

Freedom

Anarchist Weekly

MAY 25 1968 Vol 29 No 16

THREE TYPES OF RESISTANCE

WHY THE RIGHTIST BACKLASH?

LEVELLERS/DIGGERS/ENGLISH REVOLUTION Etc.

AGIT PROP MIDDLECLASSWISE

New Revolutionary Movement!

AS THESE WORDS are being written, workers in France are locking the bosses out of factories in a massive defiance of the authorities unparalleled in Western Europe since World War II. The Minister of the Interior has spoken out against 'anarchy', the *Daily Telegraph* has reported the appearance of red and black anarchist flags in Paris, and the *Daily Mail* has described the situation as one of 'open revolt against traditional forms of authority'.

At this moment it is impossible to tell whether the end will be a return to 'law and order' brought about by the unleashing of the truncheons, guns and poison gas of the Security Forces on the workers and students, the replacement of the present administration by a more 'liberal' regime (with or without De Gaulle), or a flare-up into open social revolution. But, whatever the outcome, the import-

ance of these events goes far beyond France.

First of all these events have smashed the talk put about by liberal sociologists and Maoists that the workers of the Western World have become too corrupted by increasing prosperity to fight capitalism. Within a fortnight the demands of the students unleashed forces that officially are out of date in the era of the Welfare State. Barricades have been built in Paris, buildings seized, and bosses taken prisoner. Official reaction has been predictable. The brutality of De Gaulle's CRS has been completely naked and un concealed.

This has been brought home to all by the reports in the British press of police clubbing passers-by indiscriminately and dragging the wounded off stretchers to beat them up. No matter how 'liberal' or 'progressive' capitalism may seem at a particular time, as soon as it is

challenged it reveals itself as ultimately based on naked barbarism.

Looking at the French situation we also see the impotence of the traditional left leadership. The capitalist press, so fond of attributing all opposition as a 'communist plot', is forced to admit that when the students first took to the streets the French Communist Party dismissed them as 'adventurers' (just as the British Communist Party dismissed the organisers of the March 17 Grosvenor Square demonstration).

Of course, when the student demonstrations were massive successes, the French Communists were forced to revise their line but in spite of their climbing on the bandwagon the libertarian nature of the movement is evident.

No directives are being issued from on high. Instead the students have seized the Paris Odeon for use as a forum to discuss revolutionary strategy freely. The true danger of Communist influence is that it will lead to a repetition of the events of 1936 when French capitalism was shaken by another wave of stay-in strikes and the French Communists diverted the militancy into support of the liberal 'Popular Front' whose compromises so demoralised the French workers that it was an easy

thing for Fascism to triumph in 1940.

Today this is a similar threat. Moscow is currently for 'peaceful co-existence' and would be greatly embarrassed by the participation of Communists in a social revolutionary movement in France particularly in view of the friendly relations between Russia and the Gaullist regime.

But, sell-out or no sell-out, the French workers and students have demonstrated the insecurity of the system which we fight. All over the

Western world a new revolutionary movement is being built. In Germany the SDS is the only real opposition to the coalition. In Poland demonstrations have shaken the Gomulka regime. In the USA the government arms itself for war in the cities this summer. And in Britain events such as the Grosvenor Square demonstration have shown that the potential for a similar movement exists. Soon, perhaps, it may be Wilson's turn to tremble.

ROGER SANDELL.

Don't Forget about them!

WHILE REPRESSION GROWS in Spain, since the events of May 1, De Gaulle and the French police go out of their way to contribute to the maintenance of the Franco dictatorship.

Five anti-Franco militants, residents of France for some time, have been given an expulsion order without any explanation other than the classical 'security reasons'.

In spite of their status as political refugees, the Ministry of Interior has not hesitated in putting these measures into practice. Our comrades have been placed under 'town arrest'; their place of residence has been chosen for them. One of them, living in Tarbes, has had to move to Quimper, thus losing both his work and his house.

We find that opposing Franco dictatorship is a crime to the French tribunals. This is the sad state to which France has been brought. What suspicious ac-

tivities and deals are going on behind the façade of French democracy?

From today it is urgent to put into action:

An exposure of the repressive measures taken against Antonio ROS, José PEIRATS, José SOS, Placida ARANDA, and Makno CUEVAS, so that these may be lifted;

A demand for a ban on similar repressive actions upon other anti-Franco militants;

EFFECTIVE SOLIDARITY for those who in Spain and the rest of the world are struggling for freedom and the emancipation of the working-class.

COMMITTEE FOR
REVOLUTIONARY SPAIN.
ANARCHIST BLACK CROSS.

(Letters of protest to the French Ambassador and local Vice-Consuls; Air-France is a Government agency susceptible to popular opinion!)

WEEK BY WEEK

MONDAY, MAY 13

PARIS POLICE opened fire when students attacked a police van which had knocked down several of them in the Place Deufert-Rochereau. Negotiations between the North Vietnamese and the Americans began. Both sides seemed prepared for a long stay. Essex University virtually declared itself independent. A meeting of 1,000, both staff and students, voted to set up a 'free university'. Students from the French Academy in London demonstrated in sympathy with their compatriots.

Force was used to evict forty gypsy families at Forest Road, Redbridge, near London. Their caravans were forced open with crowbars and they were pulled out.

TUESDAY, MAY 14

Sorbonne students opened the University to the population, inviting 'the workers to come and discuss with them the problems of the University'. All demonstrators who were arrested have been released. A demonstration of nationalist youths took place in the Champs-Élysées.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15

The Home Office denied that the Government would impose internal movement control on immigrants of Commonwealth origin.

THURSDAY, MAY 16

The French Prime Minister appealed to the population to resist 'anarchy'. Students at Enfield College of Technology protested against the decision of the academic board to impose a 10% quota on overseas students. Fifty Oxford students distributed leaflets outside the Cowley car factories, defying a ban by the Proctors. They are supporting the engineers' wage claim. Mr. Michael Inwood, a philosophy don, is supporting them. Suggestions for a temporary halt in immigration were rejected by the Home Secretary.

FRIDAY, MAY 17

Pilots of BOAC began a work to rule, 48 hours earlier than originally planned, as a protest against the allegation on Wednesday by Sir Giles Guthrie, the airline Chairman, that they had urged him to 'cook the books' over their productivity claim.

