

# Freedom

## Anarchist Weekly 6d

MARCH 29 1969 Vol 30 No 10

# RACISM IN EAST ANGLIA

IN ONE OF A SERIES of articles on race and immigration recently published in the 'Daily Telegraph', Clare Hollingworth observed that prejudice against coloured immigrants can be found in areas where there are either none or very few. She mentioned East Anglia as one of these areas. There are a few immigrants in NE Essex and the Colchester area, mainly working in local hospitals and the Health Service; and there is a somewhat slightly larger community of coloured workers living in Ipswich. And that is about all.

So why the prejudice?

The answer, to some extent, is that, whilst the foundations of race antagonisms lie in the social system itself, locally (even where there are few immigrants) as the recent UNESCO Committee on Race noted, 'Small groups, associations, and social movements of a certain kind sometimes preserve and transmit racial prejudices'. And such groups and associations we have in East Anglia as elsewhere. Indeed, Fascism at one time was almost respectable in parts of Essex, including Colchester. The old pre-War British Union of Fascists was quite active among army personnel in such garrison towns as Colchester. A very prominent member of the BUF was a certain Lieutenant-Colonel H. E. Crocker, who inserted on at least one occasion the following advert in an Essex county newspaper: 'FASCISM IN ESSEX. Lieutenant-Colonel H. E. Crocker, CMG, DSO, late of the Essex Regiment, has been appointed Officer in Charge of the Essex Area. He will be glad to hear from comrades of the regiment and from anyone else interested in the Fascist movement.' Some of Mosley's followers are still around and actively propagating his policies. Quite a number of East Anglia's Fascists and racists, however, do not openly belong to, or associate with, organisations such as Mosley's Union Movement or the more recent National Front. They prefer to work through local 'anti-immigrant' groups and associations in order to give a certain air of respectability to their activities. Some, particularly when writing to the local Press, assume the mantle of 'disinterested' individuals, intent on defending 'Anglo-Saxon purity'.

We shall now briefly mention some of these people, their activities and, where known, their affiliations. Our findings are based on research during the last twelve months; that is since Enoch Powell's notorious outburst last April, which gave considerable encouragement, both locally and nationally, to racism and anti-immigrant sentiments.

### 'FRONT' ORGANISATION

AN ACTIVE anti-immigrant 'front' organisation is the East Anglian Forum. It is in favour of the 'repatriation of coloured immigrants'. At one of its meetings, held in Ipswich on Saturday, June 22, last year, Mr. Albert Kingham, a motor spares trader of Foundation Street, argued that 'if one accepted immigration, one accepted that a coloured immigrant would marry one's sister, daughter or grandmother, and this I would not accept under any circumstances'. Following this meeting, members of the Ipswich Anarchist Group, supported by some Young Liberals and the Ipswich Peace Action Group, issued a leaflet deploring his remarks and calling on people to picket Kingham's premises. Altogether, about twenty comrades did so—and were given considerable publicity in the local Press.

In reply to a question from a reporter, Kingham denied that he was a racist

However, at another East Anglian Forum meeting, this time in Grays, Essex, later in the year, he stated again that he was not a racist, that he did not hate 'them' because 'their skins are black'; but, he said: 'I hate their habits. They stink. They smell. It's about time we realised it and made them realise it too.' Which is not only nonsense, but racist nonsense into the bargain.

After the picketing of Kingham's shop, discussion then moved to the columns of the local Press, particularly the *Evening Star*. About half a dozen correspondents, including a Mr. P. Redgrave from as far away as Billericay who had attended Kingham's Ipswich meeting, generally supported his views. However, three or four individuals, who through cowardice chose to remain anonymous, sent abusive letters to a number of our comrades. All repeated the same sort of lies, innuendoes, exaggerations and half-truths so popular with Enoch Powell.

Another prominent racist, who is of course not a Fascist or Nazi (so he says), is Dr. David Brown of the so-called National Democratic Party, another right-wing splinter group. He is also associated with Kingham and the East Anglian Forum. He is against 'mixed marriages' which, in his view, are only indulged in by minorities. He is an English—one might almost say, an East Anglian—nationalist. Also actively opposing 'coloured' immigration are Anthony F. Baron and Kevin Baron who, we understand, objects to 'gullible' young people who look upon authority as a means of oppression.

In November last year, Mr. A. F. Baron of Clive Avenue, Ipswich, organised a petition on behalf of the East Anglian Forum, which called for a national referendum on immigration 'to safeguard democracy'. The response, claimed Mr. Baron, 'shocked and staggered' him. And, like Mr. Powell, he argued that 'Unless there is a vent—like the platform offered by the Forum—the people of this country are going to explode'. He claims that he has 50,000 signatures, but could not produce them (to the *Evening Star*) because they are being kept by a 'nationally known agency'. The East Anglian Forum has also inserted small adverts in the local papers. 'Since the advertisements appeared in local newspapers,' said Baron, 'my phone has hardly stopped ringing, and I have had over 500 letters.'

### '500' GROUP

ANOTHER SUPPORTER of the National Democratic Party is a Victor Norris, a private and industrial inquiry agent of Maldon Road, Colchester. He also claims to be an organiser for an extremely militant, right-wing organisation calling itself the '500 Group', which according to Mr. Norris covers the whole of East Anglia. His group, he says, is 'opposed to communism, multi-racialism, student violence and anything else opposed to the national interest'. They are, according to the *Essex County Standard*, 'very intense in their objection to immigration and what they considered the inevitable doom of Britain as a multi-racial society if immigration continued'.

Norris has been involved in right-wing politics for many years. He comes from Liverpool, and is said to have tried to set up a branch of the British National Party (now the National Front) in Colchester. He was a steward at the notorious Rhodesian Friendship meetings held in the town. 'I would

I BELIEVE it was Karl Marx who said that history repeats itself, first as tragedy and then as farce. Anguilla represents the farcical stage to which the once mighty sea-power of Britain has now descended. This small island, population 6,000, declared itself independent of the government of the federation St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla in 1967. The federation, as in other parts of the world which were formerly British colonies, was an artificial thing, set up not to fulfil the wishes of the local population, but to safeguard British investments in the area. In these territories a new governing class has arisen, who find it to their advantage to continue British policies, and protect British interests, for which in return they receive British assistance. In Nigeria this assistance takes the form of arms supplies. In the case of Anguilla, however, it takes the form of direct military support.

The factor of prestige and hurt feelings cannot be left out of consideration. Anguilla has no oil wells

or mines. Its breakaway has offended the pride of the bureaucrats of St. Kitts. No one in authority can ever bear to be defied. And so a sledgehammer has to be brought down upon this tiny nut.

There is vague talk of a possible take-over by an American Mafia. Nobody seems to want to be very specific about this. It is all hints. This makes the rumour impossible to refute, which perhaps is the idea. In view of the demonstrations against Mr. Lee, the British Commissioner, the probability is that the population, or most of them, do indeed want independence.

It is ironical indeed that Mr. Stewart, the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, should have said in a BBC interview that Anguilla must not be ruled by 'a small armed, irresponsible group'. The key-word here is 'small'. At the moment Anguilla is ruled by 'a large armed, irresponsible group', the British occupying force. Size makes a difference. Not only is might right,

it is also respectability too.

Although the invasion has the support of Mr. Forbes Burnham of Guyana, and Mr. Errol Barrow of Barbados, as well as the rulers of St. Kitts of course, there are not lacking those who point out that the British have been ready enough to invade a breakaway country whose population is black, while shilly-shallying over Rhodesia, whose ruling class is white.

Members of the Black Panther movement demonstrated in Whitehall on Sunday, carrying banners saying, 'Solidarity with Anguilla', 'Anguilla will be Britain's Vietnam', and 'Black Peoples of the World—Unite'. It is a pity one cannot help feeling that they did not turn out in the same way to protest about the murder of the Biafran people.

I think that one can be fairly sure that the Anguillians will get their independence in the end. This invasion has made the British Government look ridiculous. The best way to prevent Mafia take-overs is not to invade a country, but help it to develop its economy, so that the temptation to open its doors to dubious characters never arises in the first place.

A.W.U.

# MIGHT IS RIGHT!

## I. Anguilla

## II. Attack on Squatters

LAST WEEK the GLC conducted an eviction attempt on a family of squatters in a house in Ilford. Eight bailiffs were involved. They smashed their way in, but a doctor was able to verify to the GLC official in charge that one of the family, a five-year-old girl, was sick in bed with scarlet fever. A spokesman of the GLC said, 'If we had gone to court with this case it might have taken five to six months. We could not wait for such a long time.' He added that the family would not have been on the street if evicted. The welfare department had been notified.

The callousness and brutality of this action need hardly be insisted

on. Heaven knows what grim accommodation would have been provided for this unfortunate family if they had been driven out. The general alliance of property owners, officials, and the middle class in general, showed itself soon enough. Stratford magistrates refused to issue summonses against Mr. Freeman (Chairman of the GLC Finance Committee), and two GLC officials. The application for a summons was made by Ron Bailey, who believes that this entry was in fact unlawful. He is going to try again, having acquired additional information.

It is difficult to understand why a great and powerful body like the GLC could not wait 'five or six months' for a single house. As anarchists we cannot get very worked up about breaking the law, but it is odd that the issue should have reached such a pitch that the authorities were willing to break their own laws, and act in this way, bringing in a private army to smash their way through locked or barricaded doors, and turn out a family by strong arm methods. One is only surprised that, having done all this, they should then recoil at the idea of putting a sick child into the street. This surely reveals a sudden streak of sentimentality in these toughies. Or perhaps a qualm of conscience?

