over-population is acute, so it cannot be considered a service to mankind simply to have more children, especially unwanted ones.

The nominal £10 charged by Dr. Tellam was probably not much more than the costs he incurred. It is more than likely he saved his patients from much worse experiences with quacks or poisons taken in the vain hope that they would 'do the trick' without harming the woman. To regard a foetus in the third or fourth month of pregnancy as a human being is quite arbitrary; it is just something that might one day become one. The law as it stands is forcing the moral code of a few people on the community as a whole. The estimated figure per annum of illegal abortions in England varies between 50,000 and 100,000, mostly it seems on married women who already have as many children as they want or can look after properly. The answer of course is foolproof contraception which is not harmful, but we have not reached this stage yet, so the law should be changed.

Lydia Vulliamy, 154 Corbyn Street, London, N4.

INFILTRATION IN SCHOOLS

More power to your elbows with the infiltration of the schools. (p.6, March RESISTANCE.) It might be a good idea to distribute the leaflets direct to the children at the school bus stops, as well; where they walk to and from school, the leaflets could be handed to them en route, perhaps preferably on their way home after finishing school for the day. It is as essential to "get at" day pupils as boarders.

The rot starts at birth: the child is subjected to continuous indoctrination from then on, some of the ideas that are instilled into a child's originally clean mind being so foul (as well as inconsistent) that I wouldn't like to call it brainwashing. One very glaring example of this is the idea that our bodies are indecent; yet in the same breath we are told that God made us in His own image, thus implying that He Himself is indecent. Another idea dinned into us as soon as we can understand anything is that of "original sin", which is as bad as telling the child that he or she has done wrong by being born!

John Ormsby, Parrocks Lodge Caravan Site, Tatworth, Chard, Som.

ON THE RUN

EM Chris East, who was reported in February RESISTANCE as being in cells after being arrested for absence without leave on conscientious grounds, was given a short sentence and is now back on duty whilst deciding whether to proceed further in obtaining release.

EM Paul Valentine would like to thank all those who have given him moral and material support during his extended period of French leave.

BRICKBATS (WELL DESERVED)

I attended your non-meeting at Porchester Hall. (Points of Information, last month). Congratulations on this excellent new tactic. I expect you have taken to heart Peter Simple's advice in the Daily Telegraph, i.e. that racism is merely stimulated by being resisted, since protest against it calls attention to it, and decided to have a non-meeting on the same principle that some charities sell tickets for a non-dance.

I suggest this process be taken still further. When a crisis develops don't demonstrate at embassies, stay at home and watch the telly. Don't participate in marches at Easter and so on. Before you know what has happened the H-Bomb will have been abolished and all the world will be at peace. This is the Taoist principle of active inaction. Of course it's rather hard (in the early stages, before people become used to the new tactic) on those who alter their arrangements in order to attend a meeting, and then arrive to find the doors locked and all in darkness, and have to wait around in the cold and finally give up in despair and go and sit in a cinema because there is now an empty evening to be filled. Still for The Cause one is prepared to Sacrifice All!

Arthur Uloth, 30 Arundel Gardens, W11.

(Some wrecker, saboteur, Trotskyist what we mean is, sorry! We'll check the "Points" better in future and see that when someone tells us about a meeting, there really will be one. - Eds.)

. AND BOUQUETS

This is to congratulate you on the wonderful bulletin you are publishing. We are confident that since you represent sanity in a period of history in which man is still very much a barbarian, your efforts and achievements will outlast the date of bombs, racial hatred and exploitation.

Raymond Kunene, African National Congress of South Africa, 3 Collingham Gardens, SW5.

Congratulations on the new RESISTANCE. The layout and offset-litho printing are excellent. One criticism: I do not agree with the articles on "Telephone Sabotage" mainly because they express views contrary to the aim of a nonviolent, free society. I consider openness to be one of the Committee's great weapons in this struggle. Some of us say that nonviolence has failed. Never! It is us who have not been nonviolent enough. Nonviolence plus truth is invincible.

David Flude, Oakwood Cottage, 13 Bolsover Road, Eastbourne.

LOUDSPEAKERS for every purpose

Trafalgar Square or a back-street meeting;
Albert Hall or your local school-room;
Loudhailers; mobile sets for use on cars.