The pound sank to a new low. The franc is also in trouble. A fresh outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease occurred at Maes-fan-y-Giwyden farm, near Oswestry. The Heathrow immigration officers who

supported Enoch Powell are to be let off with a strong reprimand. Noise of aircraft may compel the composer Benjamin Britten to move to Ireland from Aldeburgh, Suffolk. Three of the 42 boy soldiers who walked out of the Parachute Regiment depot at Aldershot have been discharged from the Army. All have been fined sums up to six guineas.

In a gesture of non-violent protest, a group of students squatted in the middle of Tavistock Square to protest against the hypocrisy of the government. Mr. Wilson was unveiling a statue of Gandhi in commemoration of his (Gandhi's) birth.

Several thousand students marched for the second time in 24 hours from the Sorbonne to the Renault works. France was faced with a radio and television stoppage. The Greek Left refuses to be responsible for the safety of tourists in Greece. The two main underground movements, Democratic Defence and the Patriotic Front, have issued a joint statement warning that tourists will be considered as sympathetic to the régime.

The suspensions on three Essex students were lifted. Enfield College dropped the foreign quota plan. A country landowner offered his estate in Shropshire for a multiracial housing centre.

SATURDAY, MAY 18

Ralph Schoenman was arrested in Dublin, and is to be deported back to Italy. He is said to have been attempting to enter Britain.

SUNDAY, MAY 19

Two million workers are now on strike in France. The government had no intention of forcibly returning immigrants who had settled in Britain, said the Home Office.

The revolt of the students and workers in France was part of a world-wide ferment, said Lord Brockway, addressing the Movement for Colonial Freedom. A disastrous racial war was inevitable in Rhodesia and South Africa, which perhaps might spread to Britain.

Hippies are being expelled from Laos. The government is 'disturbed' by the reputation they were giving the country.

Hundreds of Madrid students fought the police after 6,000 had attended a performance by Raimon, Spain's protest singer. Banners representing Che Guevara were carried.

Vietcong guerillas made a rocket attack on the heart of Saigon.

Sinking Ship?

EVERYONE'S TALKING about the death of the Labour Party. Is it really doomed or does the rumour rest on customary Tory gestures at Opposition? A few straws in the wind indicate that a real split is, in fact, imminent.

A Labour MP, Stan Newens of Epping and Harlow, has been publicly challenged on his stand in advocating socialism (whatever that is) and still remaining a member of the British political party which is capable of destroying an unprecedented number of people and which has proved itself the more efficient capitalist party of the two. In *Peace News* on 15.3.68 an attack was made on his position.

In response to a letter by Stan Newens and 44 of his hypocritical colleagues calling for a big Aldermaston to 'force upon our Labour Government new policies for nuclear disarmament and peace', an open letter, signed by 40 old regulars of Aldermaston indicated that pressure was not enough and that 'the State will never willingly abandon its major weapon of coercion'. This resulted in a long dispute in the pages of *PN* on the truth or not of the reply.

It interests us here only in that something has happened since then which is a clue to future action. Mr. Newens has openly stated his willingness to resign from his party. Couple this with the fact that his constituency is being divided and that he recently moved to the Labour stronghold of his area... in an attempt to take the local party with him?

This is one case. Nothing is definite. Is it a sign of the times? This month's *Sanity* contains an article by Anthony Arblaster which suggests the old thing... a new party, perhaps after Wilson's defeat at the next election. True or not, there will be a falling off from the ranks of the LP. When it happens, we must ensure we are there to avoid any further parties springing up.

Alberola to go on Hunger-Strike

FIJL BRUSSELS reports that comrade Octavio Alberola, who was arrested and found guilty on the charges of illegal entry and carrying arms in Belgium, is considering further action in order to secure political asylum there. He has elected to remain in prison although the three months' term of imprisonment has already been served, as there is a deportation order against him. It is now two weeks since he has replied to the Belgian authorities and has had no reply from them. He has decided to go on hunger-

strike on May 22 if he is not released and allowed to go free pending the decision of the Minister of Justice.

The FIJL asks all comrades to protest about his treatment to the Belgian authorities and point out the remarkable contrast between the treatment given to Alberola as compared to the sanctuary given to Colonel Goddard of the OAS who was actively assisted by Belgian authorities in the supply of false identity papers.

Dollar Leaflets for the Queen

THE AUTHORITIES' attempt to stop political protest by resorting to finicky prosecutions by using odd interpretations of the law is threatening to rebound against them in the case of Stuart Christie and the dollar leaflets. An unusually courageous article in the *Observer* last Sunday brought the case now well into the open.

This is no less than a political prosecution, which aims to limit the activities of our comrade. The authorities were probably hoping to smuggle this case into the courts as they did with Terry Chandler—and even then they only got a conditional discharge. But following Tony Smythe's speech at the NCCL's conference and reports in the *Sunday Telegraph* and the *Guardian* and now in the *Observer*, the authorities must be beginning to feel foolish about the stupidity of their decision to prosecute. A protest movement around this issue is beginning to emerge. A woman

comrade was warmly applauded at last week-end's VSC national committee meeting when she appealed for help in this matter. At East Anglia University a demonstration is planned (according to the *Guardian*) when the Queen visits the University.

All correspondence on further activities to the LFA. JOHN RETY.

WORKERS & STUDENTS

ANARCHIST ALLIANCE

DEFEND

THE FRENCH
REVOLUTION

Meeting Speakers' Corner
Sunday May 27 5 p.m.

Three Types of Resistance

THE IDEA of resistance is to make it impossible for society to continue a bad routine—and to awaken its better judgment. We assume that the Americans do not 'really' will the Vietnam war but are morally asleep and brainwashed. If in fact they are so complacent, arrogant or callous that they do will it or don't care about it, we have to talk not about resistance but exile, going underground or civil war. But it seems to us, rather, that there has been usurpation by a hidden government which makes policy, and that an awakened populace can throw it off.

The presence or absence of violence in such populist resistance is not of the essence, but the amount of violence IS of the essence. The body politic does not consist of clashing billiard balls; one cannot change minds and will by physical attack. Physically attacked, a policeman or soldier responds routinely with tear gas and bayonet, but the aim is to get him to respond as man and fellow citizen. Nevertheless, if resistance is determined and especially if it is massive, there is bound to be a certain amount of violence. Let me spell this out.

(1) In the first place, confronted by people who say and act, 'To the best of our ability we won't let you continue', a soldier or policeman, or the draft board or Dean who summons them, is bound at first to respond routinely as if attacked. The hope is that if we persist they cannot continue, because people do not really MEAN the whole package: so many jailed, hurt, gassed—police on the campus, martial law, the social atmosphere poisoned. They will have to think it over.

