

'Between the government which does evil and the people who accept it there is a certain shameful solidarity.'

VICTOR HUGO.

**In this Issue:**  
**Controversy on 'the People in the Streets'** -P 2

**THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.**

## SPAIN-are WE prepared?

THE recent execution of the Spanish communist Julian Grimau in the teeth of world disapproval, and the tightening up of press censorship after a period of relative "freedom"—at least so far as the foreign press was concerned, has given rise to speculations of a change in the regime at top level. Last Sunday's *Observer* prominently featured a report "by a Special Correspondent" the gist of which is that Franco is now so seriously ill that he has lost his grip on affairs as well as his Cabinet. It appears that the Council of Ministers debated the fate of the Communist Grimau for 14 hours, during which time Franco did not utter a single word, and it was only by a majority of one vote that Grimau's fate was sealed. All the military (including the Vice-President, Munoz Grandes who voted out "of solidarity" with his fellow military, though arguing throughout in favour of clemency) and two civilians, voted for the application of the death penalty. The *Observer's* correspondent points out that "If General Franco is not capable of backing up his vice-president in a short term question such as this, it is thought unlikely that his authority will be sufficient to ensure an automatic succession".

If the *Observer's* facts are correct it would appear that the ageing General

in recent weeks has been pushed more and more into the hands of a clique of old-timers, headed by Sr. Carrero Blanco, who want to maintain the status quo regardless of consequences.

The question that springs to mind is to ask where will these

"old-timers" look for their support. Of course they can count on the Army leaders and the powerful Sections of the Church, landowners and industrialists, but is there any reason to believe that in 1963 they can hold down the Spanish people any more successfully than in 1936, without outside support? Last time it was the Italian and German dictators. Who will it be this time?

France? (de Gaulle's brusque calling-off of trade talks with Spain following the execution of Grimau does not promise well, though on the other hand de Gaulle has shown willingness to make life difficult for the Spanish refugees in France in return for a tightening up on OAS activities in Spain. What intrigues are currently taking place between OAS, French militarists and the

Spanish "old-timers"?). It is however much more likely that the Spanish reactionaries are looking to the United States for support if and when the explosion takes place in Spain. As it is the regimes has been kept going by large injections of dollar-aid, and the army "modernised" (at least by Spanish standards) and communications improved, again by the Americans, whose

actual presence at the various bases leased to them by Franco, could be of value to the reactionaries in the event of American intervention in any struggle that might result from a political *coup-d'etat*.

Once one starts speculating there is no end to the possibilities and probabilities. After all one has not mentioned Russia's reactions, which will have an important bearing on the United States' and so on. What should be exercising the thought and activities of all those who still believe in the Spanish peoples' ability to free themselves from their local tyrants is to prepare a world opinion which if and when the clash comes, will be strong and militant enough to prevent Spain from becoming a pawn in the game of power politics, another Cuba or Congo. The ground should be prepared now. If we wait until something happens then once again all the best will in the world, the fine sentiments and the bandages and condensed milk will stir the best feelings in humanity, but it will be too late. The tragedy of the Left is that it takes up causes when it is already too late to influence, or help them.



### Spanish Embassy Demonstration

The London Federation of Anarchists supported by a number of Spanish comrades, held a demonstration outside the Spanish Embassy last Saturday. About 80 people turned up to show their solidarity with out Spanish comrades who are suffering long years of imprisonment in Franco's gaols without anything like a fair trial.

The police were there in force supported by the "hurry-up" wagon and prevented the first arrivals of comrades from occupying the island in the road directly in front of the embassy. We argued for some time with the police over using the island, but they seemed to think that we would be a little too near the embassy for its continued safety. We were slowly forced off the island onto the pavement round the garden enclosure. As more comrades arrived we started to walk up and down with our banners and posters.

Throughout the demonstration, the police stood in a line in the road at six yard intervals flanking us. A further line equally spaced out stood on the edge of the kerb guarding their precious island, in the road. Reinforcements were ready round the corner in case of need, a need that did not arise. The demonstration was held almost in silence which was broken only by occasional cat-calls from passers by.

Continued on page 4

## HOLD OUR OWN ENQUIRY!

THE Manchester and Salford Trades Council recently passed a resolution calling for an official inquiry into police behaviour on March 26th, when representatives of unemployed workers throughout the country held a demonstration outside parliament.

In commenting, unfavourably, on the suggestion, the *Guardian* (20/4/63) quotes the last inquiry, in connection with police violence at the Committee of 100 demonstration in Trafalgar Square in September, 1961. Despite the fact that the police used considerable violence at that time, both in the Square and after arresting individuals, the report presented to the Home Secretary, Mr. Butler, completely whitewashed them. At the time, it was not known that anyone actually believed the report except the police officials who investigated the affair, the Royal Commission who investigated them, and the Home Secretary.

However, it seems as if the *Guardian's* leader writer was also taken in, since he uses the former incident, without any obvious logic, to oppose holding an inquiry into the present one.

In fact, an official inquiry, as demanded by the Manchester Trades Council

would not be effective in discovering the facts and carrying out remedies, not because there were no incidents that deserve wide publication and exposure, but because an official inquiry, by its very nature, is inhibited from achieving this object. Not only are its members invariably drawn from circles in sympathy with the state, but its existence starts from the premise that it is right for police to try to control demonstrations with, no doubt, the minimum of necessary violence, and that it is

wrong for the people who are subjected to the pretensions of authority to protest against them, in any but the most polite of demonstrations.

An alternative way of tackling the matter, would be that the people who are concerned about the use of provocative violence by the police, and as the *Guardian* points out, these are not confined to the immediate recipients of it, should hold their own public inquiry. A similar suggestion was made in the editorial columns of *FREEDOM* at the time of the government inquiry into the execution of Timothy Evans, which similarly concluded that no miscarriage of justice had occurred, a conclusion that in retrospect reflects as little credit to

the committee as the whole affair does to the state and its machinery of "justice".

An unofficial inquiry of this type would have no legal status, no power to compel witnesses to attend, and no power to jail those who refused to answer it, or who expressed their contempt of it. Nevertheless, these facts could be made into points of strength, not weakness, if it was conducted openly, in the spirit of an attempt to determine the truth, and to let participants in the demonstration from all sides put their points of view without distortion or interruption. It could represent an application of the idea that the liberation

## THE 40-HOUR WEEK

The National Incomes Commission have, as expected, condemned the Scottish Building Industry's agreement for a 40-hour week which is to commence next November and the Scottish plumbers 40-hour week agreement which is in operation at the moment.