AUDIO-VISUAL AIDS of every type

Film projection: 8mm, 9.5mm, 16mm, 35mm.
Slide projection; tape recording; gramophones.
Daylight screens; tours with cinema van.

** EQUIPMENT FOR SALE OR HIRE

A reliable professional service at
LESS THAN HALF PRICE
to peace movement and libertarian groups * * * * *



Eric Walker

film projection and public
address services Ltd

154 CORBYN ST. LONDON N.4

ARCHway 7200

***DIRECT ACTION Monthly paper of Syndicalist Workers'
Federation, 4d. For a free trial copy write to
Bill Christopher, 34 Cumberland Road, London E7

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES published in America.
Spring number features: Analysis of racial integration
of schools in the North; detailed critique of the support
given by anarchist-libertarian editor, Dellinger of
"Liberation", to Castro dictatorship

Sub 10s; specimen copies from Contemporary Press,
PO Box 2357, Church Street Station, New York,
N.Y. 10008, USA.

SOLIDARITY - Unofficial, disruptive, subversive... Undermines
the orthodoxies of "right" and "left". Has been app-
earing (more or less regularly) for over four years.

There's nothing quite like it (Thank God!).

9/- to Bob Potter, 197 Kings Cross Road, WCI will make
sure you get the next 12 issues, post free.

ADVERTISE IN RESISTANCE

Rates: Small Ads. 2d per word, payment in advance please.
Exchange ads. from other publications considered.

Display: 1/4 page £2.5s. 1/2 page £4. Full page £7.10s.

ADVERTISE IN RESISTANCE!!!

Points of Information

FRIENDS OF RESISTANCE next meeting to be arranged.
Phone Bruce Samoila ARCHway 1239.

WRITING TO GOODWIN STREET? To avoid delay in
replies, please address letters as follows:

Letters, articles, subs. etc. for RESISTANCE:
RESISTANCE, 13 Goodwin St. N4.

General correspondence of London Committee, all
requests for badges: The Secretary, London
Committee of 100, 13 Goodwin St. N4!

General correspondence of the National Committee, all
enquiries from or about groups outside London:
The Secretary, National Committee of 100,
13 Goodwin St. N4.

COMMITTEE OF 100 DIRECTORY (in last month's mag.)
Additions and corrections.
S.E. London Working Group: Barbara Smoker, 86
Dalmain Road, S.E. 23. Bromley and Beckenham
Working Group: Jim Radford, 5 Clockhouse Road,
Beckenham, Kent. Hampstead Working Group,
Andrew Papworth, 184 Haverstock Hill, N.W. 3.
Bedford Working Group: Philip Worst, 60 Beacons-
field Street, Bedford. Manchester Working Group,
Zachary Kaye, 12 Fort Road, Prestwich, Lancashire.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF 100 MEETING. In Manchester,
22nd-23rd May. Details from National Secretary at
ARCHway 1239.

LONDON COMMITTEE OF 100 - next meeting to be arranged.
Details from London Secretary at ARCHway 1239.

PORTON PICKET against germ and chemical war preparations.
15th April at Porton. London Cttee. ARC 1239.

S.E. LONDON WORKING GROUP Jumble Sale, St. Mary's
School (opposite Lewisham Central Library) 2.30 p.m.
May 8th. Contact Barbara Smoker, FOR 9861.

FASLANE - POLARIS DEMONSTRATION. Scottish Committee
of 100. June 21st-26th. Contact c/o Munro,
89 Elderslie Street, Glasgow, C. 3. Glasgow
Central 2130.

FOULNESS CHRISTIAN GROUP CTTEE OF 100 demonstration.
Good Friday, 16th April at Foulness. A.W.R.E.
Contact Peggie Denny, GRE 2669.

CHRISTIAN GROUP CTTEE OF 100. Meeting upstairs, 6
Endsleigh Street, W.C. 1. Monday, 26th April at
7.30 p.m.

VIETNAM - DAILY PROTEST PICKET - Outside the American
Embassy, Grosvenor Square, W. 1. Vigilliers needed
for indefinite daily picket. Will you promise a day,
an hour or more a week? Contact Jane Graham,
9 Kings Avenue, Bromley, Kent. WID 1097.