A.W.U.

months' for a single house. As anarchists we cannot get very worked up about breaking the law, but it is odd that the issue should have reached such a pitch that the authorities were willing to break their own laws, and act in this way, bringing in a private army to smash their way through locked or barricaded doors, and turn out a family by strong arm methods. One is only surprised that, having done all this, they should then recoil at the idea of putting a sick child into the street. This surely reveals a sudden streak of sentimentality in these toughies. Or perhaps a qualm of conscience?

A.W.U.

## NEWS FROM THE BARRICADES

### REPRESSION IN FRANCE

FEBRUARY 1. Thugs hired by the university authorities attack students with bludgeons at Nanterre. Ten students wounded.

February 1. Seven students arbitrarily detained at Fresnes. The last wasn't released until February 10.

February 6. Forty-two students expelled from a Le Havre college for striking.

February 6. Barricades on the roads and railways in Angers. Police attack demonstrators with truncheons. At least one wounded.

The police are in permanent control of the Latin Quarter and all roads leading to Nanterre.

In Reims police attacked secondary school students who were demanding a school without police, reduction of scholarships, and spies.

### ITALY: WORKERS TAKE ACTION

For three weeks 4,000 workers of the Marzotto factory at Valdarno have occupied the factory, supported by schoolchildren and students. Their chief demand is for reduction in the speed of the assembly lines and workers' control of the shop organisation. At the Pirelli

### LETTER-WRITERS

PERHAPS THE MOST vociferous anti-immigrant and 'pro-English' letter-writer is a certain Mr. B. Bailey of

Continued on page 7



# The Facts about Race and Immigration

# 6<sup>D</sup>.

Further copies of this broadsheet are available at 5s. a dozen or 50 copies for £1, from Freedom Press 84b Whitechapel High Street, E1.

## I. RACE

**T**HE WORD 'RACE', when applied to the human species, is a much-abused and misunderstood term. And so-called race problems are the subject of emotion and prejudice rather than rational discussion and scientific objectivity; they tend to generate heat rather than light. What, then, is race? What is a race?

The late Professor J. B. S. Haldane defined it as 'A group which shares in common a certain set of innate physical characters and a geographical origin within a certain area'. And Beadnell states that 'It is a division of the human species based on the possession of sufficient constant heritable traits to characterise it a distinct and relatively permanent variety of mankind'. In *Race and Biology*, published in the UNESCO series 'The Race Question in Modern Science', Professor L. C. Dunn of Colombia University, argues that 'A race, in short, is a group of related, intermarrying individuals, a population, that is, which differs from other populations in the relative commonness of certain hereditary traits'. Quite a number of biologists and anthropologists, however, are not completely happy with such definitions as even the major 'races' of the world are not all that easy to classify.

In attempting to define a certain racial group biologists concern themselves with such important physical characteristics as skin pigmentation, type of hair, shape of head and colour of eyes. They also note other features as shape of nostrils and lip-formation. In this way, scientists group people into the so-called races of mankind. None have completely agreed as to the exact number of 'races' there are in the world. Linnæus divided mankind into three distinct races, Leibnitz into four, Haeckel and Muller into eleven, Morton into thirty-two and Crawford into sixty-two.

Of course there are differences between people. This cannot be denied. There are also certain well-defined groups. W. M. Krogman in *The Science of Man*, like Linnæus before him, lists three: the Caucasoids, the Mongoloids and the Negroids. But even between these three 'races' there is a great deal of blurring and physical differentiation within each group. Take for example skin colour. So-called Caucasians have pale reddish white (pinkish-grey), olive brown and sometimes quite dark brown skins; Mongoloids are anything from very pale yellow to reddish brown; and Negroids are brown-black to pale yellow-brown. Most, but far from all, Caucasoids are medium to tall in height, Mongoloids tall to medium-short and Negroids all the way from very tall to very short. Most Caucasoids have straight to wavy hair which ranges in colour from light blond to very dark brown; Mongoloids have mostly straight brown to brown-black hair, and Negroids, brown-black woolly or frizzy (a few Negroids, however, have reddish hair!). So where exactly can we draw the line between even our three major 'races'? And where do the 'Red' Indians or the Australian Aborigines fit into our racial classifications?

### RACE MIXTURE

**I**S THERE a 'pure' race? Or has there been, throughout human history, a continual mixing, intermingling and intermarrying of people? To answer such a question one only needs to sit in a street corner café for a short while, and 'watch the world go by'.

Up to the middle of the last century, however, it was still popularly accepted that there were 'pure' races, and that they were separate species created by a supreme being. It is now known that, with the possible exception of the Pygmies of Central Africa (a tiny isolated group), there is no 'pure' race anywhere in the world—and has not been since prehistoric times. Race mixture is indeed an ancient phenomenon. The process has been going on continuously, and is accelerating at a greater and greater pace. The history of Europe alone over the last 3,000 years is full of evidence of population movement, invasions and the intermingling of peoples. And during the last 500 years

the process has speeded-up considerably, first with the discovery of the American continent, and then Australasia and the Far East. Millions of Europeans have settled throughout the world; and wherever they have gone they have copulated with the local, indigenous peoples. They also took hundreds of thousands of African slaves to the New World, with whom they also cohabited in large numbers.

American Negroes today are a population of hybrids, resulting from a continual fusing of Caucasoid, Negroid and American Indian. Many also include Mongoloid strains. In Latin America there is an estimated 20 million Indian-European (mainly Portuguese and Spanish) crosses as well as millions of Mulattoes of mixed Negroid-Caucasoid descent. If we look at India we find a greater melting-pot than the United States. The same is probably even more the case with China and Japan—even if to European eyes the peoples of these countries all look very much the same. Race mixture in Hawaii, for example, has had a field day. 'Polynesians, all kinds and degrees of Europeans and Americans, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos, not to mention smaller contingents of other populations, have met here and produced a bewildering array of hybrids,' says Shapiro in his *Race Mixture*, published by UNESCO.

Only a very few individuals of any country conform to any possible notion of racial 'purity'. For example, there are hardly any 'pure' Nordics, Celts or Anglo-Saxons left. As far back as 1920, Parsons proved statistically a considerable degree of variability in the English people. Just under 25% presented the combination of dark eyes and brown hair; those combining light blue eyes and blond hair were no more than 20% and the most frequent combination was light eyes and dark brown hair, though there were some individuals with dark eyes and blond hair. No evidence is to be found to justify the alleged identification of an Anglo-Saxon race. The same goes for Germany. Nor are the majority of the population of Europe of Anglo-Saxon or Celtic descent.

In varying degrees then, we are all mongrels or hybrids. And despite racist beliefs, Negroids and Caucasoids have particularly interbred. Surprising as the information may be to many 'true blue' Englishmen, relatively large numbers of Negroes settled in London during the eighteenth century—and soon intermingled and intermarried with the native population.

### EFFECTS

**D**OES RACE MIXTURE give rise to deleterious biological or social effects? Does it necessarily cause distrust or hatred between people? And is any one racial group inherently (e.g. genetically) inferior or superior to any other group?

Our attitude toward mixture and intermarriage may, to a considerable extent, depend upon our attitude toward our own racial group. 'If we regard our own group as superior,' says Klineberg in his *Social Psychology*, 'we shall probably consider any mixture with an "inferior" group as a mongrelization destined to bring about degeneration of the race.' This kind of argument is based upon sentiment rather than upon science. Contrariwise, it has been argued that race mixing is biologically a good thing as it can result in 'hybrid vigour'. On a small scale there is some evidence for this. Franz Boas has shown that American Indian and French Canadian hybrids seem to be physically more robust and energetic than either of the parent group.

There have, however, been some biological arguments against race mixing, though not recently. Davenport has

pointed out (in 1912) that Negroids have, on average, longer arms than Caucasoids; and, therefore, the hybrid offspring could inherit the long arms of the Negroid and the short legs of the Caucasoid. This, of course, might happen once in a million (a genetic freak); but even then it would only make the individual concerned unfit for certain occupations. Davenport has also demonstrated the existence of relatively small digestive organs in a bulky body, well-developed teeth in weak jaws and thighs out of proportion to the rest of the body, in some half-breeds. But as Comas observes (*Racial Myths*, UNESCO), similar cases can be found among people of the same racial group, particularly among 'old families' of the same group. Of course, Davenport's

harmful; nor does it give rise to antagonisms, distrust or hatred unless such feelings are already present within the community before the advent of race mixing and intermarrying. Here in Britain, for example, comparatively large sections of the population (including the working-class) have, for many decades, considered themselves superior, not just to 'Blacks' or 'Coloureds' as they call them, but also to other Europeans like the French or the Italians. We tend to equate 'difference' with inferiority. Therefore, race mixing is considered harmful. Such attitudes die hard.

### INFERIOR OR SUPERIOR?

**I**T HAS been argued that one racial group is more 'primitive' and, therefore, inferior to another group. Racists

in the American Army. Negroes, on average, came bottom of the poll. Among the various 'White' groups the Poles were bottom of the list and the Italian immigrants next. Negroes from certain northern States, especially Pennsylvania, Ohio, New York and Illinois, were 'superior' in their Intelligence Quotients to most so-called Whites from the Deep South. Ruth Benedict (*Race and Racism*) gives some interesting comparisons: 'Whites' from Mississippi 41.25; Negroes from Ohio 49.50. Otto Klineberg, in his *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration* (1935), demonstrates that improvements in IQs depended upon the length of time a migrant had settled in a 'superior' environment. And in the 'fifties, tests on Negro children, who had moved to New York and Philadelphia from the South, showed that their IQ ratings went up with the length of time they had been away from the South. Again, in one test Negro children in Tennessee averaged 58, whilst those in Los Angeles had IQs of 105. (IQ ratings run from 25 for idiots to 150 and over for so-called geniuses, the normal being between 90 and 110.) In the Southern States of America literate Negroes generally have higher IQs than literate 'Whites' from the same areas. One American Negro girl of 'pure' African descent recorded an IQ of just over 200! Within the same racial groups, so-called middle class children have IQ ratings, on average, higher than those of children from industrial working-class backgrounds. Moreover, whole national groups have recorded higher IQs than other groups—witness the inhabitants of Iceland who, on average, have a 5% higher rating than the English!