The 40-hour week is described in the report as being "contrary to the national interest", and means that there will be an increase in overtime worked but not a reduction in hours with the result that there will be an overall rise in pay. If these agreements are not cancelled then there should be an understanding that there will be no further increases for three years. The reason N.I.C. have given for this is that the Scottish agreement and the recent cost of living rise will increase earnings by 9%.

In condemning the 40-hour week the N.I.C. have carried out the Government's bidding. The agreements in Scotland have caught them on the hop and they are now trying their utmost to prevent the 40-hour week from spreading to other parts of the country, not only in the building

trade but also to other industries. The employers have given way but the Government seems determined to prevent the spread and the Commission is merely a highly paid mouthpiece for them that will be used to attack any attempt to pay increases and shorter hours.

The N.I.C. have said that if a 40-hour week is introduced throughout the Building Industry, it will put up the cost of construction work by £50 million. According to them production must increase before there are any pay rises or reduction in hours.

This is the old story. If you work harder then you can have an increase, but this increase will be only a part of the bigger profits that the employer will gain from this rise in production, a rise which is achieved by men having worked harder. Employers can easily afford pay increases and shorter hours without this rise in production. At the moment their whole aim is to complete a job in the shortest possible time and with this end in mind they are willing to pay above the union rates and overtime.

With many firms there seems to be no limit to the amount of overtime they want to be worked on the sites.

We have been told this week that productivity in the Building Industry must rise by 55% over the next ten years but, and here is the rub, only a 2% rise in the labour force is expected. I know that with increased mechanisation and new methods of construction jobs will be completed more quickly and so bring increased production. With these plans in mind and with an increasing labour force, a shorter working week is essential not only in the building industry, but all round, for the changes in methods of construction are occurring now and will be continual. Full employment can only be maintained by a cut in hours. At the moment the labour force is kept down by the payment of overtime, a state of affairs with which the unions comply.

The Commission tells us that the 40-hour week is contrary to the national interest (i.e. the Government and the employers), but the interest of workers in all industries is a shorter working week and the aim of the rank and file union members should be to achieve it now.

P.T.

# ANARCHY 27

NOW ON SALE, IS ON YOUTH

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.



FREEDOM'S editorial (13/4/63) on Aldermaston contained a statement which approached prophecy. "The Committee of 100", wrote the editors, "is floundering, and hoping for an inspired gimmick to catch the headlines once more." In actual fact it was "Spies for Peace" who produced rather more than a gimmick with a responsible and brave document that was identified with the Committee of 100.

This pamphlet was a boost to the direct actionists within the whole of CND and gave the March an impetus that energised everyone. Without this pamphlet the Aldermaston March would probably have been written off.

In short the "Spies for Peace" pamphlet, whose anonymous authors I salute, has helped to orientate that section of the CND which is not wedded to the Labour Party.

This orientation was carried a step further by the militant demonstrations by the London Federation of Anarchists and some supporters of the Committee of 100 on Easter Saturday and Easter Monday.

In reflecting on this very useful and worthwhile Monday demonstration, which has brought more publicity to the anarchist movement than anything I can remember, it must be admitted that some of the actions by this final march might require some criticism.

Yet the point we made on Easter Monday, as we marched collectively through the streets of London, was that a section of the Aldermaston March was not being pushed around anymore by the leadership of CND.

It was apt indeed that the head of the Aldermaston March had split away from the main body—for this is exactly what has happened in fact. I am not saying that the majority of the March was in favour of our militant demonstration, yet it remains true that many more are wavering into a committed



THE VIOLENT ANARCHISTS



AND THE GENTLE POLICE

position, led, to some extent, by revolutionists.

What was the real significance for the anarchist movement of our Easter Monday demonstration? Was it sensible? Or stupid? Were we justified in taking our own initiative in this way contrary to the advice of the CND leader?

I feel the significance of our march was in its collectivity—it was a demonstration by the anarchist movement. The armchair anarchists and especially, I am sure, the "permanent protesters" will point out how foolhardy we were, some pacifists will criticise us for the violence that took place. What was the use of a militant demonstration?

Firstly the effect on the marchers should be examined; this march was a morale-booster—it was revolutionary action, disobedient, direct and effective. We broke police cordon after police cordon, we "held" the streets of London for a while. We asserted ourselves, our power, our humanity and our determination.

Secondly, the effect on the public has been one of publicity for the anarchist movement. Of course, it was not wholly good publicity, but one does not, in a revolutionary movement, get good publicity from the organs of mass media.

Thirdly, the effect on CND and the Committee of 100 will be, to some extent, salutary. This is due to the virility of our demonstration, it was an example—propaganda by deed—of effective action by some 1,000 determined people, standing up to the police, lacking in docility and apathy.

The violence that took place was very slight, occasioned usually by the police. Yet it was not a non-violent demonstration. But, so what? The obsessive non-violence credo is not entirely praiseworthy.

There are dangers in non-violent action as there are in violent action. It is true, that in the eyes of some we will be discredited due to the distorted picture presented of our demonstration in the mass media, but the rigid self-control of some non-violent adherents is unattractive to the anarchist. Violence does not just spring out of human beings and the natural reactions of hitting back are healthy ones. Self-defence is sometimes justified.

Even so there were some unfortunate incidents and a little intimidation of the police. One or two ugly actions need not have occurred.

Now, having made an impact, we should not hesitate to follow up with continual argument and discussion of anarchism. Especially, I feel, we should continue to widen the scope of the Committee of 100 into a full-scale libertarian movement. We must not merely concentrate on the Bomb, although it can hardly not continue to be the main issue of debate.

What has now emerged from this Aldermaston march is the dual image of the CND movement. One is constitutional and inclined to the Labour

Party, the other is unconstitutional and inclined to revolution. It is strange that Canon Collins in his uncharitable manner, should refer to us as cranks, being himself a member of a religion founded by an undoubted crank! yet if one is to question fundamentals their unorthodox views need not alarm thinking people.

Perhaps we can say that now, in Britain, the anarchist movement has at last found its sense of direction, that it is not an armchair cult and that it is having a real effect on the world of action and ideas. Unlike the myopic bureaucratic notions of the CND hierarchy, our direct steps towards peace may actually come to fruition. The justification for our direct action not only lies in the fact that the Aldermaston March originated from direct actionist elements, it also lies in the fact that the CND hierarchy remains unresponsive to rank and file pressure for industrial action.