(2) But given the complacency, callousness and sheepishness of any people, and certainly of the Americans, there is unfortunately an advantage to a certain amount of violence; it wakes people up and makes them understand that the matter is serious. We see that the TV and press mainly want to notice incidents of violence. It seems that in non-violent civil rights protests it did not hurt to have some Black Panthers in the wings. Authorities will initiate the violence anyway if they feel threatened; the question is what is the right amount of provocation. If there is none, people are not really awakened and authorities sink back into another routine of carting off limp bodies. If there is too much, people do not think it over but promptly become routinely violent, which is second nature to them anyway. Certainly we do not WANT to frighten, panic or compel anybody.

(3) In a massive demonstration there is bound, mathematically, to be sporadic violence. In the heated atmosphere of crowds and troops of police and soldiers there is plenty of fear and panic on both sides. Almost invariably the police lose their cool first and one thing leads to another, but this is understandable, for they begin in a passive state, they are outnumbered, and they have no conviction or idea about what they are for. Having set up merely formal boundaries that are spontaneously disregarded by excited people, policemen panic and become brutal. Morally, in my opinion, this sporadic violence is neither right nor wrong, though sad. The co-presence of a mass of aroused citizens and numerous representatives of authority is an exalted experience, but it entails broken heads and ugly scenes. It would be better if smart-aleck police technicians did not also invent booby-traps and if young hotheads did not act their age; but these things are inevitable.

(4) There are also Nazi, Birchite, Teamster counter-demonstrators, and resentful sailors spoiling for a fight. So far, at least, the evidence is that the police put these down. The TV, however, plays them up tremendously as if they were equal adversaries, though the ratio is a thousand to one.

(5) I must now turn to the violent on 'our' side who are wrong in principle. First, there are those who want disorder for its own sake as part of a theory of general (world) breakdown and insurrection. These are Maoists, Trotskyists, etc., who hold that there can be no decent society except by world upheaval. They do not want the Vietnam war itself to stop—they do not believe it can stop; they prefer to aggravate it for a greater future good. This is a respectable theory; there is, unhappily, evidence for it. I profoundly disagree with it—mankind has gone this route for thousands of years—but the problem is how to cope with its presence in our demonstrations, since, as a populist, I also profoundly support the principle of excluding nobody. I don't know.

(6) And there is the violence caused by young people, Oakland style, who want to stop the Vietnam war by tiny minority puches, 'taking over' or burning down draft boards, blocking traffic, derailing troop trains, numerically draining the recruitment of soldiers sufficiently to make an appreciable difference. Some of this is a misreading of Ernesto Guevara's guerrilla tactics devised for hill country among friendly peasants. It is not, however, mere fantasy, if the guerrillas are relevant to the conditions: in a complex technology, a small group of alienated Ph.D.'s and daring helpers CAN produce a shambles. There are plenty of mad scientists and high young computers around, not all in government employment, though most. But a shambles is not 'creative disorder'.

But I must not lose my perspective about these activists, although they bug me. The Oakland young are not thinking about poisoning the water of American cities and causing major power failures; it is stupid to argue them to their 'logical conclusions'. To be a Provo pain in the neck to both the police AND the peace movement is not a mortal sin and perhaps such people do more good than harm by adding hugely to the accumulation of troubles to society caused by the Vietnam war. Despite the alarming editorials in the *Times*, I doubt that the Americans are outraged by them.

More attractive and potentially more effective is the opposite alternative of the young: non-violent terrorism—for example, when a draft-card burner is arraigned, five others burn their cards in the courtroom. Such a programme draws on the strongest single energy of young people today, their fantastic peer-group solidarity against irrational authority. It can be effective if the government is finally forced to meet the challenge and make widespread prosecutions; that moment, I think, is at hand.

We cannot hold back acts of indignation and outrage; they justify themselves as a part of the elementary stuff of humanity. And as the last years have shown, it is hard to restrain the impatience of people who feel themselves powerless while horrors continue. Yet in general, we must use the tactics of opposition that in themselves do not prevent the reconstruction of a better society. In the end, all will have to live in community again. For this, a confronting conflict, mainly non-violent, is better than either false peace or violence. Further, the challenge to authority is itself a creative political act in modern societies which have been vastly over-centralized and brainwashed. Best of all is to fight in groups and with methods of organization that we want to live with if we win, and to pinpoint for attack those evils that we really want to get rid of permanently.

These have been commonplace topics which I repeat in order to make clear (also to myself) where I stand. Let me

The twelve hundred draft cards turned in on October 16, plus the thousands of statements of complicity and the pledges of war-tax refusal, are citizenly resistance. It goes without saying that they are statements of moral conscience, but their deliberate purpose and obvious effect is to challenge the legal structure—the system of trust, contract and compliance—that makes government possible. It is not necessary (or possible) physically to deplete the armed forces or bankrupt the Treasury. We who resist in this way are usually asserting by our challenge that we are legitimate and the government is illegitimate. And we have—though fearfully, for the penalties are severe—welcomed a test in the courts, hoping that when everything is duly and publicly aired, we shall be vindicated. The always-emerging meaning of the law will support us, just as the civil rights

Resisting academics have done better, in using faculty power against the draft tests and class listings, backing up resisting students and refusing to discipline them, and opposing war contracts. But they have not yet, to my knowledge, begun the long-overdue campaign to free the major universities from the incubus of military-industrial financing. Since the present university expansion is largely founded on this, such a campaign would be a showdown. An important case in point is the usual faculty mishandling of student protests against the Dow Chemical recruiters. Faculty members may abhor the manufacturer of napalm and the defoliants, but they hesitate to exonerate the students from discipline because of the need to preserve 'free speech' or because if the Peace Corps and Macy's and SNCC are allowed to recruit, so must Dow be allowed. But these other

fessional consequences.

My point is not that professionals should be 'radicalized', but that they should come on as authentic professionals, autonomous and ethically responsible. (This is, of course, what Ralph Nader, Rachel Carson, Lewis Mumford, my brother and others have been saying.) In my opinion, it is unacceptable for a professional to deviate a jot from professional obligations and standards for even the best of causes. But since it is the genius of our society to co-opt the professions to subserve money and authority, for a professional to be authentic means to be in conflict. And since the system of institutions is interlocked and centralized, it is impossible to be in conflict without being gradually involved with general reform and even revolution. This approach to becoming revolutionary has one great advantage over 'radicaliza-



trespassers became legal. Naturally the government has been loath to pick up the challenge and has tried to pick off individuals as convenient, in order to deter. From the mass draft-card burning of April 15, there has still been only one arrest (Gary Rader), and on October 16 the marshals and the Attorney General tried to refuse the turned-in cards. But here again it is clear that the climate has changed and we are getting across. Since late October there has been a flurry of subpoenas to the Grand Jury. Will the government finally order a mass trial of the draft refusers, AND INCLUDE THE OLDER PEOPLE WHO EGGED THEM ON AND ARE LARGELY RESPONSIBLE ANYWAY? We shall see.