Selling and Snowballing

Six months ago, I can perhaps now dare to reveal, the Welsh Committee of 100 touched its lowest. Three people turned up to one of the meetings. A dozen copies of RESISTANCE, at most, were sold.

Then the RESISTANCE snowball began. In September we dared to order two dozen copies and stood outside British Home Stores, Cardiff, a site which the Committee had previously used with success in selling SANITY and the BLACK PAPER. In October we sold 50; in November 150; December 175; January (when we introduced the Wales Edition) 500; February 600; and March has begun with an initial order of 600, with the prospect of selling between 750 and 1000 in April. During the same period other literature was introduced and sales have built up to over 150 FREEDOM per month, 150 PEACE NEWS and about 20 SANITY. ANTI-APARTHEID NEWS is the latest newcomer. Committee of 100 badges are also being sold at the rate of about 100 per week.

How is it done?

(i) Sell in pairs or small groups. Sell on the day when people, especially younger people, come to town.

(ii) Sell where there is space, but where people pass. Don't go for the intellectuals; Do go for those who, whatever their dress or background, look as if they might be alive - alive enough, say, to go to a dance hall or jazz club. The young will buy more than the middle-aged, apart from a few who will be imagining they are supporting the R.S.P.C.A. or the University Rag, or who just have guilty consciences and buy anything.

(iii) Approach those whom you think will buy from you, and ask them, "Would you like to buy RESISTANCE?" If you stand stationary you will sell not more than six per hour, apart from the odd one who thinks he's buying the evening paper. Don't obstruct those wishing to pass.

(iv) Under normal circumstances, you will find RESISTANCE sells most easily. You can, however, create or vary circumstances by asking a paper shop if they will sell FREEDOM; when they refuse to stock it you draw a poster "FREEDOM BANNED", together with the name of the shop which you stand outside. You will create quite a stir as well as shoot up your sales of FREEDOM.

Is it worth it? Yes, if you have a local edition, or insert a duplicated sheet which, in our case, reads: "Correspondence, requests for further information, badges, donations, or just a letter to say you want to become active in support of the Committee of 100 - whatever it is, write to" (address of local secretary). For a while after each edition we get back a letter a day, and we invite them to come back and sell. We set up groups in other towns by sending people out from Cardiff, so that now we have a completely independent selling-group in Swansea. Since the demonstration in support of the Newport Caravan Dwellers, we also sell there; (it would have been inconceivable to have put on the Newport demonstration without the support built up in the preceding weeks through the selling).

So the snowball grows. Selling RESISTANCE leads to activity; more activity leads to more sales of RESISTANCE. It can be done anywhere. If it were done by all Committee groups, the circulation of RESISTANCE would rise to 20,000 in the next 12 months. That could end some of our financial problems, since the profits from selling (which on that scale could be considerable) are shared between local groups and London Committee (and assuming the money-handlers are responsible people, which in Wales they are!). More than the money, though, is the life this would inject into the movement.

Philip Seed.

CAN YOU SELL "RESISTANCE" ??

The answer is: YES!

You cannot know until you have tried, just how easy it is to sell RESISTANCE: on the streets, at meetings, on demonstrations. Why not take a bulk order for a dozen and try this month?

LONDONERS: Sell in Hyde Park on Sundays - this is one of the best pitches! Sell at meetings, CND groups, Anarchist groups, demonstrations, marches. Contact Manny Blankett (London Sales Organiser) c/o 13 Goodwin St. N4 for details of how YOU can help.

OUTSIDE LONDON: Why not organise a sales group among your friends? Sell in your college, University, school, shop floor, on the streets. Write to 13 Goodwin St. for a dozen copies on sale or return and see how they go!

ON THE MARCH this Easter. Watch for the RESISTANCE vans which will park beside the march. Collect copies here to sell to marchers and passers-by. Subscription forms will also be available for renewals and new subs.

SUBSCRIPTIONS Has yours expired? Do you not yet subscribe to RESISTANCE? We need your subs. to build up a regular readership and provide a sound financial basis for continued improvements. Fill in the form now.

Subscription rates for RESISTANCE:

5/- for six months, 10/- per year.

Please send me RESISTANCE for the next months.

I enclose subscription and donation.

(Please make cheques etc. payable to RESISTANCE).

NAME

ADDRESS

. PHONE

Send the above with your money to RESISTANCE, 13 Goodwin Street, London, N4.