Do Intelligence Tests then prove that, say, New York Negroes are genetically inferior to New York Irishmen, or that Philadelphia Negroes are superior to Tennessee 'Whites', or that the inhabitants of Reykjavik in Iceland are inherently superior to the inhabitants of Colchester in England? Or are cultural and environmental factors the basic determinants of human achievements and potentialities regardless of racial background?

### CULTURE

**A** POPULAR argument in favour of the alleged superiority of certain racial groups centres upon the question of their so-called relative contributions to 'culture' or 'civilization'. (When using the word 'culture' in the anthropological sense, I do not refer just to, say, music, literature or the plastic arts, but to the sum total of what a given society or group thinks, practices and produces.) In the past, some writers like Gobineau, have written of the supposed superiority of blond, blue-eyed 'Aryans' or 'Teutons' or North Europeans in general, as the primary contributors to, and developers of, 'civilization' and culture. All other Europeans, they regarded as inferior, whilst Mongoloids and Negroids were, culturally speaking, 'beyond the pale'.

However, consideration of this type of racial evaluation should be placed in proper historical, geographical and climatic perspective.

Cultures have, of course, flourished and then waned. Moreover, so-called civilization, as we know it, did not originate in Northern Europe or, in fact, in Europe at all. Today, Europe can hardly be considered the centre of 'civilization'. While the people of Northern Europe were still primitive savages, other people in China, India, Mesopotamia, Egypt and S.E. Europe had already developed high standards of cultural achievement. Indeed, Aristotle, basing his arguments largely upon the effects of climate, considered North Europeans as being completely incapable of creative culture and rational politics. And as late as the 14th century AD West African Bronze Age culture compared very favourably with that of Northern Europe of the same period, particularly in regard to craftsmanship.

Of the development, or lack of de-



arguments depend entirely on the theory that size is inherited separately for different organs of the body, so that the genetic basis for the length of, say, the leg would be entirely distinct from that determining, say, the length of the arm. This is complete 'genetic' nonsense.

The phenomena observed by Davenport (genetic weaknesses) are not due to the assumed correlation between hybridism and degeneracy, but to the fact that it takes place between individuals belonging to the most impoverished and deprived sections of the groups concerned. 'The same phenomena,' says Comas, 'would result from endogamy as from exogamy, and the interbreeding of races has nothing to do with it.' And Klineberg concludes '... that neither the arguments for nor against race mixture have any special cogency. It is not necessary to go outside of one's race in order to marry someone whose genes are sufficiently different to avoid any possible harmful effects of inbreeding. ... Race mixture in itself is neither good nor bad; its results depend upon the nature of the individuals who enter into the marriage.'

Sociologically, the problem can be more serious. Here, it is a matter of personal and social relationships. For example, in some countries and parts of the world, children of mixed marriages or unions are sometimes unhappy or maladjusted. This has often happened—and is still happening—in countries like America, South Africa or Britain, where there is much ignorance and prejudice regarding the biological and social consequences of race mixing. If 'half-breeds' in any country are treated by law (South Africa) or custom (Britain) as second-class citizens, it is almost certain that their cultural contributions will not be commensurate with their innate abilities and potentialities. In countries where there is little tension between racial groups (such as in Hawaii or in Cuba), and where intermingling or intermarrying is fairly common (as in Brazil or Mexico), scientists have found no association between emotional difficulties and race mixing.

Race mixing in itself is not socially

have claimed that Negroes resemble the anthropoid apes more than so-called Whites, and that they are biologically inferior. Negroids, of course, have darker skins (which, in fact, is an advantage over much of the world, since it prevents the absorption of too great a quantity of actinic rays from the sun); but Caucasoids resemble apes more in as far as they are hairier and have thin lips. Again, at one time it was believed that Negroids, on average, have smaller brains and this was considered more 'primitive' and, therefore, inferior as the great apes also have smaller brains. However, it is not true that Negroid brains differ from those of Caucasoids in any essential manner, including the so-called effects of supposed differences in brain convulsions. Indeed, if their brains were smaller it would not necessarily follow that they were less intelligent. Leibnitz, who was considered a genius, had a brain which weighed only 1,257 grams—less than that of the earliest fossil man!

More recently, some 'inverted' racists have claimed that 'Black' men are actually superior to 'White' men, particularly in sport. They also say that 'Blacks' are beautiful simply because some Caucasoids have said that they are ugly. All these arguments are nonsense. No theory of superiority, basing itself on physical traits, is capable of scientific substantiation.

Some people—and they are not all racists—have put much faith in so-called Intelligence Tests, which appear to confirm that some racial groups (and they usually refer to Negroids) are mentally inferior to other groups. Let us, then, look at some of the results of various Tests.

Intelligence Tests do not test 'pure' intelligence, whatever that might be. Their results, therefore, are very much open to question. What might be considered 'intelligent' behaviour in, say, Ipswich, might be considered stupid in Lusaka! Moreover, an Australian Aborigine is likely to show far more 'intelligence' in finding his way, on foot, from Alice Springs to Darwin than an immigrant recently arrived from Liverpool.

The earliest tests on a large scale were carried out during the First World War,

velopment, of 'civilization', Dr. John Lewis in his *Man and Evolution*, comments: 'Because of the haphazard configuration of continents on the earth—the whole of central and southern Africa, for instance, being cut off from Mediterranean civilization by the Sahara Desert—some regions are more favourable than others for agricultural advance and the profitable association of different national groups with their complementary techniques and capabilities. Thus, there arise certain foci of attraction and organization, the prelude and presage of some new and superior civilization. For instance, we have Central America with its Maya civilization; the basin of the Yellow River in China; the valleys of the Ganges and India; and lastly the Nile Valley and Mesopotamia, with Egyptian and Sumerian civilization. These were all largely independent of each other. The Maya centre was too isolated and was extinguished. China remained isolated from the fertilising influence of Greece, while India was paralyzed by its religion and metaphysics, which gave strong ideological support to the most rigid and complete caste system anywhere in the world. . . . But there was struggle and mutual penetration around the Mediterranean. Step by step we are driven nearer to the more western zones of the world—to the Euphrates, the Nile, the Mediterranean—where an exceptional concurrence of places and peoples was, in the course of a few thousand years, to produce a society in which reason could be harnessed to facts, and religion ceased to discount human activity. Here, in spite of setbacks, an ever more highly organised technique coupled with a clearer understanding of the Universe was passed from generation to generation. Thus, the Mediterranean became for six thousand years the spearhead of human existence and progress on this planet.'

Uneven social and economic development, however, appears to be the rule rather than the exception. With the development of industrialization the centre of gravity moved to Britain, then to Germany, followed by America, Japan and the Soviet Union. These variations in the rate of progress and the differences we find between nations and

civilizations from age to age,' continues Lewis, 'are too great and change too rapidly to be attributable to inborn characteristics. There would be far more uniformity and stability if this were the basic cause. . . . Man's culture and character and civilization are not the product of something given, inherent in man, but something learned and adapted, something improved and changed.' And it is this fact that renders all race theories built on the idea of fixed types of human nature, or that relate cultural or mental differences to different genetical types, as absurd and unscientific. The complete lack of any scientific justification for racist beliefs, however, does not weigh very much with some people, unfortunately.

#### CLASS

A FAVOURITE argument of many racists is that Negroes must be basically inferior as they are always the most oppressed and discriminated against strata of society—so they (the racists) proceed to persecute, and encourage others to persecute, them all the more! Racists have also used this and the opposite argument against Jews. Here we find that they not only say that Jews are inferior or even sub-human (the Nazis believed this), but that they are also so clever that they control world finance and trade. Logicity has never been a strong point with race haters.

It is, of course, quite true that most but not all Negroes are poor, discriminated against and exploited. There are historical reasons for this. Although not necessarily discriminated against on racial grounds, it should not be forgotten that most of the world's population is, in fact, alienated, dominated, exploited and oppressed in one way or another; this, however, is not the subject of my investigation.

The first English settlers went to America in 1607. Shortly after, African slaves were introduced there. Most of the slaves became agricultural labourers, but as slavery developed they became craftsmen as well. In fact, they almost eliminated 'White' workers from most skilled occupations. Within the Southern slave-system, the Negro slaves naturally

did most of the work. When the American civil war ended in 1865, the laws supporting slavery were abolished; and in theory the Negro became a free man. In practice, however, his conditions became worse. With the abolition of slavery, many of the poorer 'White' farmers and their 'hangers-on' had to work themselves. And the Negroes now found the skilled jobs which they had done under chattel-slavery were being monopolised by 'Whites'. They could only get the hard, dirty and routine jobs, or become 'share-croppers' on the poorest land. Until the First World War, the Negroes were mainly confined to the Southern States. Since then they have migrated northwards in increasing numbers. The vast majority of them have now become wage-workers, or have joined the army of unemployed. Both in the South and in the North they have been discriminated against, often by employers, but mainly by so-called White workers (many of whom have themselves only recently settled in the United States from Europe) who looked upon them as a potential or real threat to their precarious livelihoods. Race prejudice and hatred in America (and elsewhere) has an economic basis. Despite their presumed beliefs that Negroes (or Chinese or Japanese or Indians) are inherently inferior, many 'White' workers sub-consciously feel that non-Whites are actually their equal—or, perhaps, even superior—and will compete more successfully in the economic rat-race. And, of course, many have.