But occupational, professional, institutional resistance has so far been feeble. I mean action springing from what a man works at and the function he performs in the fabric of society. For many people, if not most, their vocations are what they are most concerned, what they know most about, care most about, and where they have the most influence. And inevitably, in an interlocked and centralized society like ours, it is impossible to practice most vocations without connecting with the war system. Yet workers and professionals, who may resist in demonstrations and take part in civil disobedience, go on with their jobs as ordinary.

I will merely mention as the most obvious and probably most important group the unionized workmen in war industries and the scientists and engineers; these may be opposed to the war and yet do not quit. I cannot dig this.

organizations are not an overwhelming threat to the essence of the University; the military-industrial corporations are such a threat and must be purged—just as the McCarthy witch hunt was such a threat and Harvard finally simply barred the door against it. This year 86% of the money for Research and Development is for military purposes!

The doctors who came to Dr. Levy's defence, refusing to practice phony political medicine, did well. In general, it is a touchy question how physicians can resist: if they become politically involved, they lose the immunity which entitles them to the impartial compassion necessary for the practice of medicine altogether. Yet there must be some way for them to try to prevent the ghastly situation where useless and immoral horrors are committed and they then feebly do the best they can.

Consider, again, a typical group of professionals strongly and actively opposed to the war, the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, of which I am an associate. Some of us, by our expertise and connections, are continually and even intimately in contact with government policy-makers. In these professional contacts, were there not opportunities for confrontation and resistance during October 16-21? One of us spoke at the Lincoln Memorial, others were in the crowd; but, in my opinion, it would have been better for a few of us to have been making it a little more lively in MacNamara's or William Bundy's office, with whatever supporting voices one could muster in. Naturally such behaviour might have had unpleasant pro-

cesses. The dissident professional has a more concrete and knowledgeable programme of what needs to be done to reconstruct a decent society.

The professional dissident in his own terms is likely to be less passionately committed than the 'radicalized' professional, the one who devotes himself directly to hot causes like community development, peace action, etc. But I think he tends to be more enduringly committed, and he has more far-reaching and daring ideas. If activism has no room for authentic and absorbed professionals and does not use them on their own terms, it is a loss all round.

Let me say a word also about professional students. The New Left has been urging students to leave school and get into the world of real conflict. This certainly makes sense for many students who are wasting their time in universities and should never have been there. But for those who are potentially authentic professionals—who are good at something and want to build livable neighbourhoods, improve health, report the news, teach children, explore the unknown, find the right use of new technology—the best advice is still Prince Kropotkin's:

Think about the kind of world you want to live and work in. What do you need to know to help build that world? Demand that your teachers teach you that.

Then, in their own professional terms, most such students will also soon resist the Vietnam war and enter other areas of conflict, and may carry some of their teachers along. PAUL GOODMAN.

WOBBLY

BLACK POWER by Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton. Jonathan Cape. 30s.

ONE WILL NOT FIND a tightly logical, well-formulated ideology in this book, because the Black Power idea and ideal was not worked out from reading philosophical tomes in a luxury flat or the British Museum; it has grown from the day-to-day experiences of the struggle of Afro-Americans to gain their freedom. It has changed and will continue to change as the black people of America will continue to have experiences, taking the right path or the wrong path towards the solution of their problems. But the book, of course, is about Black Power today, as seen by the authors, and one can find in it aspects with

which one would agree and those which one would criticise. Here is reformism and revolutionism, parliamentarism and anarcho-communism.

These Black Power people see a parallel in their struggle and those of the various 'National Liberation Fronts' which have and are taking place in various parts of what is called 'The Third World'. In this they do not seem to have any feeling that the conditions and freedom of black people in Africa could have been improved had the struggle and the organisations of struggle taken different forms and had different ends other than that of establishing bourgeois republics.

They find a parallel because they see themselves subject to political and economic colonialism. For example, in some areas black people are a majority,

and here they suffer from indirect rule: the black establishment only having as much power as the white establishment will allow, and in the ghettos most shops are white-owned; resources, in the shape of money, are taken out of the ghettos, but not put back there. The situation is, however, different in that it would be difficult, to say the least, to establish an independent black republic in the USA. So the hard geographical facts force the authors to consider other means for the black people in America to acquire their freedom; push them onto a different road; a road whose end is not an independent republic, nor 'the domination and exploitation of other groups, but rather an effective say in the total power of society'.

However, in those administrative areas where Afro-Americans are in a majority, the Black Power people want their party to take over, by vote, the governmental administrative and judicial machinery: a machinery that was built for the purpose of exploitation. They have

Continued on page 6

Why the Rightist Backlash?

NOTHING DOES or could demonstrate more the divorce between the Left and the workers than the support given Enoch Powell. It's no use our burying our heads and asking the facts to go away (as no doubt the majority of 'revolutionary' socialists will do), we have to face the fact fairly and squarely that there is widespread support for racism, support which shies away from more or less openly fascist groups but which welcomes any politician of the two main parties who uses racism. We had a foretaste of this in the Back Britain's Bosses lark, but that was merely a prelude. We have to see that the disillusion with Labour has not led many of the working class to the Left but has disheartened the more honest social democrats in industry and as a result the fascists have been able to creep out of their holes, and workers are to be heard cheering Nabarro and Powell.

Since Labour became the Government, the greater part of the revolutionary left has, while mouthing clichés about the dictatorship of the proletariat, turned its back on the British working class. Mao, Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Malcolm X, Stokely Carmichael, Abdul Malik and a host of others such, have all been produced as revolutionary leaders fitted to our day, all in some way or other having put (probably in some lesser measure than Debray, though not than Fanon) some way other than relying on the working class of making social revolution. The ideas of each have been used as sticks to beat the bourgeoisification of our own working class, and to prove that the working class of the metropolitan countries is incurably reactionary, anyway quite irrelevant to modern revolution, and after such hectoring British workers are told that the most they can possibly do to aid revolution is to pass measures in favour of the NLF or perhaps take part in a demo organized by the Vietnam Solidarists.

WE HAD WARNING!