The CND movement of sheep—our action in the streets of London has underlined this fact.

JEREMY WESTALL.

DEAR FRIEND,

For the past nine months I have been a regular reader of both ANARCHY and FREEDOM.

About six months ago I came to the conclusion that Anarchy was the only sane, if not the only future for mankind. When I, and several others read the article by Charles Radcliffe in ANARCHY 26, the reception varied, to say the least.

We then went on the Aldermaston March. I should add here that 'we' are all active members of the 'Romford and Hornchurch YCND Group', and are already in the process of forming a local Committee of 100 working group.

We went on the march, although we thought it an expensive and inefficient method of canvassing and protest (in terms of money, time and sweat), because we were willing to support any anti-bomb non-aligned demonstration.

When we read the papers on Saturday morning, we saw the first confused, misreported inkling of what was to come. When, within half-an-hour or more, we had read the R.S.G.6 document we resolved (or some of us did) to support the demonstration.

Having lost our own banner, I was marching, along with some friends, under the L.F. Anarchists' banner.

On arriving at the turning-off point for the R.S.G.6 demonstration we were greeted by the figure of Peggy Duff, saying: "Go straight on, only 1 mile to dinner," and other self-appointed Stewards saying "Turn off here for the R.S.G.6 demonstration."

It seemed to me, at that moment, we had to make a choice, either:

(a) Obey the National Executive, in the form of Peggy Duff, and carry on with the march.

or

(b) Turn off the road and support the R.S.G.6 demonstration, which in

my mind was the most effective direct action demonstration we have yet held.

We chose the later.

We were given the choice, indeed it was forced on us, the Campaign or the Committee.

We chose the Committee and had a demonstration that was twenty times more to the point, effective and publicised, we aroused public opinion, we stirred up a first-rate mud-slinging match in parliament, we took the lid off the government's war preparations, and I hope we were an acute embarrassment to the rats who use the place.

It was however, at this time that my mind returned to Charles Radcliffe's article.

How prophetic it was!

The Loyalty oaths and accusations will start any day now!

Besides wishing to congratulate Charles on his prophetic powers, some of my friends and I have been goaded out of inaction.

We have decided to form an Anarchist Discussion Group in the Romford and Hornchurch Area.

We would be pleased if you could publish our address in either ANARCHY or FREEDOM, with a view to contacting any similar groups or persons in the area.

The Easter Weekend has goaded us from inaction. We wish to make it quite clear that we will stand behind the Committee if the split comes to that.

In the meantime we are forming our group and will do our best to get certain people of the National Executive.

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN,

On behalf of several others.

74 Upper Rainham Road,  
Hornchurch, Essex.

DEAR SIR,

I disagree with the lesson you draw from the "closing incident" of this Easter's Aldermaston march. You claim that "if the police had used truncheons or dogs, there would have been an immediate and effective sit-down." By "effective" sit-down do you mean a sit-down in which one thousand demonstrators were arrested? Arrests occur at the rate that the police want them to. And so it is nonsense to declare that "about a thousand of all kinds of politically conscious people in the anarchist movement proved conclusively that they possessed the road for as long as they wanted", because having sat down, it is only a matter of police time before everyone is picked up and carted off. These people proved their point only for as long as they stood up and resisted arrest. They went through police cordons—showing their contempt for the state and the police that maintain it—they didn't sit down passively and accept the right of the state to arrest them and dispose of them at its own leisure. A sit-down in the event of the police using "truncheons or dogs", whether it was 'effective' or not, would have led to the arrests of the demonstrators, and thus the demonstration against the power and right of the state to dispose of our lives as it wishes, would have failed dismally.

The lesson to be learnt from the "closing incident" of the march, is that to be successful, those who demonstrate against the authority of governments and states, must be prepared to actively oppose at all levels the instruments of the state, and they must be prepared to use violence.

London, April 21. A. R. HUGHES.

COMRADES,

I have never cherished illusions in the revolutionary potential of the CND. At the time I most actively supported CND I was not an avowed anarchist (the last thing I wanted was revolution!) and when I became an anarchist my support for the CND was considerably diminished. This does not stop me deploring any steps backwards the CND may take from its already hopelessly inadequate 'liberal' policy. My point was that the CND was a meeting ground, at group level, for people of very varied beliefs (a thing which no one, surely, will deplore) and a breeding ground for genuine dissent and therefore worthwhile. If the ranks are closed against subversives we shall, to put it at the most cynical level, lose a platform (and often a remarkably sympathetic one at that). I do not object to organisation but I would object to exclusion!

The real point of my ANARCHY article was in the last paragraph, and I am immodest enough to suggest that at least some of my predictions have already materialised in the two fantastic demonstrations on the march when people marched behind anarchist banners (four of them) for anarchism. Admittedly

some of these people behind the banners were there by accident but not all that many! This ties up, I think, with the FREEDOM editorial which calls Aldermaston a human success and a political failure. If CND does tighten up—and the sensational events on the march might further encourage this—the "human" beings, those who are not afflicted with parliamentary idiocy, who do not wish to hammer the insensitive corpse of the Labour Party or join Britain's 'party of peace and socialism', those whose ideas in fact are anti-political, may be interested in anarchism. Are we ready for them?

London, April 22. CHARLES RADCLIFFE

COMRADE EDITOR,

Your article *People in the Streets* is a tale of over-excited schoolchildren who have got past the prefects and are masturbating in public. I am astonished that you are so thrilled by a substitute for the real thing. Why do you revel in scuffling with the police and imagine this to be some kind of achievement? You are so much reacting to authority that you must photograph the middle page of the *Times*, that symbol of the Establishment, because it mentions the anarchists in a headline.

On the other hand the revelations of the Spies for Peace have made a great impact. This responsible and effective action was the result of patient investigation and timely release of information—which enabled the marchers to show up the RSG.

A non-violent revolution will be the only kind worth having. This no doubt involves changes in economic and social relations, which is to say that it will only be carried out by men and women who have attained a higher level of behaviour, in terms of reciprocity between human beings, than an aggressive attempt to get the better of the powers that be (or their substitutes the police) for the moment.

A proper revolutionary has long grown out of mere rebellion. Let us get down to the business of educating and training ourselves.

London, April 21. Tony Weaver.

DEAR COMRADES,

Of course the culmination of the Aldermaston march in a "picnic" in Hyde Park following a few hours dreary trek around London in contingents small enough to accommodate traffic and perhaps to allow the police to feel secure, is meaningless and results in feelings of frustration; feelings doubtless stronger in the more deeply committed and perhaps nearer the surface in the younger. This year to exacerbate this unrest there had been the excitement of R.S.G.-6 and of the struggle for the leadership going on throughout the march.

Some show of disaffection might, then, have been expected, and the form it took, of attempting for a limited stretch to take sole possession of the streets and make anything less than an ambulance or a fire engine wait a couple of hours or find an alternative route, might not seem so very vicious and might not merit the outcries of "Violence!" which came from the press. Neither does it merit the aura of a famous victory spun round the episode by FREEDOM's front-page editorial article and I think some aspects should be questioned.

It is dishonest to pretend that this "taking over the road" was not a separate demonstration; it was premeditated and merely separate from the one which had been agitated for throughout the march and had, by the "feeling of the meeting" held to discuss this, been postponed until after the C.N.D. march. And, despite the historical facts of the formation and growth of the campaign, and the growing revolt against C.N.D. leadership and policy, this remained at that moment C.N.D.'s march in that most of the people there were there because it was the C.N.D. demonstration. They would not have been marching in a demonstration called and organized by the F.L.A. or any one of a number of constituent bodies of this march. There was at least a chance that the police, who did not know what the independent demonstration intended to do, might have panicked and taken action against the main march.

The breakaway action in which the F.L.A. figured prominently would not appear to have been any more meaningful in relation to the abolition of nuclear weapons than was the mere show of numbers of the C.N.D. Its lesson, says FREEDOM, was that "we could possess the road for as long as we wanted to". I think a second lesson is that we and our main propaganda medium need to give some slight care lest the popular image of us as uncreating lovers of disorder and violence become our true face.

London, April 23. MARY CANIPA.

## BOOKS?

## We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

## NEW BOOKS

Sex in Society Alex Comfort 21/-  
Twentieth Century Capitalism E. Varga 7/6

De Sade Quartet Marquis de Sade 18/-

## REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

The Law and the Profits C. Northcote Parkinson 3/6

A Case of Conscience James Blish 3/-

The Image D. J. Boorstin 4/6

South from Granada Gerard Brenan 6/-

Conversations with Stalin Milovan Djilas 3/6

The Boy in the Bush D. H. Lawrence & M. L. Skinner 5/-

New Bearing in English Poetry F. R. Leavis 7/6

The Crown and the Establishment Kingsley Martin 3/6

Laughter in the Dark Vladimir Nabokov

The Day of the Locust Nathaniel West 4/-

## SECOND-HAND

From the Red Archives C. E. Vullamy (1929) 17/6; A. Soldier Must Hang John Deane Potter 20/-; The House that Hitler Built (chewed by a puppy) Stephen H. Roberts 6/6; Zen and Reality Robert Powell 15/-; Men in Uniform M. R. D. Foot 10/-; Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time H. J. Laski 5/-; Peace Through the Ages (trans. from the Poets of China) Rewi Alley 3/-; Rise Like Lions (limp) William Gallagher 4/-; The People Speak Out (ed.) Rewi Alley 3/-; Under the Axe of Fascism (1936 (damaged) Gaetano Salvemini 4/-; Red Star Over China Edgar Snow 6/6; Rationalist Annual 1950 Knight, Haldane, etc. 2/6; Rationalist Annual 1958 Allegro, Farrington, etc. 2/6; Rationalist Annual 1959 Nott, Howell Smith, etc. 2/6; From Trotsky to Tito James Klugmann 6/-.

## PAMPHLETS

Non-Violent Resistance Nicolas Walter 1/6

## PERIODICALS

Solidarity (Aldermaston Special) 6d.

## Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily;  
10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays;  
10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736



## ILLUSIONS

OUR correspondence columns this week reflect the very considerable interest aroused by the unofficial demonstrations which enlivened the Aldmerston march this Easter, but it is quite clear that our comrades are not unanimous either in their appraisal of the anarchist participation or in the way it was treated in the last issue of FREEDOM.

What we published on our front page were first-hand accounts of what happened at R.S.G.-6 and during the last stages of the March in Central London, written by comrades whose objectivity we have no reason to doubt and whose word we would trust in preference to that of the professional newsmen, the timid legalists or the police. Of course their accounts of the "incidents" can be said to lack a sense of proportion, and we must plead "guilty" to connivance in splashing these items all over the front page. For this we make no apology. Would that all events could be described by those who actually participate in them! There would be much less cynicism in the Press and there would still be plenty of time to analyse, to have second thoughts, to put events in their proper perspective, and to draw the lessons. When Tony Weaver, one of our critical correspondents, describes the report as "a tale of over-excited schoolchildren who have got past the prefects and are masturbating in public" and goes on to ask "why do you revel in scuffling with the police and imagine this to be some kind of achievement?" he shows only too clearly, in our opinion, that however sincere he may be in his desire for a social revolution he remains oblivious to the massive entrenched, built-in, forces with which the privileged minority in our society have surrounded themselves to resist; to disarm (morally speaking) and discredit all serious attempts to change society radically.

Tony Weaver's letter, the more we study it the more does it appear as the epitome of middle-class pacifism. Apart from the obvious middle-class analogy in which the people are "schoolchildren" and the police "prefects", not to mention "masturbation", the public school "vice"—one cannot overlook the scathing reference to "the aggressive attempt to get the better of" the police or fail to compare it with "the responsible and effective" revelations of the Spies for Peace which was "the result of patient investigation and timely release of information". As if the revelations of the Spies for Peace was not a scuffle with another section of the security forces—except that it was carried out with kid gloves, at cocktail-party-level rather than in the streets where the scuffles with the police generally take place. We do not deny the publicity value of the RSG revelations—we acclaimed them in our last editorial—but, unlike Tony Weaver and his friends, we also acclaim confrontation between, even a section of, the people and the police, when it occurs, for the latter no less than the former tends to undermine the authority, the mystique of superiority surrounding the Establishment.

Tony Weaver dogmatically proclaims: "a non-violent revolution will be the only kind worth having" and condescendingly adds: "This no doubt involves changes in economic and social relations", from which he concludes that

it will only be carried out by men and women who have attained a higher level of behaviour, in terms of reciprocity between human beings, than an

aggressive attempt to get the better of the powers that be (or their substitutes the police) for the moment.

A proper revolutionary has long grown out of mere rebellion. Let us get down to the business of educating and training ourselves.

"Educating and training ourselves" for what? If we understand Tony Weaver correctly it consists in not being beastly to the police who, as the pacifist saying goes, are only "doing their job"; in bringing about a better understanding between worker and boss—failing which, presumably, the workers will have to wait until the bosses "have attained a higher level of behaviour in terms of reciprocity" and in the event that they show no inclination for this "higher level of behaviour" what then? Does the fault lie with us? Must we, like Boxer, declare that we must "get down to the business of educating and training ourselves" still more?

★

THE only kind of revolution worth having, is, in our opinion, the one which results in the weakening of governmental power and a corresponding increase in responsibility, and direct control of their affairs, by the people. If such a revolution can be "non-violent" so much the better, for it will indicate that the revolutionaries are strong and the forces of reaction are weak, divided, rotten. But supposing that the revolutionary forces and those of reaction are both strong; the former trained in "the business of education" by Tony Weaver, and the latter in the business of capitalism by (Tooth and) Clore buttressed by the weight of the Law, the police, the Army, the Civil Service, the aspiring politicians, and capitalists, the specialists: scientists, intellectuals, economists, publicists, brainwashers *et alia*—what scrap of evidence is there to show that comrade Weaver's dogmatic—to our minds, naive—faith in the power of education *per se* is justified in fact?

The so-called "violent" revolutionary anarchists have always recognised that violence is a dangerous, unpredictable weapon. It must be so in any situation where "reciprocity between human beings"—which implies social and economic equality—is replaced by one in which "might is right". If "reciprocity" were in fact the existing state of affairs, we would be the first to condemn the solution of differences by resort to force. But this reciprocity does not exist today, and to assume that it can be achieved without "provoking" violence on the part of those whose privileges depend on the maintenance of the *status quo*, is to display a faith in the power of pure Reason which, if valid, would have long ago removed the antagonisms which are the root of the class struggle. One can solve human problems by reason only in a society, a community, a family, governed by reason. Reason is the art of persuasion; persuasion, which is neither blackmail nor a confidence trick, can only operate in the common interest when the argument is not vitiated by personal considerations of material gain or loss. If reason, education, were the criteria for the establishment of a harmonious society then it is in the seats of learning and among the leisured classes that one should seek the advocates of social justice and revolution. Apart from the exceptions (and how many of them in the event turn out to be armchair-fairweather-revolutionaries?) the socially privileged classes use their

WEARING A GOWN of corded silk with broderie Anglaise and drop pearls, Miss Brenda Pearce, of 58 Bramber Road, Fulham, was the pretty bride of Mr. Michael Benson, of Chiswick, at West Kensington Congregational Church. The bride, carrying roses and freesia, was given away by her brother, Mr. B. Pearce. The bridesmaid was Miss Marina Swain, wearing a dress of pink slipper satin and a pink rose head-dress. She carried a white prayer book and mixed freesia. Best man was Mr. Bryan Weston. Guests were entertained at a reception at the bride's home before the couple left for their honeymoon in Sussex. . . .

THE PRIME MINISTER said that the peace spy leak was not vital but "the object of the Special Branch will be to try, by their inquiries, to pin the responsibility where it lies." Mr. Fenner Brockway, Labour M.P. for Eton and Slough, said the Spies for Peace pamphlet "was an unnecessary step . . . I regard this document not as nuclear disarmament but as nuclear encouragement because it provides targets for any nuclear power in time of war." A technical reconnaissance officer in Essex Civil Defence Force said that he had received at least a dozen documents marked 'restricted' with information on S.G.R.'s, "at least 5,000 others must have received them." A man posing as a newspaper reporter visited an R.S.G. in Cambridge a year ago. The Cambridge Committee of 100 held a demonstration outside the building and stuck up posters showing a picture of the Cambridge R.S.G. One of these posters is still up. The office of the Committee of 100 in London was broken into on April 13th. The police were not informed since it was thought the raiders were from M.I.5 or Special Branch. Undergraduates at Cambridge, according to the *Daily Herald* have been selling R.S.G. pamphlets in coffee-bars



at ten shilling per copy. A shortened version of the pamphlet was distributed in Doncaster public-houses. Two police officers warned *Peace News* of their possible liability under the Official Secrets Act if they printed extracts from the R.S.G. pamphlet. The home of Jon Tinker, former secretary of the Committee of 100 was visited by police officers; they copied from a writing pad a list of names. Mr. Tinker did not tell the officers but they were people who had sent wedding presents and to whom 'thank-you' letters must be sent. 500 duplicated sheets of an abbreviated version of the S.G.R. pamphlet were put on seats at the National Union of Students Easter Conference. The President of the N.U.S. urged students to hand over the leaflet, and two plainclothes detectives spent three hours searching the building and questioning a Student Mr. Martin Loney of Bradford admitted duplicating the document at 4 a.m. for circulation to the conference. The Shadow Foreign Secretary of the Labour Party, Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, said that the publishers of the S.R.G. pamphlet should be severely punished. "They are spies and must be

treated as such." The Welsh Committee of 100 published a pamphlet about the S.R.G. for Wales. Edinburgh Committee of 100 marched to Corstophine Hill which they claimed was the R.S.G. for the area. A local 11-year-old boy told the reporter he'd known what it was since the beginning of the year. Mr. George Williamson, secretary of the Scottish Committee of 100 said, "We want to get rid of this bloody, State, this warfare State. We are not against the British people, or the Russian people, or the American people. It is people against Governments." Dr. Geoffrey Taylor, prospective Liberal candidate for Yeovil, wrote to the Prime Minister reminding him that over a year ago the press reported the official opening of what was said to be a headquarters of regional government near Yeovil. The BBC was also represented at the ceremony. Every alderman and councillor and many businessmen in Tunbridge Wells received a copy of the R.S.G. pamphlet. Police said they were making inquiries. Two more editions of the R.S.G. pamphlet were sent out. One went to officers in charge of all London police stations and chairmen of hospital boards. A pamphlet called "Beyond Counting Arses" was published by eight members of the Committee of 100 last February which suggested that the Committee "should publicise the most secret preparations of the Warfare State". The homes of all eight of the signatories were searched last week. It was claimed by marchers that R.S.G.-10 was at the village of Goosnarth, Lancashire. . . .

DR. ERNST MAYR, director of the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University said that the intelligence of man may have reached its peak many years ago and he now may be heading in a downward direction.

JON QUIXOTE.

## Scenes at Court

ANGUS OGILVIE (unemployed of no fixed abode) and Alexandra Ogilvie of Kensington, stated to be independent means, were charged with obstruction at Bow Street today. The police said that further charges would be preferred. It was a grave case, nearly ninety London streets were obstructed. Additional charges were under consideration, of causing a crowd to collect, hindering the police in the execution of their duty, having no visible means of support, and being a charge upon the public purse.

The accused were involved in some religious rite which had been the occasion of the grave obstruction in London streets which had lasted for several hours. They were members of a family who were habitually in the Courts on such occasions. The female defendant was a member of an anti-democratic and pro-royalist movement and the man was the member of what was known as the "Mayfair set". He was a gambler on the Stock Exchange but he had no prospect of future work.

The mob, said a police inspector, which had collected on this occasion was not hostile to the accused but the accused seem to have had an unfortunate effect on them, making them maudlin,

belliciously patriotic, and in many cases, sentimentally inebriated. The evidence of several newspaper proprietors would be called on this point. Some of the crowd had been heard to sing a blasphemous song implying that it was one of the Almighty's tasks to look after the defendant's relatives.

Defendants had collected around them a group of aliens and others whose methods of living were at least, doubtful. Many, in defiance of the Public Order Act, wore quasi-military uniforms and several offensive weapons upon their person. The collective ostentatious display of jewellery upon this occasion (about which enquiries were being made) was cause for the assemblage of other crooks and the excitement of feelings of envy in the less fortunate sections of the populace.

Evidence was given that London traffic was tied up for several hours, radio and television programmes were interrupted with and an enormous amount of newsprint was rendered useless. Several people were subjected to the rigours of the English climate for long periods of time and commercial life had been disrupted.

The Magistrate (Mr. Bumblebee, J.P.) said that he thought the defendants had

got into bad company, they should pull themselves together and try to make an honest living and cease from agitating the population and also break loose from their hangers-on. He would remand them for a Probation Officer's report.

At the same court Joe Dope and his wife Alice Dope were charged with wilful obstruction of the pavement in Piccadilly for twelve hours. P.C. Collins said the defendants were lying on the pavement. When asked if they were objecting to nuclear weapons, they told him not to use an offensive expression, they were only waiting for the wedding-procession. He thereupon cautioned them but when he returned to duty twelve hours later they were still there; frying eggs upon a primus which he produced as exhibit A. They were remanded for a psychiatric report.

JACK SPRATT.

## ROYAL SENSE OF HUMOUR

Viewers noticed how solemn the Queen looked at the wedding. But in the crush to see the honeymooners off at St. James' Palace, there was one moment when the Queen threw back her head and ROARED. She had trodden on King Olaf's foot.

*Daily Herald* 25/4/63.

And we learn from a reliable source that the Queen said afterwards that she hadn't had such a good laugh since she kicked King Frederick in the crutch.

background to preach equality and to live as privileged members of society.

★

BOTH Tony Weaver and Mary Canipa who are more or less ashamed of the behaviour of their comrades at the Aldmerston march, fall over backwards in "trying to be fair" to everyone but their comrades. Mary Canipa suggests that this was "C.N.D.'s march in that most of the people there were there because it was the CND demonstration". What specious pleading is this! CND, as we pointed out two issues ago (*FREEDOM*, April 13) "advocates the most popular and uncontroversial of all causes" and it is not surprising that it should attract at one extreme the anarchists and at the other Bow group Conservatives. Mary Canipa is right when she suggests that

they [the marchers] would not have been marching in a demonstration called and organised by the Federation of London Anarchists or any one of a number of constituent bodies of this

march (our italics)

in which case she must advocate a tightening-up of membership of CND which would exclude the anarchists and other undisciplined riff-raff, and install Canon Collins as the Pope of the Campaign and Peggy Duff as his Papal Legate. Or she and others of like mind must enjoy the freedom from party line which perforce characterises the CND, and put up with Canon Collins as the permanent figurehead as well as the company of unpredictable anarchists, and Committee of 100 direct actionists, predictable Quakers, CPers, Trotskyites, Leninists, Kingsley Martinists, Footists, not to mention the *je-m'en-foutistes*—who probably represent the majority group in CND, so far as political commitment is concerned.

We also agree with comrade Canipa when she declares

The breakaway action in which the FLA figured prominently would not appear to have been any more meaningful in relation to the abolition of nuclear weapons than was the mere show of

numbers of the CND.

But are there any anarchists to her knowledge who imagined, as they spread across the road, that in so doing they were hitting the H-bomb in a vulnerable spot? Of course not. On the other hand is there any serious revolutionary who shares the Tony Weaver illusion that the revolution we want will be made by the police and all the other representatives of the institutions we want to break down? For this in fact is the argument of the advocates of non-violence as a principle, of "a higher level of behaviour" and "get down to the business of educating and training ourselves" school. They are expecting the enemies of anarchism to make the revolution; they want the policemen to stop behaving like policemen; soldiers to lay down their arms; businessmen to stop making profits, and politicians to stop desiring power over their fellow beings! This, it seems to the writer, is the fundamental weakness of non-violence as a revolutionary principle.



# Need for an enemy?

DEAR COMRADES,  
Colin MacLennan in his article on the kibbutzim barely mentions what seems to be an important cause of the anarchic way of life prevailing in them: the presence of an immediate enemy, the Arabs, against whom considerable emotional feeling can be maintained indefinitely.

In other communities where anarchic attitudes are to the fore, an enemy, whether abstract or concrete, human or inanimate, is usually close to hand. The Spanish anarchists had Franco's armies; Castro's guerrillas, the Batista government; the Nuer tribe, the neighbouring Dinka; soldiers in trenches, their commanders and the war itself; coalminers, the coal; modern British anarchists, British capitalism and its manifestations; anti-nuclear demonstrators, the police. These are only a few examples and obviously the degree to which the hostility is justified varies in each case; but it seems to me that some easily-identifiable enemy has to be present, to stimulate people into co-operating in an anarchic manner. I should be very grateful if someone could explode this theory, because otherwise anarchism will not be so attractive as it should be.

Cambridge. T. OXTON.

# Come out of the Lavatory, Arthur!

DEAR SIR,  
Much as I normally enjoy Arthur Moysé's plangent prose style I was a little startled to find it being used against myself and quite astonished that he could have misinterpreted my article to the extent he has.

I never intended to suggest that the audience at the Establishment "attended out of a desire for spiritual regeneration," and I agree that most of them, who had not heard his records, went along because he was known as a comic who used four letter words. The whole irony of the situation lay in that fact

# LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

that whatever their reason for going, what they heard was a two hour moral lecture. When Bruce uses fuck he is using it to make a moral point and all Arthur Moysé's remarks about obscenity as a pleasure in itself are beside the point. If Arthur had ever heard Bruce work he would realise this, but he hasn't and on this issue he must be placed with the Conservative M.P. who tried to ban both Miller and Bruce without having heard or read either.

The real trouble with Arthur Moysé is that he has led a protected life and has obviously been shielded from the type of American paperback I was talking about when I instanced "Mental Ward Nympho". Such books bear as much relation to the ballad of Eskimo Nell as nationalisation does to workers' control. In one of these productions, for instance, the anti-hero, tremendously strong in the best Anglo-Saxon Superman tradition had the habit (described in detail) of breaking a woman's limbs one by one, and, when she recovered consciousness, raping her. This sort of thing has nothing to do with the healthy obscenity of Eskimo Nell! Nor am I moralising about people who have the need to read such books. Nevertheless such books are a symptom of the sickness of our society without even the virtue of being well-written, and it is this sickness that Lenny Bruce is attacking. As he says, "In a sane society one would say 'Unfuck you mister!'" Perhaps Arthur Moysé had better come up out of that lavatory and find out what is happening to the world.

London, April 29. J. M. PILGRIM.

were to take them to the camps. Yet this non-violent behaviour, not unlike that which takes place at some of our sit-downs, did not save them. The only ones who escaped were those who unheroically fled abroad or went into hiding, or who turned guerrilla.

I am not trying to make a case for violence. What I am trying to do is to point out that both the case for violence and the case for non-violence have terrifying weaknesses, of which their advocates seem cheerfully unaware.

If a government thought that its survival depended on the massacre of fifty, 100,000 or six million people, whatever their convictions, it would do so. This goes for almost any government in the world. Do I need to give examples from recent history? It isn't necessary to threaten the state with violent overthrow. The millions sent to the Russian camps were for the most part not planning the violent overthrow of the Bolshevik regime. They constituted a threat all the same, and that was enough.

Yours fraternally,  
ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

# Individualism and ..

DEAR EDITORS,  
I see that your editorial writer has once again charged that individualists do not believe in "organisation" even in the sense of agreement between two individuals (FREEDOM, 12/4/63). He brings no evidence forward to support this charge, other than the gratuitous assertion that individualists are "smug introverts". Could he now give some proof for his claim?

Meanwhile, I can only repeat what I wrote in a letter published in FREEDOM just over a year ago:

"May I state, once and for all, that ... individualists are not opposed to association. What we do claim is the right for individuals to produce and live alone, if they so wish, equally with the right to free association."

Nothing I have read, or heard of, regarding individualist anarchism in the last year had made me want to change these words in the slightest. I appreciate the editorial writer's benevolent desire to incorporate us all into his ideal of a gregarious and indiscriminate com-

munist, but it does not follow that those who wish to stay outside are necessarily lacking in the same qualities of good-fellowship that he has. By all means criticise individualism as much as you like. The criticism might be more to the point, however, if it rested on more than mere assertion.

A final point. I think that those who are suspicious of "organisation", in the general sense of the term, have good reason for being so. What Michels has called the "iron law of oligarchy", has operated even in professedly anarchist organizations, as was shown in the Iberian Anarchist Federation during the Spanish Civil War and the French federation in the early 'fifties. It is the good fortune of the anarchist movement that its adherents have generally proven "unorganisable" and various grandiose schemes of general organisation have been wrecked by their conscious or unconscious individualism. The only grouping—apart from purely temporary, ad hoc protest or emergency movements—that seems capable of keeping an anarchist character is that based on personal affinities and small enough to allow each member a direct voice in all decisions.

London, April 17. S. E. PARKER.

# .. the error of dogmatism

DEAR EDITOR,  
I have just read, with dismay, Arthur Uloth's letter about Individualism. For me, Individualism signifies that spirit of opposition, inherent in all matter, to every attempt to manipulate it, to change its shape, or its personality. It signifies the principle of revolt against, and of escape from, the pursuer; in the essence, the determination to continue to exist.

"Political" anarchism of the kind which endorses concepts like Progress, Science, and the good of Humanity needs of course organisation if it is determined to achieve "practical results". Provided it does not outrage completely the personality of the individual it may be tolerated and even be acceptable. But let it go too far and it must inevitably be overthrown whatever slogan it bears on its banners.

Existence demands the opposition of two principles, one, the principle of disorder, of individualism, or anarchy, is the other, the principle of order, of collectivism, of authority. As related to Mankind, these are symbolised by the concepts of Freedom and of God. Between them the eternal struggle goes on; without either there would be nothing to argue over.

Sometimes we shall be on one side, sometimes on the other. No set of principles can be propounded for choosing either. This is the error of dogmatism from which I trust Mr. Uloth may be preserved to continue to instruct us.

Yours sincerely,  
Cambridge, April 21. J.P.H.

# WATCH FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETINGS IN CENTRAL LONDON

# NEW MEETINGS

Informal Meetings: Soho Finch's "One Tun", 60 Goodge Street, W.1. Saturdays from 6 p.m.

Bristol Federation of Anarchists Meeting MAY 8. 7.30 p.m. 38 Canynge Square, Clifton, Bristol 8.

# OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulbam, S.W.6.

3rd Tuesday at Brian and Doris Leslie's, 242 Amesbury Avenue, S.W.2 (Streatham Hill, Nr. Station).

Third Wednesday of the month, at 8 p.m. at Albert Portch's, 11 Courcy Road (off Wood Green High Road), N.8.

First Thursday of each month, Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

Last Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at George Hayes', 174 Mcleod Road, Abbey Wood, S.E.2.

3rd Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald & Irene Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Please note that the meetings at Fellows Road, N.W.3 are now on the third Friday, not the third Wednesday as hitherto.

Notting Hill Anarchist Group (Discussion Group) Last Friday of the month, at Brian and Margaret Hart's, 57 Ladbroke Road, (near Notting Hill Station), W.11.

# Why not subscribe to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

# Freedom The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month. ANARCHY (1/9 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY  
12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)  
6 months 16/- (2.50)  
3 months 8/6 (\$1.25)  
Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies  
12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)  
6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)  
12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only  
1 year (40 issues) 20/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)  
4 months (20 issues) 10/- (\$1.50)  
3 months (10 issues) 6/- (\$0.75)

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only  
1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$4.00)

Check, P.O.s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers:

**FREEDOM PRESS**  
17a MAXWELL ROAD  
LONDON, S.W.6. ENGLAND  
Tel: RENOWN 3736.

# FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'  
Vol 2 1952: Postscript to Posterity  
Vol 3 1953: Colonialism on Trial  
Vol 4 1954: Living on a Volcano  
Vol 5 1955: The Immoral Moralists  
Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters  
Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era  
Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair  
Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public  
Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa  
Vol 11 1961: The People in the Street  
Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6  
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/6 post free.

BAKUNIN  
Marxism, Freedom and the State 5/-

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

CHARLES MARTIN  
Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER  
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

JOHN HEWETSON  
Sexual Freedom for the Young 6d.  
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE  
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6  
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

HERBERT READ  
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

TONY GIBSON  
Youth for Freedom 2/-  
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.  
Food Production & Population 6d.

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

PETER KROPOTKIN  
Revolutionary Government 3d.  
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:  
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-  
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6  
Neither East Nor West paper 7/6

# 'Comrade' Grimau?

DEAR COMRADES,  
A writer to FREEDOM invites readers to send protests to the Spanish Embassy on behalf of "Comrade" Grimau. As far as I know, this Julian Grimau was a Stalinist police official in Spain when his party were working against the libertarian forces to establish their own dictatorship. I know nothing of his subsequent record or the real reasons why the present regime wish to murder him as they have murdered so many others. However, I think that it is pertinent to point out that had he and his fellow Stalinists been successful, there would now be in Spain a regime equal in barbarity and repression of elementary liberties to that of Franco's.

London, April 20. TONY GIBSON.

# Will any Government?

DEAR COMRADES,  
Albert Coddington's attitude to non-violence differs from mine fundamentally. To me it is a method to be used, to him it is a way of life. While I don't accept the popular myth that man is by nature a warrior, I do believe that it is natural for him to defend himself when threatened or attacked, and one has no right to expect people to suppress this very fundamental impulse, except temporarily in the interests of a particular cause.

While non-violence seems to me to be more consistent with anarchism than violence, anarchism is not based on the suppression of impulses, but on their fulfilment. There is no inconsistency with anarchism in driving off, or even killing, some bully who is making life a misery. If you can win him over well and good, if not, take other means to deal with him.

Albert Coddington asks, "Will any government massacre 100,000 non-violent anarchists in a group? What can they even do to fifty?"

The answer to the first question is simply "Yes". The answer to the second is "Put them in jail indefinitely."

The Nazi government massacred six million Jews, who were for the most part non-violent, except for a handful who fought in the Warsaw Ghetto, and in a few other risings.

The victims were often heroic. I have read accounts of them singing their national songs, comforting their children, carrying themselves with great dignity as they were herded into the wagons that

# HOLD OUR OWN ENQUIRY!

Continued from page 1  
of society requires the substitution of free, voluntary, non-coercive institutions, set up to achieve definite purposes and dissolving once they have been achieved, in place of the oppressive authoritarian institutions of today's society, that masquerade as being for the protection of people, but "protect" them with prisons and police violence as soon as they demand a role better than that of H-bomb fodder.

The writer is under no illusions that everything would be plain sailing for such an unofficial committee of inquiry, as it would presumably meet with little

approval from the authorities or the press which serves them, although it might for instance introduce the writer of the Guardian's headline article of 16/4/63, who saw that the temper of the march was inflamed by the appearance of the mounted police, and that the latter physically attacked demonstrators, to the writer of the above-mentioned leader, who doesn't believe that such things happen. Despite the difficulties it might face, it could provide a useful exercise and lesson both to the people who took part, and to liberal thinking people throughout the country, in the relationships between power and truth, between the press and the dissemination of facts.

If it had to publish its findings in the form of a duplicated pamphlet, the RSG affair has shown that even this despised form of publication can be very effective, if the subject matter is of sufficient interest.

It is important that the consequences of events such as the clash between the police and the march on Easter Monday should be exploited to the full by the libertarian movement, in bringing home the fact that the solution of social problems can be best achieved by free, anarchical methods than by authoritarian ones. For instance it is obvious that the circulation of essential traffic in Central London on Easter Monday would be easier if traffic control were put into the hands of the CND marshals, and the police took the day off, but such a thing will presumably not be allowed because of the effect of a realisation that the "authority" of non-uniformed people using commonsense and co-operation rather than the threat of prosecution can be effective in solving a genuine problem.

The ultimate object of anarchism is social revolution, which will undoubtedly be resisted by the state with all the force at its command, but before that can be attained, its day to day activities must involve exposing the uselessness of state institutions for any other purpose than protecting those in authority, and demonstrating the effectiveness of those springing from the free organisation of the people.

It is in this spirit that the suggestion is made, that the Manchester Trades Council, instead of merely calling for an inquiry into police conduct, should initiate one.

# SLIPPING!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT APRIL 27th 1963

Weeks 16 & 17		
EXPENSES: 17 weeks at £70	£1,190	
INCOME:		
Sales & Sub. Renewals	£	£
Weeks 1—15	383	
Weeks 16 & 17	52	
		435
New Subscriptions:		
Weeks 1—15 (112)	120	
Weeks 16 & 17 (29)	32	
		152
		587
		DEFICIT £603

DEFICIT FUND

Lincoln: A.R.B. 1/-; Hounslow: L.* 2/6;	
Hertford: M.G.A.* £2/7/11; E. Rutherford:	
A.S.* 7/-; Brighton: M. & D.* 2/6; Wolver-	
hampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton:	
J.K.W.* 3/-; Bilston: J.W.P. 2/6; Bilston:	
W.F. 2/6; London: J.L. 10/-; London: J.S.	
7/8; Northwood: E.H. 8/11/8; Peter-	
borough: F.W. 3/6; Oxford: A.S.* 5/-;	
Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Bletchley: R.S. 2/6;	
Wolverhampton: J.L.* 2/6; Wolverhampton:	
J.K.W.* 2/-; London: B.S. 4/-; Brighton:	
M. & D.* 2/6; London: W.M. 5/6; London:	
Anon. 5/-; Stockton-on-Tees: E.I. E. Ruth-	
erford: A.S.* 7/-; London: A.S. 3/-; Surrey:	
F.B.* 10/-.	
TOTAL	10 10 5
Previously acknowledged	305 12 4
1963 TOTAL TO DATE	£316 2 9