The situation is, and has been, very similar in the West Indies. It is worth a brief mention here in order that we can at least try to understand the factors which have literally forced West Indian workers to leave their beautiful islands to seek work and, they hope, a better life in a dark, damp and inhospitable country like Britain.

Most of the inhabitants of the West Indies are either Negroes, the descendants of slaves taken from Africa to work on the sugar plantations, or 'Coloureds', the result of past crossings between Caucasoids and Negroes. Except for Trinidad, Guyana and 'Communist' Cuba, much of the West Indian economy is based on agriculture, plus

a certain amount of tourism. Most of the land is owned by British or American monopolies. Tobacco, bananas, cocoa and coffee are grown on a large scale. The wages of the workers, compared with those of workers in Britain, are pitifully low. Even the salaries of qualified teachers are less than the wages of, say, dustmen in Birmingham or Wolverhampton. In many of the islands there is also considerable unemployment and, consequently, malnutrition and disease. Schooling on Mother England and Affluent Albion propaganda, many West Indian workers and would-be workers emigrated to Britain, only to find discrimination, hostility from their fellow workers, and continued exploitation—all for the dubious benefits of a slum in Brixton or Birmingham, a TV set on credit and, perhaps, a mass-produced Ford or Vauxhall car.

Without going into details, the same, or very much the same, story can be told of the mass of the people of Africa, India and Pakistan, many of whom have also sought, if not 'fame and fortune', at least a less degrading poverty than is their lot 'at home'. Of course, Indians and Pakistanis are not Negroes or Mulattoes. They, like most 'true blue' Englishmen, are Caucasoids, or a mixture of Caucasoid and Mongoloid. A few have Negroid strains as well. They, too, are discriminated against by racists and many of the more unthinking English (and Welsh, Scottish—and Irish!) workers—unless they are rich! Then, like the rich and powerful everywhere, they are fawned-upon and looked-up to, regardless of race.

#### SUMMARY

IN THE ABOVE, I have attempted—albeit very briefly—to discuss some of the misconceptions regarding the biological and social aspects of what is usually termed the Race Problem.

I have demonstrated that it is very difficult even for a scientist to answer the question: 'What is a race?' That there are differences, no one denies. That there are three main groups, is accepted. It must, however, be emphasised that there is considerable blurring and overlapping between these three main groups, and that there is no such thing

as a 'pure' race. In varying degrees almost all of us are hybrids. Moreover, there is no scientific evidence that race mixing (which is going on all over the world all the time) is in itself genetically harmful. Nor is it socially harmful unless willed so by prejudiced sections of a community where race mixing is, or has been, taking place.

There is not the slightest evidence that any one racial group is more 'primitive' than any other group, biologically or mentally. Intelligence Tests, inadequate as they are, concern themselves mainly with knowledge and ability to cope within a certain type of environment rather than with so-called 'intelligence'. The longer a person lives in a certain environment, the higher will his IQ rating become, all things being equal. Race cannot be equated with so-called contributions to culture. Cultures have flourished and waned. Europe appears to be on the wane. But whatever continent or country, or racial group, is supposed to be flourishing or dominant, the majority of its people are always dominated, exploited and manipulated. If they are considered to be non-Whites within a 'White'-dominated society, they will also be racially oppressed and discriminated against, both by the Establishment and by many of the workers as well.

Racism, as a recent UNESCO report shows, has historical roots. It has not been a universal phenomenon. It was not evident for long periods of history. 'Many forms of racism', continues the report, 'have arisen out of the conditions of conquest, out of the justification of Negro slavery and its aftermath of racial inequality in the West, out of Colonial relationships. Race prejudice is largely socio-economic in origin.' Some scientists have suggested that the word 'race' should be dropped altogether and the phrase 'ethnic group' be substituted. Such changes of terminology, however, are not likely to lessen prejudice.

I shall now turn to an important by-product of the so-called Race Question: immigration and racist reactions to immigrants.

## II. IMMIGRATION

GEOGRAPHICALLY the British Isles have, until recent times, been somewhat remote from the mainstream of population movement. Until the discovery of America, Ireland and Scotland, together with the even more remote Iceland, were about as far as the wanderer from the East could go. They were at 'the end of the line'. The British Isles, however, did not escape invasion, immigration, occupation and settlement throughout the centuries. In fact, unlike many other countries which were astride trade routes, the occupiers tended more to stay, settle down and, ultimately, to integrate with, and become part of, the indigenous native population.

The earliest known 'immigrants' to this country (which at the time had not entirely become an island) were the Iberians. They arrived about 3000 BC, and have in many ways left their mark on the face of the land even more clearly than later settlers. And their stock, as Morton notes in his *A People's History of England*, is one of the main contributors to the present population of the British Isles. The Iberians were a small, dark-skinned, long-headed people, who came to this country originally from North Africa via the Iberian Peninsula. Soon after 2000 BC, the 'Beaker Folk' entered the country. They were of Alpine stock, and came from South East and Eastern Europe. The Iberians and Alpines (who, incidentally, settled along the East Coast and throughout East Anglia) met and fused with each other in the Wiltshire area, which was the focus of all pre-Celtic civilization in Britain.

Soon after 700 BC, the first wave of Celtic invaders arrived, coming probably from the Upper Rhineland. 'These invasions,' comments Morton, 'were part of a widespread westward movement of tall, fair-haired, warlike tribes which overran the Mediterranean civilization much as the later Teutons were to overrun the Roman Empire.' The Celts were, culturally, on a lower level than the Beaker Folk. The first Celtic invaders were Goidels or Gaels. They were followed about two centuries later by the Brythons, who had learnt the use of iron. A third wave of Celts were the Belgae, who contained a considerable Teutonic element, and who arrived here about 100 BC. The Celtic conquerors soon blended with, 'integrated' with, their Iberian and Alpine predecessors to varying extents in different parts of the country. 'While in the West,' says Morton, 'the dominant strain is Iberian, the Celts were able to impose their tribal organisation, modified to some extent by the fact of conquest, throughout the whole of the British Isles.' The Belgae founded Britain's first settlement at Colchester.

In AD 43, the Romans (mainly Medi-

terranean but already racially mixed) landed and began their conquest of Britain proper. (They had already made reconnaissance raids previously in 55 and



54 BC.) Some time before, however, native tribesmen from Gaul (France) had settled in Britain. The Roman occupation of Britain lasted almost 400 years. About the year 450 a new wave of 'immigrants' began to make their presence felt along the East Coast. These were the Angles and Saxons from the German coast.

#### THE ENGLISH

THE BULK of the invaders came from the most backward and primitive of the German tribes, living around the mouth of the Elbe and in South Den-

mark. The third group of Anglo-Saxon (English) invaders were the Jutes, a Frankish tribe from the lower Rhineland. They appear to have been on a slightly higher level of civilization.

About AD 500, there was a pause; but later in the six century there were more invasions by the English. Just before 800 new waves of Norsemen arrived, mainly in Scotland; and Danes, mainly along the East Coast of England. These people were, in many ways, even more barbaric than the English; and 'civilization' in Britain almost disappeared. In 824 London was burned by the Danes. From 876 England was divided into roughly two equal halves—the Danes controlling the North and East, and the rest mainly in the South and West. The period between 900 and 975 is marked by the reconquest of the Danelaw in the East. 'The two peoples were sufficiently alike in language and institutions,' says Morton, 'to make tolerably good neighbours, and the tenth century saw the disappearance of many of the differences between them.'

Late in the tenth century the Danish invasions were renewed. And during the previous century, they had also made inroads into Northern France, and had established themselves in Normandy. After a certain amount of 'peaceful' penetration, the Normans under William their Duke conquered England, with 12,000 men, in 1066. And this was the last successful military conquest of Britain. From now on immigration became more peaceful, but no less important to the racial and ethnic mixing of what is now called the British people.

After the Norman Conquest trade with the Continent increased considerably. This resulted in a new influx of Normans and Flemings. Merchants, traders, and skilled artisans, began to enter England, particularly into the East Anglian towns of Kings Lynn, Boston, Norwich and Colchester. Considerable immigration continued unabated for centuries. 'In 1540,' writes Paul Foot in his *Immigration and Race in British Politics*, 'as a result of immigration from the Low Countries, a third of all those who paid subsidy to the King in London were aliens, and in St. Martin's-in-Le-Grand Ward there were six Englishmen to 207 foreigners among the taxpayers.' Canterbury, Colchester, Norwich and Yarmouth were inundated with waves of immigrants, and by 1569, for instance, there were almost 4,000 resident Walloons in Norwich alone. To this day, a part of Col-

chester is called 'the Dutch Quarter'. In 1685 almost 100,000 Huguenots arrived from France; and a little later on, in the reign of Queen Anne, some 10,000 Palatines settled in England—and all this in a country with a population of probably less than five million! There was, of course, considerable hostility towards many of these immigrants when they first arrived in Britain. 'The Huguenots, Palatines and Walloons . . . arrived desti-



tute. They were foreign in their ways and their language . . .', says Foot. And . . . they encountered resentment and bitterness' on entry. Today, except for their names, they are indistinguishable from the rest of the English-speaking population. They have become completely 'integrated'.