Anyone who studied the thirties, or who even studied the growth of the various post-war fascist groups in this country, knows that fascism flourishes where social-democracy has failed and there is no alternative socialist force arguing against racism or where milk and water reformists duck the issues compromising with prejudice rather than meeting it head on and where revolutionaries, instead of campaigning in working-class areas, make blanket condemnation of all non-revolutionaries as being objectively fascist, and so avoid arguing with them.

Therefore when the Labour Government killed the Labour Party, it left a vacuum in industry and in working-class constituencies, which for sheer reason of numbers could only partially and inadequately be

filled by the propaganda of the revolutionary groups. Views such as Black Power or the Guevarism of the Castrati were produced to justify complete neglect of all mass propagandizing, and radicals took to a phoney radicalism, an activism not designed to win converts but which purported to challenge the state, even though the activists were a minority, on behalf of the many.

ONE BIG UNION STILL THE ANSWER!

Many comrades have rightly pointed to the fact that all too often advocacy of Negro integration, even when the advocates are in the long term socialists, is done on the basis of let's get integration first and struggle for social change later and this, besides lacking a revolutionary spirit, is impossible as it ignores the economic causes of white racism.

However those who have pointed this out have tended to retreat into tail-ending advocates of Black Power, ignoring the fact that if a 2% minority can demand power against the majority, then the majority will retaliate in kind. Where such comrades are anarchists or at all knowledgeable of pre-bolshevik syndicalism this is inexcusable, as the Wobblies were a living embodiment of the integration of differing cultures and interests, of craftsmen workers and migrant labourers, of white Anglo-Saxons, Negroes, Mexicans, European immigrants, Irish and Asiatics. The One Big Union was integration in practice, and at the same time set out to solve the economic causes of race prejudice. It may or may not be that some other organizational form could more adequately fulfil this job in today's conditions, but if none other are suggested here was one that did marvels in its day. Far more than in the days in which the IWW flourished, the major contradiction of capitalism today lies not in exploitation, but in those who are excluded from an equal chance to be exploited, who are homeless, permanently unemployed and so forth; and for all of these the first necessity is the chance to join the ranks of the organized and established working class.

Naturally one cannot build a syndicalist movement out of thin air, and no serious socialist would think for one moment that one could. But if it is seen that the main reason that the greater part of the Left have effectively turned their backs on the working class is the lack of any real perspective of how, having got a number of people disillusioned with the Labour Party, one can progress to socialism, then the concept that somewhere along the way a Wobbly-

type organization would help and that all activity ought to be propagandist aimed at forwarding the day when this would be a possibility, the actions that would follow would conform more closely to sense.

But the real tragedy is that not only is there any immediate hope that the bulk of the Left will turn back to the working class but there are signs that sections who have till now refrained from pretending that they can overthrow the British state and build socialism against the wishes of the British working class, now look as if they are trying to get on the bandwagon created by those who have always thought in this way. A touchstone for this is as always those who start to equate self-determination for the Vietnamese with uncritical support for the NLF nationalist struggle. The ILP Conference has just made this step. The Solidarity Group (perhaps subconsciously motivated by the similarity of their name with that of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign), has just issued a pamphlet using techniques of distortion and character assassination which their leaders presumably learnt when they were the SLL bully boys, and which attacks practically everyone but themselves for not supporting the VSC demo—some of those so attacked had publicized the demo, and others, attacked by implication or even openly, were on the organizing committee (in my view—no commendation), though it must have been news to most *Solidarity* readers that that paper had any time at all for VSC. Anyway, these anti-bureaucratic advocates of mass spontaneity now tail-end those who ignore the masses and the limit of whose are as a Stalinist bureaucratic state.

However we must remember that

this is not the only touchstone and there are other indications that revolutionary Leninists are trying to horn in on the Maoist bonanza and making despicable compromises to do this. Lest anyone suggest that I am deliberately covering up tendencies to this among my anarchist comrades (other than the Easter anarchists who are not part of the anarchist movement), let me say that while I know of the occasional enthusiast for Black Power spokesmen, I know of none that has deliberately turned his back on the working class; it has been suggested that the First of May Group has. Apart from the fact that I have not the faintest idea who they are, what their previous views were, or whether they engage in any mass educational work when they are not engaged in sabotage, two out of three of their cyclostyled open letters would appear to contradict such an assessment; so, though I personally do not think the time is ripe for their methods, I am not prepared to make a political judgement of them.

But, having said this, one has to admit that remarkably little anarchist activity has openly posited the integration of gypsies, of the homeless (to name but two instances where anarchists have justifiable reason to be proud of what they have done) into a mass movement aimed at winning workers in every field under a united banner. Certainly no easy task, as obviously an OBU wherein the depressed and excluded tenth were predominant would tend to frighten away other workers and so integration would not be achieved in it; but comrades who applauded when an inter-racial organization expelled its white members might now do a little thinking.

L.O.

WORD SPACE Esperanto Notes

IF YOU ARE going to judge or criticize the artificial, but international language Esperanto, it's necessary, first of all, to know it. The writer of this article has been in the Esperanto movement—sometimes without much hope—for over two generations.

This universal language was, at first, of petit bourgeois origin, but all the same, I, an anarchist, like it. You could say to me that a person who is against all rulers should avoid getting mixed up with a micro-bourgeois movement. Sometimes, there's a good reason for this criticism, but it's still a good idea that everyone should be able to understand each other despite all the different languages in use. All the same, linguistic understanding is not everything—husband and wife speak the same language, but that doesn't prevent the plates flying at times! Moral comprehension is also of some importance.

Yet one has to accept the idea of men and people communicating through an international language, if only to eliminate 'treacherous translators'. Use of a language directly can avoid many grave misunderstandings. That it should be used by both bourgeois and proletarians is a separate question, though, in any case, such a situation is inevitable.

The inventor of Esperanto, Dr. Zamenhof, was a man of the so-called middle class... and I have spoken in this language with clerics, rabbis and other people addicted to the capitalist system. I used to say to myself that I had nothing in common with these types, and I dreamt of a proletarian Esperanto movement. However, I eventually discovered that such an organisation already exists, the SAT—the Universal Anti-Nationalist Association. This, to some extent, fulfils my dream, except that it is not very powerful, since it is not tolerated in the 'Soviet-democratic' countries; and in Portugal not even Esperanto is allowed. Hence, propaganda for Esperanto is almost impossible in totalitarian countries, whatever their colour. As far as they can, however, the members of the SAT meet each year in different countries and exchange impressions and work together. What a pleasure it is to encounter understanding amongst people from different

countries!

The other universal Esperanto association, the UEA claims to be entirely neutral. This year the UEA held its conference in Madrid, where neutrality reached its peak in offering the presidency to General Francisco Von Franco. Honours for everyone, it seems, including the chamber pot!

In the face of facts like these, friends of liberty who are not Esperantists will say that Esperanto can go to the devil. There's no need to go on so, friends. In every language you can say good things and bad things. If some tyrants hinder Esperanto this is a sign that it is a vehicle of progress, and if another Esperanto movement, like the UEA, is reactionary, others, such as the SAT, are a vital factor for the advance of the species. An ideal should never be abandoned because some inferior people try to soil it.

Against the so-called neutralists of the USA we protest energetically because their adulation of tyrants is against the spirit of the movement, and of Zamenhof. This 'neutralist' act of support for the Spanish dictator is an anti-Esperantist calamity. To honour Franco is to insult Spaniards. This 'civilisation', stuck together by Moors, Falangists, Carlists, Nazis and 'Bersaglieri' from Spanish blood, should not be accepted by the gentlemen of the UEA.

Esperanto's fortune is bound up with the growth of the anti-nationalist and proletarian movement, a well-defined entity which has no connection with reactionary societies of the UEA type, which visibly discredit Esperanto.

What matters is to make positive use of the facilities offered by Esperanto. It is easy to learn, there is hardly any grammar, and pronunciation is very easy. It is the only language which offers us the means to understand each other without using translators. International correspondence between comrades on interesting topics opens out wide perspectives, including anarchy itself. Workers who know Esperanto can become ardent internationalists, that is to say they can become independent of narrow party paths and reach wider horizons.

The use of a national language, however extensive it may appear to be, offers serious inconveniences owing to the greater part of its potential audience being ignorant of it. Neither English nor French offer any guarantee or internationality, since there exist other populations which, taken all together, are a

LEVELLERS & DIGGERS

Dear Editors,

I keep hoping that one of these days we might have a discussion in the pages of FREEDOM not on a point-scoring basis but in a serious attempt to get at the truth. Is this too much to hope for?

I was not 'attacking' Arthur Uloth. I was answering certain things he said because the English Revolution happens to be a subject into which I have put years of work and it seemed to me that a reply was called for.

From the radical point of view there are two quite different ways of looking at the Revolution and both are valid. They are to consider the separate and different contributions to progress made by the Levellers and the Diggers.

The Levellers were concerned with politics and freedom at the immediate practical level, i.e. with defeating Stuart tyranny and creating a new and better political system for the future. In common with most people of the radical tradition, then and now, they were not anarchists. They cannot be blamed for not being what they never set out to be!

The Diggers were utopians who went off to create their own community at St. George's Hill and dropped out of political society. They were anarchists but I don't know if they ever actually described themselves as such. Perhaps Jim Duke or Nicolas Walter might take that point up.

It is difficult to say which the Establishment of the day disliked the most. Both were destroyed by force, the Levellers at the Battle of Burford in 1649 and the Diggers about the same time by a landlord-police type operation exploit-

ing local peasant conservatism. The Russians and the Chinese, the new 'conquistadores' of the age, could just as easily impose their languages owing to their military arrogance and their vast spaces.

It seems clear there is no national language equal to Esperanto. Our own comrade, Rudolf Rocker, used Yiddish to communicate with Jewish anarchists. He used it in the International Forum but in other spheres he had to resort to the national languages in vogue.

Objectively, there is nothing better than Esperanto for international contacts

and for our own internal purposes. The language is, certainly, artificial, but it is simple and practical and can be learned in six, or at the most twelve weeks. When a Spaniard uses Esperanto in international circles nobody can say he 'speaks French like a Spanish cow', and no Spaniard can say a Frenchman speaks Spanish like a 'pig from Aubernia'.

CH. HOCHAUSER AMONY.

(From *Le Combat Syndicaliste*)
Translator's note: If people used Esperanto I could go to the cinema instead of translating this!

trans.: j.w.s.

meaning.)

The Leveller regiments' refusal to go to Ireland or to disband, to abduct the King and draft THE AGREEMENT OF THE PEOPLE culminated in the great army rendezvous at Newmarket at the beginning of June 1647. It was at that meeting that the march on London was decided. It was then and only then that Cromwell joined in again. He rejoined the revolution when the Levellers by their deeds had made it a going concern. The tragedy is that the Levellers needed the military and political know-how of Cromwell, Fairfax and the other Independents. Thus the Revolution was both made and unmade at the same time. Cromwell used the Levellers and then trod them into the ground.

It was after crushing the Levellers in 1649 that Oliver massacred the Irish. Burford was the Kronstadt of the English Revolution and the situation was quite different after it. 1649 cannot be compared with 1647/48.

The Levellers successfully opened up the struggle that was to last for another 50 years until by the 1690s there was achieved in England the political and religious toleration that we have enjoyed (more or less) ever since. This was an achievement of historic proportions and the American and French Revolutions of the following century trod paths mapped out in England and even earlier in the Netherlands. To this day no absolutist (or totalitarian as we would now call him) has ever re-established himself in any of these four political cultures. This is the contemporary index of the Leveller achievement and of the radical tradition to which it is fundamental. It is part of that tradition that it never takes its freedom for granted or rests on its laurels.

Cambridge

PETER CADOGAN.

Revolution & The Levellers

THE ANARCHIST and other libertarian revolutionary movements are like a man attempting to cross a deeply flowing mountain torrent at its most difficult point. Again and again he is swept off his feet, and only just manages to regain the bank from which he set forth. He is bruised and battered, soaked to the skin and thoroughly miserable, but nothing will induce him to seek some other way of getting across. He could go upstream, till he reached the source if necessary, and walk round dryshod. Or he could go downstream till he found a ferry or a bridge. Or he could build a boat, or get hold of an aeroplane, or anything. But no, back he comes to the same spot, and again and again he tries to wade across.

Revolutions have been attempted over and over again. If they have not been crushed by the existing regime, they have ended by setting up new tyrannies in place of the old. Still people keep advocating the social revolution. They study the revolutions of the past, and explain how they went wrong, hoping that the same mistakes will not be made again. Each new situation is just that little bit different, so in fact revolutionaries can and do make the same sort of mistakes, even if they are not absolutely identical.

Isn't 1649, and 1789, and 1848, and 1871, and 1917, and 1936 enough? Has it got to happen yet again, and again, and again? Is there some mystical force which prevents us trying anything new? The only revolutions that have ever succeeded at all in achieving their stated aims have been wars of national liberation.

To be an anarchist does one have to believe in social change brought about by revolution? Can't we try to undermine existing society by setting up our own communities? I am inspired to write this by I. R. Mitchell's comments on my review of James Duke's book, which seems to me to exemplify the revolutionary attitude perfectly.

Were the Levellers a minority? Look, I don't know the population statistics of seventeenth century England, but I do know that the majority always gets its way if it is sufficiently determined. Revolutionaries always like to feel that the majority of the population, 'the people', 'the workers', are with them. To read revolutionary writings you would think

that most of the population were on the verge of revolt, held back only by... what? The revolt never comes.

I used to have a large number of issues of the old war-time predecessor of FREEDOM called *War Commentary*. Over and over again, particularly towards the end of the war, prophecies were made of a revolution that was soon to break out. That's over twenty years ago now. What happened to that revolution?

Most people I meet outside Left-wing circles, whether working or middle class, are very reactionary in their attitudes. These attitudes are mitigated by a sort of Orwellian 'decency', but I would not care to rely too much on it in a crisis.

If the Levellers were not a minority of the population then the conclusion to be drawn from their defeated revolt is even more terrible than the conclusion to be drawn if they were a minority. It is simply this, that a large popular movement can be suppressed fairly easily by a small body of armed and well-organised and ruthless men. That the 'masses', despite their large numbers, can always be held down by a much smaller number of people.

This is the only logical thing one can say. I do not however believe this. What I do believe is that if we had the statistics of those who actively participated in all the great revolutionary struggles and those who did not, we would find that only minorities were seriously engaged on either side. (People often sign petitions and don't do much else.)

In the Russian Revolution the majority of the people, who were peasants, must have continued to cultivate the soil, though the armies marched back and forth. If they had not, the armies would have had nothing to eat. I have no doubt much the same applied during the English Revolution too.

I am not advocating that we should be political quietists, still less am I saying that 'the course of history is determined by the actions... of those at the summit of the social pyramid'. All I am pointing out is that social revolution as a method of achieving a freer and more just society does not work. It has been tried repeatedly and it does not work. Let's try something else for Liberty's sake!

I am not a permanent protester. I would very much like to see a free society coming into being. I have only

vague ideas of how it might be done. We are just wasting our time though trying the revolutionary road.

Most of the points made by I. R. Mitchell have already been dealt with in James Duke's letter a couple of weeks or so ago. The bit about the Irish seems to have stung one or two people, so I will quote chapter and verse. Regarding the massacres at Drogheda and Wexford see page nine of James Duke's book. On page eleven occurs the following, which I quote to show I have not distorted anything:

'The driving force behind the English Revolution was the Puritans and the driving force behind the Puritans was their religion, for every Puritan interested in reforming the government of England there were ten whose sole concern was the reform of the church. Even Lilburne was an opponent of prelatry long before he became an opponent of the government. And although the Levellers appeared to have large numbers of supporters when it came to threats of open warfare most would not fight against a Parliament which had carried out the religious reforms they desired. The other element of the Leveller defeat was shown in Cromwell's repeated exhortations to combine against the Irish. If there was to be more fighting most Englishmen whether Levellers or not preferred to have it in Ireland rather than in England and if anyone was to be killed they preferred it to be Irishmen. Men would cheer for John Lilburne but when it came to a crisis few would fight for him.'

The Irish are a sore point because revolutionaries, who put their trust in the wisdom of the people, can't bear to admit that these same people are sometimes racial bigots, or are simply indifferent to the fate of foreigners. The dockers who marched in support of Enoch Powell for example.

To sum up then, and finish with it. Either the majority of the population, who are after all mostly lower middle class or working class, accept the existing order, even if they grumble at times, and follow their rulers willingly, or the majority are 'natural anarchists' but are always outwitted or overawed by a tiny minority of well organised brutes. I find the second conclusion much the most repulsive, nor does it fit in with my own experience.

ARTHUR W. ULOTH.

NOT SO ANCIENT HISTORY

I DON'T WANT to join the bizarre argument about the English Civil War/Revolution, but there's one word in I. R. Mitchell's article (FREEDOM, 27.4.68) I must comment on. He calls it 'a unique occurrence in our history'. Our history, Mitch? Surely not. In the sense that all humanity is one, yes—but in that case the possessive adjective is superfluous. For the benefit of Scots confused about their history, here is a brief picture of that period.

In 1649 Scotland was a theocracy ruled by a Covenanted Kirk, more Calvinist than Calvin. Heretics were hunted, witches burned, and the people had a foretaste of those torments which lay ahead for all but a chosen few. As for foreign policy, this was summed up by Alexander Leslie, Supreme Commander of the Army: 'Consider what glory it would be before God and man if we were to drive the Catholics out of England and follow them to France, and rally round us all those of the true religion there, and plant, either with consent or by force, our religion in Paris, and thence to Rome, drive out Anti-Christ, and burn the town.'

Leslie's scheme failed for two main reasons: (1) The committee of ministers which travelled with the Army and 'advised' him on everything, and (2) discontent amongst his fanatical troops, who suspected him of being too moderate.

The Kirk's ambition to extend its

DAVE COULL.

Labour Government

LABOUR GOVERNMENT OR SOCIALISM, published by the Socialist Party of Great Britain. Price 1s.

AS WITH their previous pamphlet, *Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism?*, the SPGB make out a very good case for not supporting the Labour Party or a Labour Government. Demolishing a Labour Government is not difficult.

After admitting that many people have come to believe that political parties are all the same, that politics is a sham and not worth supporting, but that in fact 'nothing could be more mistaken', the pamphlet then traces the history of successive Labour Governments.

The first Labour Government existed for less than a year. It was only a minority Government. It could not pass legislation without the support of the Tories and the Liberals. And when these combined against it, it fell. During its period in office, unemployment remained at well over one million and prices rose despite measures which were supposed to lower them. Despite its alleged lack of power, however, the pamphlet points out that it started the building of five new cruisers, was responsible for bombing tribesmen in Iraq, firing on strikers in India and made preparations to declare a state of emergency if a strike of underground workers was not called off. So much for the MacDonald Government of 1924.

The second Labour Government came to office in June 1929. Like the first it was a minority Government, and like the first its Prime Minister was Ramsey MacDonald. It lasted two years. When it came in unemployment stood at 1,164,000; when it went out it had risen to almost 3,000,000. Moreover, during the two years, the Government reduced the wages of its own employees. Altogether four million workers had their wages cut.

In 1945 the Labour Party won a clear majority for the first time. It had 393 MPs in a House of 640. They had real power. The coal mines, railways, gas, electricity, Cables and Wireless, the Bank of England and most of road transport were nationalised. Iron and steel were also taken over during the period of the third Labour Government. Fortunately, unemployment remained low (this was nothing to do with the Government), but the Government did everything in its power to keep wages down. It began a policy of 'wage restraint'. One of its promises was to keep prices stable. They rose 30 per cent. In 1949 a financial crisis developed and after a dozen declarations by Sir Stafford Cripps that the pound would not be devalued, it was devalued by 30 per cent. The Labour Party used troops to break a dock strike, and started to build the British A-bomb. At the 1950 General Election the Attlee Government had its majority reduced

rule to England and beyond brought the inevitable reaction. In 1651 Cromwell invaded Scotland, and to cut a long story short, the English won. The Kirk was horrified by the invaders. They include Arians, Socinians, Pholimians, Familists, Seekers, Antimonians and Polagians; they practise freedom for all except Catholics and Episcopals; a door is opened, and an inlet made, unto the worst of those who bear the name of Christian, yea, unto Jews and Mahometans and Heathens, to converse, and dwell, and profess their religion in this land!

The English troops were, comparatively speaking, a liberalising element. In an age when the pulpit was virtually the only means of communicating ideas, they frequently took it over, and encouraged others to do likewise. Nevertheless, they were hated by the common people. The English Governor, Robert Lilburne, was distressed by this hatred. It is a curious fact that invaders often expect their victims to love them.

With the restoration of the monarchy came also the restoration of the Scots Parliament. The forts which Cromwell had built throughout Scotland were destroyed. The Kirk never regained absolute power, though in a watered-down version it remains to this day a force to be reckoned with, a major prop of the class system, and an ever-present threat to individual liberty.

Nasty Mess at the Dorchester

THAT UNIQUE RATIO of exchange change values as outlined by your correspondent Jack Spratt in Vol. 29 No. 10 has caused me a ton of trouble. Please grant me space to explain.

In my perambulations around London trying 'to get the bread', I dropped into the Dorchester, Park Lane. So I saw the Chief Engineer. He said, 'O.K. Mick, the bread is yours if you do the stoking.' He is a nice man that Chief. I explained to him how when I started stoking 'they' had wooden boilers and iron men. Now 'they' have iron boilers and... 'You're the guy we want,' he said. So then he tells me about 'scratch'. It was good. I started the shift at 2.30 p.m. and took over at 8 p.m. Hope you understand this proletarian jargon.

The boiler-room seemed O.K. Next day a bell rang loudly and I got some fire buckets. The engineer asked what the fire buckets were for. 'Gonna put out the fire,' I sez. He said, 'Naw, it's the shit tank.' So I discovers two big tanks of genuine and correct excreta in the boiler-room. One of these tanks was overflowing. In the boiler-room. In the Dorchester. Underneath the entrance to the kitchen.

Then I discovered that the unchokeable pump was choked up. Meanwhile I had an alternate pump working. Unfortunately it could not take the load suddenly and there was a surplus of the dull yellow substance on the floor. If Jack Spratt had written sooner I would have known what to do. The Stank of England or the Federal Reserve Stank could have got it. Fort Knox is too far away.

I noticed the lawenorder boys around a lot. I suppose they were watching no one brought it out. If anyone was caught the government would introduce flogging. Quicker than the Asian passport bill. Learned judges and barristers would deliberate for months in the High Courts of conveyancing about legal technicalities. It would be worse than dollars for peace. Why? Well, it would prob-

ably be taken from the lawyers' own sanctuary.

Dear reader, don't think that it is a veritable Klondyke or Lena. No gold rushes across Hyde Park please. It is too well guarded. Fact. I will explain how.

The bottoms of these tanks are cleaned out (by hand) once a month. The cleaning out of these tanks has created considerable dissension among the engineering staff. There has been much arguing and bickering about who should have the privilege of doing it. It's worth £1 per hour.

There was one 'engineer' who really fought for his rights. And he was really good. He was the best carrier of buckets of shit that ever walked down Park Lane. It would do your heart good to see him. Shaymus was superb. Chin back, chest out, tummy in, erect each foot and firm each step. Nobly he marched through the boiler house and up the stairs. He then deposited it in a steel van. Fact. I think it went to the Houses of Parliament as there was something about Westminster written on the sides of the van. Fact.

But alas we are all human. And many humans are weak. Shaymus had a weakness. Alcohol. One Saturday the poor fellow had much too much. And he came in on overtime to carry his buckets. The poor fellow was delivering the buckets and he collapsed. Buckets of the dull yellow substance an' all. It was solid from the bottom of the tank. It sure made a nasty mess. He lost his place as champion shit carrier of the Dorchester Hotel. A famous place. He was deprived of his honoured position. He was a sad man.

The chief engineer is a good humane charitable man. We were all one big happy family there. The chief was the Daddy of them all.

But Shaymus was depressed. He got so confused, he put left-handed threaded nuts on with right-handed spanners. The humane chief got to hear about Shay.

The smooth flow of industrial relations was upset. He thought profoundly for some time. The all-wise chief solved the problem. Shay got a better job where he got more money. And he comes to work with yours truly. His beaming happy physiognomy graced our presence.

When he was asked why unchokeable pumps had to be dechoked, he explained that if such things did not happen there would be no necessity for engineers. Unchoking unchokeable pumps. A man can have a vocational interest in his job, and what can a poor igerant stoker say to an engineer?

Thus, while the Duke of Dulittle and the Duchess of Dulless and Lord and Lady Stepladder reclined under a four poster in the arms of Morpheus at 3 a.m., the engineer can be happy unchoking unchokeable pumps. Getting the sh—sorry, effluvia, out of it. The dull yellow substance. Jack Spratt's ratio of exchange values. At the Dorchester. Nearly under the kitchen. An open tank too. When you are dining there, be cautious with the tornado and the chateau-briand. The hors-d'oeuvres is OK.

Yours truly was offered the privilege of carrying the dull yellow substance upstairs. Being an anarchist and not mercenary, I at first declined. Then on volunteering to carry it up on condition that the manager would help me, my offer to do it, freely, was refused. I then got to hear about demarcation of employment. How it holds up the national effort. What a selfish beast I was, etc., etc. Backing Britain? I should read the *Daily Express*. Then I would get ambition. