

ONE WORLD AT A TIME!

IT IS RECORDED of some French rationalist that on his deathbed he was importuned by a priest (as is frequently the case) to bethink himself of the next world. More in sorrow than in anger he retorted, 'One world at a time, my friend,' and forthwith expired.

In a like manner the scientists of today, who are but the old priests writ large, exhort us to bethink ourselves of outer space, of the world beyond the stars. The Russians, being so scientific and materialist in their outlook, are particularly prone to think on these things. It was recently reported, although subsequently damped down, that Russians had picked up signals from outer space on their radio-telescope which were regular in their pattern indicating that they came from other civilizations.

Capitalist countries may have exhorted a diet of hay and promised pie in the sky but Russia seems to be the one country with a diet of hay (if the harvest doesn't fail) and a mechanical pie in the sky.

In the same way, but less efficiently, the capitalist countries shoot loads of ironmongery, radio stations, nuclear power stations, pins and needles and monkeys, mice and men, into outer space, the whole accompanied by a profusion of scientific talk which baffles the meanest intelligence.

There is a theory, plugged at one time by the *New Daily* that it is all a hoax; that nobody ever gets in touch with outer space, that nobody has voyaged into space—at least, as far as the *New Daily* was concerned, not the Russians. Sometimes it seems reasonable that it is all a hoax cooked up by the scientists. They have all the expert knowledge and cannot be contradicted in this field.

Discarding this tempting theory, we are left with the question, What are they up to? The usefulness of such projects is doubtful except as a lofty long-term programme or as a rather sordid short-term programme connected with the military usage of such devices as rockets. It will be recalled that the late Adolf Hitler had a series of such devices culminating, if we are to believe the scientists (as we must), in a reflecting-burning-glass located in outer space which would burn up the opposing forces.

One is led to think of scientists of unworldly humanistic humane dreamers, slightly absent-minded and completely humourless; one now glimpses them as power-hungry, status-conscious, callous,

materialistic, cynical, plotting jokers. They, in search of a powerful position in society have succeeded in kidding the military and the politicians that their subsidized experiments in space are militarily useful. They have even a long-range line of sales talk about colonizing outer space and a loftier pitch about 'pure research', when all else fails.

One of the clichés nurtured by this age is of the 'affluent society'. True to the age's deforming tendencies the phrase has been twisted from its true meaning; the criticism implied in 'the affluent society' is that of private affluence and public squalor. It will be observed that the faster we travel through space, the slower we crawl on the ground. The more money we spend on such projects, the less seems available for social services (there is a school of progressive thought which believes that if less were spent on space-research more would be available for social services).

It may just be one of the quirks of the uneven development of capitalism that progress is so patchy, and eventually it will all even itself out. The more optimistic feel that with the end of capitalism will come the end of uneven development and society will move in well-ordered grooves. The Soviet Union seems to be a riposte to that solution, but the labelling by the ultra-left of the Soviet system as 'State capitalism' seems to solve, or at least, side-track that problem.

The psychologist, William James, made a rather unfortunate contribution to pacifist thought when he suggested we might find 'a moral equivalent of war'. The 'space-race', as it has been called, may be considered as the 'cosmological equivalent of war'. Could not national honour and prestige be satisfied by achievements in space? Have not relationships improved between America and Russia because the 'space-race' has sublimated their aggressive instincts?

This is an interesting speculation but it is far more probable that 'space' is the continuation of war by other means', to adopt Clausewitz, and that the military uses of space research will be used fully and the residue of discoveries which may, or may not be of peaceful use will be discarded. In the same way the 'peaceful uses of atomic energy' seem to have been minimized whilst the military uses have gone on apace.

The situation is illustrative of what happens when man ceases to have control or responsibility with regard to events and retreats to a world of deep space of specialists whether scientists, military men or politicians. The answer is simple whether the other world offered is Heaven or Venus—the answer is 'one world at a time my friend'. The world we live in now.

JACK ROBINSON.

ANARCHY 52

DISCUSSES

The Limits of Pacifism

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

Dollars Won't Buy Everything

THE Organisation of American States has announced it will pay all the salaries of the Dominican Civil Servants and soldiers no matter whose side the latter are on. \$6 million is the sum mentioned. Before one tries to decide who is the philanthropic society, the Americans or the OAS, the people who are being looked after are the basic props of the establishment. Keep these people happy and the 'system' will prevail no matter who is in charge.

The Communist label pinned on the rebels is causing the Americans more embarrassment than enough. They are slowly being forced to accept the fact, that the 'rebels' must be represented in some sort of government or other, but they (the Americans) are sharply reminded by Imbert's military junta, that the Americans' intervened on their own say so 'to prevent a communist take-over' now they want Imbert to join up with the 'so-called' communists.

Juan Bosch, ex-President of the Dominican Republic, in whose name the revolution started, is still in Puerto Rico, and it appears he has no intention of returning home. It is always safest to make the bullets, firing them leaves one open to getting killed.

President Johnson's chief 'hatchet man', McGeorge Bundy, is working very hard to do a deal. He didn't shape too well in Vietnam. The man he is trying to put in the president's seat is Guzman, former Minister in the Bosch regime.

Guzman has had many discussions with Bundy and they had practically agreed on a 'cabinet' then something went wrong. Obviously the head thieves were not getting the right cut. Imbert, the American puppet, would not respond correctly to the pulling of the strings. He has the Americans by the short hairs and they know it. It is more than America dare do to 'pull him into line'. He is carrying out the job exactly as they originally

planned it.

The Dominican situation has the stench of chicanery, intrigue and simple bloody murder. Even at the United Nations the Americans couldn't bluff their way out of trouble. Adlai Stevenson first claimed that US intervention in Dominica was on humanitarian grounds, then a danger of communism, and finally the US was strictly neutral in the whole affair.

Whilst the 'ducking and diving' goes on, what about the 'Dominicans'? The people who are virtually starving? The people who revolted and were clobbered by American intervention? Will things be any different for them? Unfortunately, no! Presidents come and go, but the people starve forever.

Dr. Jaime Benitez, Rector of Puerto Rico University, summed up the situation when he stated, 'When I walked round the rebel zone I got a sense of a lot of young men who had suddenly found a cause to live for. And, paradoxically, one of the basic ingredients in the situation is that, to their amazement, the United States found people here who are ready, literally, to be killed for what they believed in.' (The Observer 6.6.65.)

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

Where is Stalinalee?

IN MEMORIAM JUNE 15 1953

TWELVE YEARS AGO, on June 16, 1953, East German history made the gravest ideological error: the workers, as one, rose up against the 'workers state'. The East German Uprising, overshadowed by the Hungarian Revolution three years later, has regrettably been overlooked by historians, and more regrettably by anarchists, since a study of this revolt not only casts a revealing light on the nature of State Capitalism, but leaves valuable lessons for posterity.

In June, 1945, the East German Communists gained control on the bandwagon of the later-liquidated Social Democratic Party. Scarcely had the eighteen millions begun to live again than the same regimentation as before set in. Ulbricht launched The Two Year Plan in January, 1949, and followed it by an even mightier monster, the Five Year Plan, embracing all aspects of social and economic life. True, they can point to amazing successes, but the conditions of the East German worker remained relatively unchanged. He had no say in the running of the factory, no control over his own life. The East German Communists rightly feared invasion from the West, but in building a centralized totalitarian State they incubated the very disease they wished to destroy—the subjugation of working peoples to a police dictatorship. Class divisions did not narrow—they widened—between the order-givers and the order-takers. Wage divisions were equally extreme: an unskilled electrician was earning £4 a week while 'highly qualified technicians' would be paid weekly salaries of £75 and over. The collectivization of the farms led to a mass exodus of 22,852 farmers in four months. The pace did not slacken off until March,

1953, when Stalin died and the East German leaders admitted to certain vague 'ideological errors' and 'economic miscalculations'. As Bertold Brecht commented: 'Despite most zealous reflection, they could not recall the precise nature of their mistakes; passionately, however, they claimed to have made them—as is the custom.' The easing-off, however, was not enough to prevent the Party's Central Committee from recommending a general raising of working-norms, by an average of 10%. The workers' backs were already bent enough trying to fulfill the targets of the Plan. The revolt came when wages, now calculated according to the new norms, were to be backdated one month.

To the men on the Stalinalee building works, this was sheer robbery; as for their union official, he curtly told them that the backdating was not a contribution to discussion, but an order. His remark was punctuated by the dropping of tools.

WEST GERMAN SABOTEURS?

The morning of June 16 heralded a greater and more damaging revolt than any number of 'West German saboteurs' could organize. By 10.30 a.m. the bricklayers on the Stalinalee had formed up and were already marching towards the Government buildings in the centre of the city. Workers on the neighbouring sites look up, drop tools, and with scarcely a word, join in; from the other sites men shin down the scaffolding and run to join the strikers. A detour is

made to the Marx-Engels Platz, where six hundred more join in. Three abreast becomes six abreast . . . six abreast becomes nine . . . nine becomes twelve till the whole street is taken. In the Square outside the 'House of the Ministries' a young striker jumps onto the platform. 'It's not only a question of norms and prices', he shouts. 'We're not just from the Stalinalee, we're from all over Berlin.' A dramatic pause and then: 'This is a rising. The Government has made mistakes and must take the consequences.'

A chain reaction spread throughout East Germany. From Berlin to Magdeburg, Solidarity spread and assumed the force of law. In 350 towns and villages there were strikes, demonstrations and rallies where demands for immediate measures to reduce the cost of living, free and secret elections, and payment according to the 'old' norms were put forward. In some towns, strike committees took over the task of public administration, but within three days Soviet Army intervention suppressed the uprising. Berlin was a typical example, where Soviet tanks scattered workers' processions throughout the city and patrolled the public squares to prevent any re-assembly. The real damage against the Ulbricht regime, however, had been done, and though the death sentence was not executed on the Government, it had been passed—unanimously.

'STRIKING AGAINST THEMSELVES'

Several observations are inescapable throughout the whole rising. Firstly, it was a working class achievement. Unlike the Hungarian Uprising three years later, the middle classes and intelligentsia formed up behind the workers, and not

Continued on page 2

Seeing Red

up more than 43 subversives. For this I pay taxes!!

Meanwhile the other cretin, one Charles E. Moore, divulged that 'real Communists had stayed in the background working mainly through others to whip student demonstrators to a type of frenzy'. Actually they sat down with quiet determination, but maybe he thinks they're endowed with frenetic backsides. The 'others' through whom the Communists worked included many from 'unusual backgrounds'. He went on to complain that 'some magazines had published sympathetic articles portraying the student rebellion as a demonstration for their rights'. In reality, he pointed out, the demonstration was a sinister device which 'provided the

Reds with an exercise in crowd manipulation and how to contend with the police by trying to make them seem the tactical enemy'. (The policeman is my friend. The policeman is my friend. The policeman. . .)

Then J. Adled Hoocher—J as in Jeremiah—leaped back into the act with the following warning: 'In regard to the Communist bloc espionage attack against this country, there has been no let up whatsoever. Our government is about to allow them to establish consulates in many parts of the country which, of course, will make our work more difficult'. In other words it will take Hoover longer to get us into World War IV. (I've got nothing against J. Edgar personally, but I wouldn't want

him to marry my brother.)

One name that kept cropping up in the article was that of Bettina Aptheker, who is the daughter of Herbert Aptheker, a leading Communist Party theoretician. She was quite an activist out there.

A rather discouraging fact was mentioned in the article: only 20 of the 274 groups on the Attorney General's List of Subversive Organizations, as it's popularly known, are considered to be currently active. On the bright side, however, was the testimony of Dr. Stefan Possony who is an 'authority on Communist tactics'. He informed the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that 'the radicalization of American youth is proceeding beyond the wildest expectations of the Communists'. He said that the result was not exactly what the Communists had envisioned because it included a rebellion against the old-line Communists and 'actually bordered on anarchy'. Things are looking up.

R.S.C.

How Building bosses sack militants

THE BUILDING INDUSTRY has been a notoriously insecure one to work in and, in fact, because of the casual nature of employment, operatives have been described as 'dry land sailors'. One can point out improvements, and quite rightly so, to the 'Contracts of Employment Act' which stipulates that 24 hours' notice must be given, at least, when anyone is sacked. However, according to the Working Rule Agreement of the building industry's Joint Council, a worker must have got in six days with the firm before this applies and during this time he can be sacked with only two hours' notice, expiring at the end of normal working hours on any day.

A recent example of this, and this is not an isolated instance, has occurred on the Bernard Sunley job in Horseferry Road, S.W.1. During the last three months a number of men have been sacked in this manner with no reasons given. Things came to a head on Friday, May 14, when a carpenter, a member of the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers, was sacked. Again no reason was given, the management stating that it reserved 'their right to sack operatives within the first six days—no reason need be given'. When the shop stewards got this reply from the management, a site meeting was called at which it was decided to take unofficial action.

SUNLEY'S IGNORE COMMISSION

The case of this carpenter was referred to the Regional Disputes Commission. Here, the foreman, who in fact gave the sacking order, said that the man was a good tradesman and timekeeper and as far as he was concerned, he was fully satisfied with his work. The commissions findings condemned the strike action and, although they did not actually say that the carpenter should be re-instated, they said that discussions should take place with a view to re-employing him. The stewards then met the management who refused to discuss anything until the

Very sorry, but

WE regret to have to announce some increases in subscription rates.

1. To cover increased postage rates coming into force May 17, inland subs. will be from June 1, 1965: Combined FREEDOM/ANARCHY subscription £2 2s. 0d. per year FREEDOM only £1 2s. 6d. per year ANARCHY only £1 6s. 0d. per year
2. Apart from this increase, costs have risen and we have known for some time that the figure shown in weekly financial state as Expenses (£70) falls short of present-day costs; even on last year's figures the expenses amounted to £76, and this year additional typesetting costs have to be added to this, so the current figure is £80.

We are not at present putting up the price of the paper but we shall have to do so at the end of the year unless sales go up.

To encourage new subscriptions we are introducing immediately an introductory Gift Subscription at reduced rate. Send us 5/- and the name of friend you think might be interested and we will send both FREEDOM and ANARCHY for two months.

men returned to work. It was decided to do this but Sunley's made no attempt to reinstate the sacked man and so they towed tools again.

The case was then taken a stage further in the disputes procedure, to the National Commission, who supported the decision of the Regional Commission, but the management of Sunley's still declined to reinstate the man.

All this has taken two weeks, during which time the strike has been 100%. However this week the men voted to go back to work and at this meeting three district organisers said that they would demand from their Executive Councils an official withdrawal of labour, but in the meantime the men should return to work. In actual fact two unions have made the decision to call an official strike, but it now hinges on the ASW Executive, whose member it is after all that is involved. This is how things stand at the moment, with the ASW decision expected soon.

CLOSER CONTACT WITH OTHER JOBS

Although this strike was 100%, it was isolated. The strike committee sent out appeals for money to jobs and union branches, but other channels, unofficial ones, were ignored, at least until the return to

LETTER Bank workers unite!

Dear Comrades,
Having worked in the Midland Bank, before leaving in disgust about a year ago, I read Bill Christopher's short article 'Playing Happy Families' (May 27) with great interest.

The extreme patronising attitude of the Midland and other banks is sickening to anyone who believes in the dignity of work. At present the leaders of the Staff Association are themselves employees—which turns negotiations between them and their bosses into a complete farce. They dare not disagree as their chances of promotion may depend on it.

NUBE works hard to change the system, and has a very large membership, yet nothing is changed as many people working in banks believe firmly in the old negotiating system. This is partly because of their attitudes (they have been lulled by their environment into being complete conservatives in their attitudes to labour and industrial questions—many don't believe Trade Unions should exist!). But also the Bank uses a subtle method of perpetuating the system—the word spreads around that the best chances of promotion are given to Staff Association members. (Yet they are no fools, the best jobs go to 'capable' men, whether they are Union or Association members.) All wage increases and benefits are, of course, publicised as being a result of long 'negotiation' with the Staff Association, even though these 'yes' men had no say in any decision.

As long as workers in banks really believe that they can place complete trust in their bosses, as long as they regard themselves as being a vital part of the capitalist system instead of its tools, the present system will continue. When workers in banks realise that the employers care sod all for their welfare when it really comes to the push, we can expect a more militant labour force. Unfortunately the realisation will probably only come when it is too late—when all but the bosses will be replaced by cybernated accounting systems and the cashiers will be elaborate slot machines. Then they will find themselves out on their ears, wondering why Daddy has stopped buying them ice lollies.

DESMOND HALL.

work. Because of this, a chance to obtain sympathy action from other jobs was lost. It was a pity that the stewards on the Sunley's job were not in close contact with their counterparts on other jobs. Organisation along these lines has been going on and a certain amount of success has been achieved, but generally it is an uphill struggle. Let us hope these lessons have been learned from the present dispute, and now that closer contact has been made, it will be kept up.

However the thing is to get this 'chippy' reinstated. Obviously this six day rule is used to sack men because of their union activities on other jobs. Make no mistake about it, a 'black list' is operated by the employers in London and the 'six day rule', No. 2B in the Working Rule Agreement, is a convenient way of getting rid of militants who have slipped in in the first place. It is a means of preventing any strong organisation emerging on a site, but it must be remembered that the unions are a party to this agreement. As far as Rule 2B stands, no reason has to be given for sacking a man in the first six days of employment.

The commissions have really only recommended talks and have not actually said that the carpenter should be taken back. Now it looks as if no further action will be taken unless the union executives sanction it. If they do this, they will in actual fact be breaking their own agreement with the employers, so this seems unlikely.

The best hope seems to be further action by the men themselves, although judging from what I heard from one of the stewards, this is unlikely after being out for two weeks already. But if this Rule 2B is to be done away with, a stand must be taken somewhere, sometime. It need not be a withdrawal of labour, but could be a work-to-rule. I feel that if some form of action was to be taken at Horseferry Road, then other jobs would act in sympathy. The situation has changed now and they would not be isolated as before. With the support of other jobs in London, action could be taken to try to get rid of the Rule 2B once and for all. The workers on Sunley's have made a good start, let's hope it can be followed up with further action.

P.T.

FREEDOM For Workers' Control

JUNE 12 1965 VOL. 26 No. 18

FOYLED AGAIN

THE 'settlement' of the strike at Foyle's proved to be a romance. After the strikers had returned to work, the Union commenced negotiations with the management on conditions of work and wages, but Foyle's management refused a happy ending by insisting that wages should be fixed by the industry's Wages Council and not by the union. Foyle's claim that they pay over the minimum rate fixed by the Wages Council in any case, so the plot seems fairly pre-determined.

It is stated by the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers that five other unions are supporting the 'blacking' of Foyle's but it has been pointed out by an eye witness that the postmen—for example—who are supposed to be supporting the strike leave Foyle's parcels outside the picket line and blacklegging workers come out and collect the parcels through the picket line, so something more vigorous needs to be done to halt the numerous Book Clubs which Mrs. Batty—née Christina Foyle—runs. (It will be remembered that Foyle's has run the Right Book Club and the Catholic Book Club in their time.)

A Mr. Ben Perrick of Foyle's wrote to the *Express* to point out that Robert Pitman had erroneously said that Christina Foyle advertises abroad for foreign staff at low wages. Mr. Perrick says that 'every foreign employee at present at Foyle's is here as a result of his or her own application' or as a result of a recommendation from a happy and contented ex-employee. Mr. Perrick agrees with Mr. Pitman that Christina is 'an attractive and able woman'. The *Express* had also printed

a touching anecdote that Mr. Perrick did not deny. 'Only recently,' says Mrs. Batty, 'I had one of our young chaps down working on my husband's yacht. We gave him a tenner for his trouble and dinner at my mother's place—Burleigh Abbey in Essex. I was horrified to find him out there this morning with a banner.' Let us hope he was there again with the banner saying 'We have been betrayed.'

It is doubtless easy for Foyle's to get all the unskilled, part-time, student labour they wish to keep their flow of James Bonds, Churchilliana and text books going but only an effective boycott by buyers (but not by browsers and others) will serve to halt this arrogance of Christina. One of our comrades was threatened with police action for having twice entered Foyle's for the express purpose of leafletting the customers and leaving strike literature in books.

Whether this is effective or not and whether extra pickets would be useful we do not know but Foyle's as book-sellers have been rumbled for years. In the *Spectator*, not a wildly left-wing journal, Leslie Adrian as a mere consumer of books, ventures the criticism often made of the damnable ignorance of bookshop assistants which is the result of treating books as 'supermarket fodder', and he concludes with the revolutionary suggestion, 'But in general the standard of service in bookshops is low, and looks like getting lower still, unless the assistants who handle books are paid more like professionals (which they ought to be), and less like counterhands at Woolworth's.' Over to you, Christina—and why no strike at Woolworth's?
JACK ROBINSON.

Keep Open the Channels!

RECENTLY I ATTENDED a conference on Workers' Control held in London by the Voice of the Unions, an unofficial Labourite group running a paper of that name, and the London Co-operative Society. Preceding the conference a special issue of *Hull Left* was produced with interesting articles on Scott Bader and Algeria among other things. Also produced in connection with the conference were papers on 'Workers' Control in Mining', by a group of students at Ruskin College, and a paper on the 'Steel Industry' by a group of academics and steel workers in Sheffield. These papers make forceful criticism of the present industrial structure but offer solutions only in terms of representative democracy and there is no proposal to get rid of management. There is no mention of job enlargement.

The conference was well attended, I should say between one and two hundred people. More important, possibly, half were manual workers. Unfortunately, however, as in the papers, the concept of Workers' Control, in circulation, was one of committees tacked on to the existing management structure. This was exemplified in a speech by Ian Mikardo. He demolished the split loyalty objection to Workers' Control, and basing his argument on the need for a continuous line of communications, he said that workers' representatives should not be full time union officials, but his communications were of course those up and down a pyramid. He gave no indication of ever having heard of self organisation. Discussion included details of the mechanics of the Algerian and Yugoslav systems, and a Yugoslav sat on the Brains Trust on the Sunday afternoon. The latter was irrelevantly devoted to the Government's incomes

policy. A number of contributions were also irrelevant and dealt with the shortcomings of the nationalised industries, from a consumer angle, and of the London Co-operative Society. One contribution by a docker was however very informative. He said that urgent ships are held up, whereas other ships are cleared because the company clearing the other ships got its labour first. Some jobs pay six to seven pounds a day for doing nothing, whereas hard and dirty jobs paid only two pounds a day. All this unknown to the Port of London Authority management, who apparently don't have sufficient information to run the docks. Perhaps it is unlikely that in a rapidly changing situation like the docks that they ever could have. This seems to be almost a text book example of the results of a lack of requisite variety in the control system. (See ANARCHY 31 'Anarchism and the Cybernetics of Self Organising Systems', John McEwan: 'If stability is to be attained the variety of the controlling system must be at least as great as the variety of the system to be controlled'.) I got up and put the case, not very well I am afraid, for self organisation, suggesting that the solution would be for the dockers themselves to decide which ships to go to. I argued against the pyramid structure, pointing out that elected committees could be just as authoritarian as managers. I suggested that what was important to most people was the degree of initiative they were allowed to exert.

Whilst two or three people came up to me afterwards, and said how much they agreed with me, it was obvious that for the most part my remarks fell on uncomprehending ears. There are people better able than myself to put over a libertarian concept of Workers' Control. The pity is that they were not

present. The movement which organised the conference is active and seems to be growing and influential in the Labour and Co-operative Movements. Some of its support seems to have come from the New Left. A few months ago one comrade expressed the fear that the Communists might take on the slogan of Workers' Control, take over the movement and kill the reality. Now it would seem there is a possibility that the Labour Party might take on a watered down version of Workers' Control in the form of a few workers or ex-workers on the boards of nationalised industries plus a proliferation of committees out of touch with shop or factory (ANARCHY 31, p274). I don't think the people supporting this movement are for the most part self-seekers using it to enhance their own power, but that they are blinkered to any system other than that what might be called delegate democracy. This term itself is self-contradictory, if you think about it. From the earliest years we are conditioned at school and elsewhere to regard parliament, local government, etc., as the embodiment of democracy. Hence people find it difficult to think of democracy in terms of non-delegation. It is, however, only by putting over the case for a libertarian system of Workers' Control to people who are at least looking for something different from the present industrial system, that the idea will be spread. On this point there is a conference in Manchester, the third in the series, on Saturday, 19, and Sunday, June 20, 1965, at AEU District Office, 120 Rusholme Road, Manchester 13. Individuals may attend in a personal capacity, applications to Alan Rooney, 8 Ashkirk Street, Manchester 18. I hope I may have persuaded some of the Manchester Group to go along, if they had not already intended to do so.

MICHAEL WOOLLISCROFT.
Any queries phone ELS 1341 Ext. 37 day
MAI 5947 evening