#### ... AND THE IRISH

IRELAND is, perhaps, slightly less cosmopolitan, less hybrid, than England—but not much. The Gaels, who reached Ireland in comparatively small numbers, came from various parts of

Spain, Western France and Belgium, and as far afield as Asia Minor. 'It is quite inconceivable that they should have preserved their "racial purity" during all these, possibly, thousands of years; and very doubtful whether they had any to preserve,' observes T. A. Jackson in his *Ireland Her Own*.

And in Ireland the Gaels found an aboriginal population which was likewise of mixed descent. The Gaels, however, did not exterminate the aborigines; they fused with them. Indeed, 'Any theory, romantic or fascist, which supposes a "pure" Gaelic "blood" as a determinant of Irish history,' says Jackson, 'is completely worthless.' Since then Ireland has been invaded and subjugated by the 'mongrel' British on innumerable occasions. The last 120 years has seen the population movement back across the Irish Sea, to England and Scotland.

In the 1840s the potato crop failed in much of Europe. In 1845, there was a partial failure in Ireland—a consequence of the concurrence of several sorts of epidemic disease. In the following year, the failure was general and in 1847 it was absolute. There were deaths from hunger, cholera and typhus on an astronomical scale. Indeed, the population of Ireland was reduced by one-third in under ten years. The Irish Famine, or the Great Starvation as the Irish called it, only took hold in Ireland—and not elsewhere in Europe—because in that country the people, who were still mainly peasants, were almost entirely dependent upon the potato crop. In fact, during the Great Starvation, Ireland produced grain, cattle and dairy produce in abundance; most of which was taken from the peasants by English and Irish landowners, and of course the State's tax collectors, and exported.

In England and Scotland the Industrial Revolution was by now well under way. At the beginning of the century steam-power was introduced. This led to the concentration of industries in certain areas—particularly where coal had been discovered. At first the labour force was recruited from the surrounding agricultural districts. But, as in recent times, most English people were reluctant to move from the South to the Industrial North. Starvation in Ireland provided a ready source. So, as Foot remarks, hundreds of thousands of Irish crossed the sea from their homeland to serve

Continued on page 5



the Bill and, according to one MP, Mr. Arthur Bottomley, all restrictions on immigration on principle. The Bill became law in June, 1962. Commonwealth immigration then dropped to almost nothing. In October, 1964, the Conservative Party was defeated at the General Election. Labour returned to power.

But by 1963, there had been a shift in Labour Party policy. An increasing number of Labour MPs, including the new leader Harold Wilson, began to favour control of Commonwealth (that is 'Coloured') immigration—but not Irish. So, although the Labour Party opposed the 1962 Commonwealth Immigration Act, they themselves introduced further restrictions in 1965. Today, Labour policy is in essence no different from Tory policy. Most Labour Party members, like their Tory counterparts, are racially prejudiced. And the average Labour MP is hardly less so. Nevertheless, both Tory and Labour administrations have been, to some extent, governed less by actual racism but by political expediency. As governments, they are much concerned with 'running the country'. When, therefore, there is what they call a 'labour shortage', they will oppose or soft-pedal immigration control, or will, as in the case of European workers just after the last World War, ignore their own laws. But when business is not quite so good or there is supposed to be a financial crisis with, perhaps, half-a-million unemployed, then they (Tory or Labour) will tighten up the controls and restrictions. Both parties are completely unprincipled and dishonest. For if, say, in three or four years' time, the Government of the day allows industry to expand considerably and, once again, employers in various parts of the country (Birmingham, Smethwick or Wolverhampton?) begin to cry out for more and more workers, then we are quite likely to hear the Government—Tory or Labour—arguing for increased immigration from Europe or anywhere else, including India, Pakistan, and the West Indies. And, again, no doubt the not-so-young Jim Callaghan will once more say that '... we ought now to be-

come a country where immigrants are welcome'. That, they call 'statesmanship'! Orwell called it 'double-think'.

#### RACIST REACTIONS

**E**ARLIER IN THIS article I have already mentioned that many people in this country not only considered—and still consider—themselves superior to 'Blacks' or 'Coloureds', but also to most 'foreigners' and 'aliens' as well. This applied to the Irish, although no avowedly anti-Irish organisations as such ever came into existence during the period of large-scale immigration, in the second half of the last century. The first such organisation seems to have been concerned with 'aliens', particularly the Jews. This was called the British Brothers League and was formed around the beginning of this century by Major William Evans Gordon, MP. He and his league likened 'foreigners' and Jews to criminals and 'bad characters'. They were, he said, diseased like 'store cattle'. But according to Dr. Herbert Williams, a Medical Officer of Health, who reported his findings to a Government commission, these allegations were not true. Despite appalling housing conditions in the East End of London, the Jews, he said, were 'as clean and as healthy' as the native working-class population of the area.

But many of the Tories of that period continued to poison the atmosphere—particularly in such areas as the East End of London—with similar racist propaganda. 'Anti-semitism in Britain,' remarks Paul Foot in his *Immigration And Race In British Politics*, 'starts with the adoption by the Tories of the views of their extremists.' They paved the way for exclusively racist and anti-Jewish organisations, which began to emerge soon after the end of the First World War.

May, 1924, saw the formation of British Fascists. In October, the more extreme elements broke away to form the National Fascists. In 1927, the party adopted the title British Fascists. Its policy, according to Frederic Mulally's *Fascism Inside England*, was:

Immediate cessation of 'alien immigration'; deportation of 'undesirable' aliens; the setting up of an Alien Immigration Tribunal and the 'suppression of all revolutionary activities'. It had about 1,000 members. In 1928, a certain Arnold Leese founded the Imperial Fascist League and published a newspaper called *The Fascist*. The League was violently anti-Jewish, setting itself up as the 'defender of the white man against the Jews'. None of these early Fascist organisations had a positive political programme. That is why, when Sir Oswald Mosley formed his British Union of Fascists with its authoritarian but detailed policy, most of the members of the other groups flocked into the BUF. The British Union of Fascists came into existence in October, 1932. When Sir Oswald Mosley, 'the Leader', published his *Greater Britain*.

Despite the occasional denials, the BUF was as anti-Jewish as the previous Fascist groups. They accused the other political parties of being 'Jew-ridden' and in March, 1937, the BUF Policy Propaganda Department (directed by the late A. Raven Thompson and the notorious William 'Lord Haw-Haw' Joyce) issued a confidential memorandum to Blackshirt candidates such as Mr. B. Bailey in Shoreditch and Mrs. A. Brock Griggs in Limehouse, stating: 'If they (the electorate) agree with the attitude of the British Union to the Jews, they will have a chance of showing their real views at an election by voting for British Union candidates. . . . Throughout 1936 and 1937, gangs of Fascists attacked Jews and Jewish shops throughout the East End of London. In the BUF booklet *Fascism For The Million*, one reads: '... under the new Fascist system of Government, it would be made harder, if not impossible, for foreign peoples to settle here. . . . In his book, *Tomorrow We Live*, Mosley, in his ignorance, refers to the Jews as a race, but says that the BUF do not intend to persecute them on account of 'their race'. He then says: 'That many Jews regard themselves first as members of Jewry, and secondly as British citizens, is not only a matter of simple observa-

tion, but of proof from Jewish literature and statement. British Union, therefore, affirms the simple principle that Jews, who have placed the interests of Jewry before those of Britain, must leave Great Britain. In particular, those who have indulged in practices alien to British character and tradition must leave these shores. . . . It remains to inquire whether it is fair to regard the Jew as a foreigner. The simple answer is that he comes from the Orient and physically, mentally and spiritually, is more alien to us than any Western nation.' Mosley then, like Hitler, proposes 'The Final Solution'. There are many waste places of the earth, 'possessing great potential fertility', where they could be sent. But, of course, not Palestine. 'Other territory must and can be found for the solution of the Jewish problem of the world,' he says. At that stage, however, he did not propose a Ministry of Repatriation of Jews as a more recent but equally notorious politician has done for 'Coloured' immigrants. BUF supporters and members followed their Leader's advice with such slogans as 'We've got to get rid of the Yids'. 'Is this persecution or is it justice?' asks Mosley in *Tomorrow We Live*.

During most of the War the BUF—quite naturally—did not function. Many of its active members like Sir Oswald himself were interned. In 1948, various groupings made up of almost entirely pre-War BUF members, formed the Union Movement, a quasi-Fascist organisation. Although its publications, such as *Union Incorporating Action*, occasionally mentioned the Jews, anti-Jewish propaganda was largely omitted. The Jews were no longer of much interest to Mosley. After 1950, Union Movement found a new scapegoat—'The Coloured Invasion'. And a new slogan, 'Keep Britain White', could be seen, together with the pre-War BUF symbol, whitewashed on walls in Dalston and Brixton. Moreover, the same old arguments that the Fascists used against the Jews could now be heard against the 'Blacks' or the 'Niggers', as the cruder racist elements called Negroids. They were uncivilized, of a different or 'alien' culture, were lazy,

bred like rabbits, smell, were diseased, are inherently inferior to so-called Anglo-Saxons, live off the State or the community and many other things, almost all of which are either grossly exaggerated (suffering from TB or higher birth-rate) or are completely untrue (such as being 'lazy', living off what used to be called National Assistance or being inferior to the so-called Anglo-Saxon natives of England). And, like the racists and Fascists of before the last World War, the post-War ones advocate more and more control, and the 'Final Solution' of repatriation or worse.

From about 1960 onwards a number of other racist and anti-immigrant organisations began to proliferate, first in the Midlands, then in London and elsewhere. Some, like Colin Jordan's National Socialists (who, incidentally, still seemed to be obsessed with the Jews) were even more fanatical than the Mosleyites. Perhaps the 'best' organised of these is the National Front, formed by an amalgamation of the old League of Empire Loyalists and the British National Party. The National Front is far more active than The Union Movement, which has become increasingly middle-aged and 'middle-class' in composition. There are also quite a number of Immigration Control Associations up and down the country, but mainly in London and the Midlands, and a few small 'parties' like the English People's Party and the United National Party, all of which advocate control of immigration and/or repatriation. They are not, however, overtly Fascist or, they claim, really racist. None of these groups, including the National Front, have attracted a mass membership, simply because, to a very large extent, the Tories (and now the Labour Party) have 'stolen their thunder'. But they do exert quite a lot of pressure locally and often give their support to national politicians like Enoch Powell. And like his, their ideas and nefarious activities must be ruthlessly exposed.

## III. EMIGRATION

**I**NOW TURN THE immigration side of the coin over—and look at emigration from Britain. Although it will take up far less space, it is, and has been over very many decades, of greater magnitude than immigration into Britain. It is, indeed, a part of the continual world migration and movement of peoples and an aspect of the permanent mingling and cross-fertilization of racial groups, nations and cultures.

Emigration from Britain appears to have begun on an organised scale during the earlier part of the seventeenth century. Between 1630 and 1643, around 20,000 men, women and children settled in New England; and in the same period, according to G. M. Trevelyan (*English Social History*), 40,000 emigrants went to Virginia and other colonies. Many also went to the West Indies to 'better themselves' in much the same way as West Indians today try to come to England. During the English Civil War the flow of emigrants diminished. Emigration on a really large scale did not begin again until about 1800 or just after. The majority went to Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United States and, later on, Africa and elsewhere. Around 1820 a few thousand emigrated to South Africa.

How many people have left the United Kingdom over, say, the last 150 years?

Up to 1830, the numbers leaving were, according to David Thomson in his *England In The Nineteenth Century*, 30,000 a year. In 1830, according to both Thomson and Cole (*The Common People*), the figure was 60,000. And, by 1832, it had reached 100,000. In 1842, it was 130,000 and, from 1847 to 1850, the yearly average of people emigrating from what Mr. Powell, if he had been alive, would have called 'this green and pleasant land', reached 250,000. In 1852, over 35,000 people went to Australia alone. Between 1851 and 1871, writes Thomson, 3,700,000 emigrants left the United Kingdom for America. And between 1853 and 1880, 2,466,000 emigrants left these islands for countries other than the United States.

In a revealing passage in *The Population of Britain*, Eva M. Hubback observes: 'In the hundred years ending 1931, the United Kingdom lost something like 20 million persons, brought up and educated at its expense, who emigrated mainly to the United States and British Dominions. But this constituted only a temporary relief from economic pressure, and from the beginning of the twentieth century emigration from the British Isles increased steadily, the peak being reached in 1913, when about 380,000 emigrants left for

overseas. . . . After the 1914-18 war, emigration started again and reached nearly 300,000 in 1920, but was reduced to 200,000 in 1921 when the USA restrictive quota came into operation.' During the 'thirties, however, about 400,000 returned to Britain from Australia and elsewhere. There was, at this time, mainly due to unemploy-



ment, considerable anti-British feeling in Australia. Moreover, other countries like Canada were bringing in various measures of control.

After the last War, the flow from Britain began again almost immediately—well before the arrival of 'Coloured' immigrants in any numbers. Many more people have left Britain since the War than have arrived to settle in the country.\* And all these emigrants are leaving houses or apartments of some kind or another behind them! So, it is complete and utter nonsense to suggest that immigrants are coming here and taking 'our' homes from us. In the main, they are being forced to live in the very houses and apartments that no one wants or are not really fit for human habitation. Moreover, I have

\*Between 1962 and 1966, a total of 1,042,500 people emigrated from Britain (General Register Office—Overseas Migration Board).

been able to estimate from all available figures that whilst approximately 5,000,000 immigrants have permanently settled in this country over the last 150 years, over 25,000,000 have emigrated and settled in other countries. Less than 1,000,000 have returned. Therefore, it is not true to say that immigrants are 'overcrowding' the British Isles. Quite the reverse. Although in absolute numbers, the population of Britain, like almost all other countries, has increased (due to a general increase in the birth-rate before and after the arrival of 'Coloured' immigrants; and, through an improvement in health and medicine, the lengthening of human life), relatively speaking, the population of Britain has diminished considerably. Neither the 'Coloured' nor 'alien' immigrants have, except very marginally, reversed this trend of relative depopulation.

#### FREEDOM—THE ONLY SOLUTION

**D**ESPITE a number of minor physical differences, all the peoples of the earth belong to one human species, *homo sapiens*—thinking man. The differences are infinitesimal compared with the similarities. Culturally, men have differed to quite a considerable degree. The lives of an English aristocrat, a French entrepreneur, a Russian peasant or an Australian Aboriginal are not similar. Neither are the backgrounds of, say, an English steel-worker and a West Indian sugar-cutter. But two important factors are worth considering by those who argue that peoples of various and different environments will not mix, will not peacefully 'integrate'. First, due to the development of industrial capitalism throughout the world, communications and physical contact have, over the last few decades, increased and speeded up considerably. This has meant that, for good or ill, cultural differences (including language) are diminishing at a greater and greater pace. Second, one must appreciate the enormous plasticity and adaptability of human behaviour (I knew an African cleaner in the Post Office who, when he first started work, could hardly speak English, had tribal marks on his almost black face, and had never lived in a large city before. Nine months later, he still had his tribal marks—naturally—but he then spoke almost perfect English, had passed his driving test and owned a Volkswagen car!).

Man has been called a toolmaker; he has also been called a wanderer. Man is naturally inquisitive. And, generally speaking, he appears to imagine that the grass in the next, or further, field is

greener than the grass in the one he is in. Hence, his desire to travel, to migrate. This desire to wander the globe is sometimes motivated by 'pure' adventure, sometimes by avarice or greed. But most of it, particularly over the last 150 years, has been the result of a blind urge to escape from oppression and/or poverty and degradation. The Jews of Russia emigrated for both reasons. The Irish came to England or Scotland, or crossed the Atlantic to America, mainly to escape evictions from their land and starvation. English people left this country in their millions, mainly to escape poverty and, to some extent, an increasingly authoritarian society. The majority of immigrants coming to Britain since 1950 have come for much the same reasons as the English who emigrated from Britain between 1800 and 1930—to escape from degradation and poverty. None of them liked being taxed or exploited. None liked slavery or economic bondage. None liked being bossed. But none have, in fact, escaped these evils. Leaving India for England, or England for Australia,



will not make any basic difference. The problems may be less acute, but that is all.

All this does not mean that I am in favour of restricting people's move-

ments. Far from it. Most States have some kind of control. And this includes Australia, the United States (I wouldn't be allowed there!), the Soviet Union (I've been allowed there!) and also such countries as Jamaica, Pakistan, Kenya or Tanzania. In this, as in most things, all States are basically the same. Whilst in itself it cannot solve such problems as poverty or exploitation, I am in favour of the absolute freedom of all peoples to be able to enter or leave any territory or 'country' at will. It should be one of man's inalienable rights. And the more that would-be immigrants—to any country—are able to 'evade' control by the State the better.

It is important to remember, however, that such restrictions on movement from one country to another is often supported by ordinary working-people themselves. Those who emigrate to new fields are usually the more adventurous. Those who remain, particularly in such countries as England, are sometimes very insular or nationalistic in their outlook. And, as I mentioned previously in this article, they consider themselves superior to 'foreigners' or 'aliens' or 'Blacks'. Such people are fair game for avowed racists and 'alien-haters'. Moreover, such attitudes tend to rebound. Over the last few decades, we have witnessed the rise of Black Nationalism in ex-colonial territories, and of Black Power movements in America and, to some extent, here in Britain. In my view, this racism-in-reverse is every bit as dangerous and stupid as that of the avowed Fascist and Negro-hater, even if to some extent it is inevitable.

Nationalism ('My country right or wrong'), racism or even migration, in itself, will not solve basic problems, will not bring social harmony, will not achieve freedom. Nor even will race mixing or the acceptance of people of different nationalities into a country like Britain, desirable as they may be in themselves. Man's major problems, including racism, have, as UNESCO has pointed out, historical roots; they are part of the present social structure, which I for one consider to be sick indeed. Only drastic surgery can save it, save us. And that will necessitate much hard work, much education (on such subjects as race), much self-discipline as opposed to imposed discipline and authority—and a lot of organisation. All of which will bring more freedom not less. . . . A FREE SOCIETY.

PETER E. NEWELL.

'MERCY KILLING'

THERE EXISTS TODAY a strong parliamentary lobby for the legalisation of 'voluntary' euthanasia.

I have laboured for some years in a hospital institution. The wounds are dressed, the bodies bathed, the linen sluiced.

infected geriatric wards, an old man is 'sick-noticed'; condemned to die. A slow decline is hastened.

POLITICAL MACHINE

Admittedly it's true that euthanasia is not presently a normal part of the political machine.

quite easily persuaded, by a 'friendly' doctor, that this is what they wish.

The euthanasia lobby cries safeguards. Bits of paper properly signed and witnessed; legally valid.

TOTALITARIANISM

We already exist in a national society and worldwide community, rushing rapidly into economic, social, political and psychological totalitarianism.

'Anarcho-Fascism'

SINCE FASCIST AND NAZI are the most abusive words in the English political vocabulary it is hardly surprising that they are being thrown at the revolutionary students.

Dr. Marie Jahoda, Professor of Social Psychology at Sussex University, managed to use both words in her evidence to the House of Commons Select Committee on the students recently.

And she said that she had not seen this sort of political argument used by anyone else other than the Nazis.

Personally I am against motorways since the Nazis built some very good ones.

Dr. Jahoda got herself rather worked up about the revolutionary students. Other people have described them as right-wing while remaining calmer.

I suggest that many people—particularly the middle aged—can conceive of only three kinds of politics: liberalism, Leninism and fascism.

The liberal who is unable to look at an anarchist without seeing a fascist hiding inside him is also prone to deny his own values and argue that liberal democracy should defend itself by using 'non-liberal' methods.

DAVE CUNLIFFE.

LETTER

'G' and Jacquetta

Dear Comrades,

I found 'G's' article on 'Anarchism Today' irritating, and would like to explain why.

First, 'The position of anarchists in this country being an extremely small minority, has led to a sort of anarchist inferiority complex when faced with larger political groups'.

Second, after denouncing sectarianism, 'G' comes away with this piece of ill-concealed arrogance: 'People who cling to the trappings and prejudices of any particular social class—'.

proletarian yobos') are very handicapped in understanding what anarchism is all about.

Third, there is his asinine statement that people who want a working class victory are snobs.

In other words, I'm saying that 'G' has at least his share of prejudice. He advocates 'workers' control'—but so does Jo Grimond.

While I'm in the mood, I'd like to say something about Jacquetta Benjamin's letter (FREEDOM, 8.3.69).

DAVE COULL.

One School for the Rich

ABERDEEN TOWN COUNCIL, seeking for a blunder with which to cap their recent triumph in building a skyscraper in line with a belching factory chimney, have now produced a plan on comprehensive education which will certainly save money . . .

This week the council decided to scrap the one-tier system of education planned by the previous Labour administration (there is no point in being ultra-revolutionary about it, Aberdeen City Labour Party fought hard to get a good plan) and replace it with a two-tier system.

city under the new system than under the present one, they won't have to worry about us grubby elements from the gutters entering their hallowed portals in such vast numbers (last year 4% of Aberdeen students came from working-class homes), unless it's to read the meter or empty the bins.

The real villains of the piece are not the Tories, who have acted like true blue capitalist bastards, but the ageing, creaking, right wing Labour Party who, after 25 years of free limousines, slap-up dinners, and council cigarettes, had become so useless that the people would have voted for a stuffed rhinoceros to get them out.

Perhaps now the people will begin to see daylight and will appreciate what the Aberdeen Anarchists have been saying for years. DON'T VOTE FOR ANY-ONE (except, just possibly, a stuffed rhino). AND TAKE OVER THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION AND EXCHANGE YOURSELVES.

ALBERT LIBERTAD.

MOVING FUND

Target is £500. Donations to date: £442 12s. 3d.

PREMISES FUND

Target is £1,000 per year. 1969 Pledges honoured and donations to date: £144 12s. 0d.

PLEASE RENEW SUBSCRIPTIONS 1969

IN THE RED!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Estimated Expenses, Income, and Deficit.

PRESS FUND

London, N.W.6: B.S. £2/5/8; Tiptree: P.N. 10/-; Auckland: B.S. £2/13/-; Tunbridge Wells: R.E.W. 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.\* 2/-; J.L.\* 3/-; Tackley: T.J.P. £1; Cupar: B.T. £1/10/-; London: Anon 2/6; Los Gatos: L.M. £1.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes TOTAL, Previously Acknowledged, 1969 Total to Date, Deficit B/F, and TOTAL DEFICIT.

\*Denotes Regular Contributor.

RACISM

Continued from page 1

Mill Road, Boxted. He objects to a 'privileged minority' of coloured people 'being introduced into our midst', particularly as 'there is no work that an Englishman would not perform for Englishmen (or Anglo-Saxons)'. Indeed, claims Mr. B. Bailey, 'The British are Anglo-Saxons and Celts, and we're so to remain'.

In Mr. Bailey's view, if coloured immigrants 'were all returned to their own countries', the numbers who are 'performing services' (in hospitals, on transport, in the public service, in the Post Office, etc.) 'would be counterbalanced by those who had been receiving the services'.

it's because they are black. It is we who are underprivileged in our own country.' Following a spate of letters from people like Bailey, Pettican, Hughes, Newman and others in the local Press since well before Christmas, there has been the familiar daubing of walls in Colchester by National Front supporters with such slogans as 'Niggers Out'. A coincidence, of course!

Many of the racists' arguments have been answered in the Press. But, of course, most ordinary people are not aware of all the facts, and therefore tend to accept, to some extent, such statements as 'multi-racialism breeds racial hatred', or that immigrants are 'pouring in' in 'vast numbers', or that they are breeding at 'five times the rate' of the local native population, or that some poor West Indian nurse or postman is a member of a 'privileged minority'.

Such propaganda is spread in order to set one group of workers against another. And while they are so divided, our rulers will continue to rule—so-called Black and

White alike. In a sick world, racists are indeed that much more mentally disturbed than the majority. People who say that they would not ALLOW THEIR daughters to marry a Negro or a German, or would not ALLOW certain people into a country, or would RETURN immigrants to 'their own country', are extreme authoritarians. Like the Nazis, they want to dominate and, also like the Nazis, they NEED a scapegoat for society's ills. But, essentially, they are also weak characters. They need a Mosley or an Enoch Powell to 'look up to'. As Mr. Bailey says: 'I have neither the knowledge nor ability of Mr. Powell.'

(Compiled by members of NE Essex and Ipswich Groups.)

FREEDOM NEXT WEEK!

'Freedom' is to be published next week (April 3) so that we can comment on the Easter activities and campaigns.

Can YOU take some copies for sale?

Anguilla

THE THEATRE OF THE ABSURD has seen nothing like it since the abolition of free milk for secondary school kids. As the nation listened anxiously to each radio bulletin and started buying tins of corned beef, as the Daily Sketch got ready to re-use its old Suez headline IT'S GREAT BRITAIN AGAIN, the Red Devils put on their parachutes, checked their automatic weapons and wrote their wills.

Journalists and the people who write letters to newspapers have made the most of the performance. My favourite phrase was in a letter to The Times; it described Harold Wilson as 'a pint-sized Palmerston'.

Meanwhile of course Smithy continues to enjoy good health and immunity from military attack. As Papas suggested in the Guardian what the Anguillans need is a few Kith and Kin.

'IF'

AT LAST I HAVE seen 'If . . .'. This excellent film has twice been reviewed in FREEDOM and many readers have probably seen it now. It does not try to show an ideological conflict between politically aware rebels and the institution. Instead the film shows the more fundamental—and common—conflict between the institution and the adolescent who wants to experiment, explore and grow in his own way. By trying to force the three 'heroes' to conform to its own rigid pattern the institution makes them rebels. But they do not repudiate everything the school teaches them. Physical violence is clearly successful when used by the school to enforce conformity: to the rebels it is the logical way of fighting back.

Public schools, like most institutions, include many interesting contradictions. One which was not shown in the film is the conflict between forcing kids to become robots—and encouraging them to develop their minds. I would emphasise that I am not referring to learning how to pass examinations but to genuine intellectual exploration: genuine because the answer is not provided by the teacher—at the beginning or at the end of your work.

WYNFORD HICKS.

# Why Ford Workers didn't win

**T**HE strike of 46,000 Ford workers which lasted three-and-a-half weeks is over and the workers have lost. After High Court hearings, legal judgements, midnight meetings of union officials at Mrs. Castle's ministry, and full press and TV coverage, the unions finally recommended a return to work with sub-

stantially the same agreement which caused the original spontaneous walk-out at Halewood and Dagenham.

When Mrs. Castle announced the terms of the return to work the Tories in the House of Commons stood up and cheered—and well they might. Fords keep their penalty clauses and they keep the right to punish those who don't behave. The only difference between this agreement and the original one is that Fords have had to pay a slightly higher price to get it.

They have raised the guaranteed holiday bonus from £5 to £15—but the full bonus (of up to £35) will NOT be paid to those who take 'unconstitutional' action, i.e., who take part in unofficial stoppages in defence of wages and working conditions. Similarly, if there are lay-offs due to strike action in any section of the Ford empire in Britain NOT ONE Ford worker will get his 'lay-off' pay!

## DOUBLE-TALK FROM POLITICIANS

To describe this miserable agreement as a victory, or even a 'partial victory', is to make nonsense of the English language. Yet that is precisely how it is described in the journals of both the Communist Party and International Socialism. The *Morning Star*, in an editorial called 'Lessons of Fords', declared that Fords had made concessions to the unions, while the *Socialist Worker*, also in an editorial, called it a 'partial victory' because the workers have 'breached the incomes policy'.

In fact, Mrs. Castle sanctioned the wage rises in the first place providing there were clauses in the agreement which guaranteed 'continuity of production'. It was precisely these clauses which caused the strike, but they are still there—so whose is the victory?

Those late night meetings at Mrs. Castle's ministry could have had only one object: to make clear to the union officials that either they accepted that wage rises must be accompanied by penalties against unofficial strikers—or the wage rises themselves would be vetoed by the Prices and Incomes Act. Thus faced with taking on the Government as well as Fords, Scanlon and Jones, the two chief negotiators, ducked the issue and recommended a return to work with an agreement which left the penal clauses more or less unchanged.

When political groups call defeats victories there must be a reason, and the reason is not too hard to find in this case. Both groups are trying to exert 'influence' within the unions and to do this they are trying to 'win over' some union officials and shop stewards. The immediate targets are Scanlon and Jones and all their supporters in the AEF and the T&GWU. So the *Morning Star* congratulates these two gentlemen and credits them with a 'major share' in the 'successes' achieved. The *Socialist Worker*, having defined Cannon and Kealy as company men, hastens to add that 'Hugh Scanlon and Jack Jones are quite different'. Why? Because, says the *Socialist Worker*, 'they are Left-wingers'!

Left-wingers, right-wingers, it sounds like a bloody football match! The fact is that all the union officials play in the same team, they all accept the rules of the game, and they all obey the referee (the State). None of them will challenge the right of Fords to own vast productive units whereby they control the very lives of thousands of working class families, none of them will ever challenge the Government's dictation over the workers, and none of them would ever think of taking a course of action which brought them into conflict with the sacred 'law of the land'.

Cannon, Kealy, Scanlon, Jones, they all play in the same official union team—the only difference is that some play on the right wing and some play on the left. But in this game the workers don't play at all. Their role is to be spectators only.

## DOWN WITH 'POLITICS'!

What a painful sight it was to see workers who had been on strike for more than three weeks, who had thoroughly alarmed the Government, and who had Fords at their mercy, returning to work at the request of the 'left-wingers' Scanlon and Jones. Most Ford workers didn't think it was a victory—and many of them said so in radio interviews—but what the hell could they do?

The unions were against them, the strike which their stewards had asked to be made 'official' was now 'officially' called off, many of the leading stewards (briefed by the political groups) agreed it was at least a 'partial victory', and even the Communist Party and International Socialism said so. But above all, the workers were utterly unprepared for such a situation. The political propaganda which has been going on in the factories for donkey's years has all had the purpose of indoctrinating workers with the belief that 'leaders' are essential, that unions are essential, that governments are essential, and that workers by themselves are incapable of changing the situation they find themselves in. The most they can hope for, say the politicians, is 'good' leaders, 'good' unions, and 'good' governments.

That is the reason why Ford workers have been saddled with this rotten agreement—not because they are politically uneducated (as IS suggests when it urges them to form study groups to discuss how government policy affects the workers—as if the workers didn't know!) but because they have been taught to leave to others what can only be done by themselves.

Defeats will occur again and again until there is a strong body of opinion in the working class which denounces the idea of authority and leadership and which teaches—by example and not in editorials—that to act for ourselves is to live like men, but to leave others to act for you is to live like beggars.

That is the real lesson of the Ford strike. Whether Scanlon and Jones are left-wingers, right-wingers, or full-backs, makes not the slightest difference to the nature of official trade unionism. It is dead and nobody can resurrect it. With all its money, with all its membership, with all its access to government, with all its knights and lords, official trade unionism couldn't get the Ford workers a decent wage increase without accepting the strings of industrial slavery.

We must act by ourselves and for ourselves—and ask nobody's permission to do so. The only education we need is education through experience of the principles of **Mutual Aid and solidarity.**

# Freedom For Workers' Control

MARCH 29 1969 Vol 30 No 10

# COLLEGE CREEPS?

**W**E HAVE BEEN given to understand that the principal of the Rochdale College, Mr. Hardcastle, objects to the suggestion in *FREEDOM* on March 8, that he collaborated with Foster, Dunlop's personnel manager, in the sacking of a shop steward. After all he only provided the information which led to the sacking.

But, even if we accept that Hardcastle acted more from simple-minded innocence than from any sinister motive to back Foster's passion to persecute the Regent workers, the action still raises many serious questions regarding the security of students at the Rochdale College. Hardcastle may well be, as many academics are, out of touch with the realities of the shop-floor, but in his liberal innocence he is easy meat for any ruthless employer, like Foster, who may want to use him. This is why, of course, under a dictatorship, many well-meaning liberals often wind up doing the dirty work in the name of 'law and order', 'duty', etc.

Hardcastle, therefore, has come in for much criticism especially from the Dunlop workers, who seem to hold him responsible for the sacking. Yet it is just possible that he was duped by Foster. It is also worth noting that in exchange for the information regarding the shop steward's college attendance, Foster did in fact promise several members of the Rochdale College staff that on no account would Bamford, the shop steward in question, be sacked.

What the lecturers, students and apprentices at the Rochdale College, should now obtain is an assurance that college information of this kind should only be given an employer when it is considered in the interest of the student to do so. But when it is clear, as in the case of Bamford, that the firm only wants the information in order to create industrial mischief, then it should be withheld.

## UNION WET BLANKETS

Another party to come under attack in recent weeks at Dunlop, has been the union handling the Bamford case, the General and Municipal Workers' Union. Not only do most of the rubber workers object to the failure of the union to consult them before making agreements with the firm, but on the question of the sacking they have suggested, according to the *Rochdale Observer*, that 'There is a feeling that he has been let down by the union'.

The reason for this is obviously much to do with union's anxiety to stop a strike in the first instance by playing the

wet blanket, and then afterwards trying to blame the lads for not coming out. On top of this, there is the union's habit of accepting everything Dunlop offer or tell them, apparently unquestioningly.

The union complained when the Manchester anarchists organised a picket at Dunlop the other week, but it's a poor do when the union is so weak that a handful of anarchists can show it up. All we can hope is that they'll buck up a bit in future.

## DUNLOP FAILS TO PROVE MISCONDUCT

The Dunlop employers have failed to prove to the satisfaction of the Labour Exchange, that Bamford was guilty of misconduct. This means that after a concerted attempt on the part of Dunlop to stop Bamford's 'dole', the Rochdale Employment Exchange, to the surprise of everyone, decided to grant Bamford unemployment benefit from the time he became unemployed. Dunlop's argument, that Bamford was sacked on grounds of misconduct, has not, it seems, convinced the Labour Exchange authorities, and they have not even seen fit to send the matter to a tribunal.

But while we are distracted by the Bamford case, a new menace grows, as Foster organises his rate-fixers and pen-pushers to put Dunlop on time and motion.

It is generally known that no firm can alter its workers' conditions of employment without their approval. Time and motion or piece-work cannot be introduced without the agreement of the men it affects.

All we can do is demand the facts and not allow ourselves to be bamboozled by sales talk. We must insist on a clear statement of what we will be expected to give up and what we'll cop in return. But should we decide to kick the scheme into touch, then we should enforce that decision to the full.

This being said, it should be remembered that such schemes can operate against the firm's interest as well as the 'blokes'. It won't do the firm much good if work standards fall as a result of higher production.

It is even thought that some of the firm's administrative staff oppose the scheme on practical grounds. The scheme is backed mainly by men of limited practical knowledge, like Foster.

However, with profits rising rapidly and the Dunlop chairman, Sir Reay Geddes, bragging that profits, before tax, will be over £24,000,000 for last year and the *Daily Express* suggesting they could reach £29 million next year, perhaps the company thinks it can risk losing a bit of quality.

# What DO they Manufacture?

**F**OR ALL THOSE people who get paranoid about the CIA and Special Branch, here is some food for thought. I draw no conclusions, that's for you to do. I merely present the facts which have crawled out like little creatures from beneath the stones that have been overturned in the last year or so.

In the spring of last year a number of demonstrations were taking place outside

**Help Increase 'Freedom's' Circulation.** Are you willing to take 'Freedom' and 'Anarchy' regularly to local newsagents and collect returns and cash? If so we'd like to hear from you. — CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

the offices and factories of Dow Chemicals. This was because the Dow Chemical Company was the main producer of Napalm and Napalm 'B' with 'added adhesion qualities'. We discovered in Windsor, a stone's throw from the castle, the offices of Dow Corning International. This was a subsidiary of Dow made by an alliance of Dow Chemicals and Corning Glass International. In June of last year we had a demonstration outside the offices of Dow Corning at Castle Chambers, 3 Sheet Street, Windsor (Windsor 69494) and in our leaflet brought attention to the effects of Napalm and another Dow subsidiary, Dow Badische, whose chairman, Herr Wurster, developed the Zyklon 'B' gas which slaughtered the Jews in Auschwitz.

We began to question why they have an office in Windsor. They describe themselves as silicon manufacturers. If they

are distributors, where is their store-house? If they are researchers, where are their laboratories? If they are manufacturers, where is their factory? The nearest factory of the group is the Dow one over 120 miles away in King's Lynn, and that is controlled by Dow's London office. They have nothing but a small, modern third floor (whole top floor) office.

All this is interesting but hardly revealing. But wait.

In 1961 President Kennedy revived the 'President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board'. It served both the Kennedy and later the Johnson administration well and there is no reason to assume that it has been disbanded. Its job was defined as 'Investigate the entire intelligence community, including the CIA and USIB. Recommend changes and see that they were carried out. To meet six to eight times a year and, between times, to carry out special assignments for him at home and abroad'.

Again interesting but hardly revealing. Until we consult the list of members of

the PFIAB and see 'Robert D. Murphey, president of Corning Glass International'. LARRY LAW.

## Barlow and Carver

### COMRADES!

Alan Barlow and Phil Carver lie in HMP, Brixton, accused of malicious damage to the Bank of Bilbao in King Street, London, on Saturday, March 15. We must defend our comrades at all costs. Send donations now to the Barlow-Carver Defence Committee, c/o Freedom Press. All week people have been visiting them and they are in good spirits.

Remember! They are YOUR comrades.

## STOP PRESS

### Phil got Bail at High Court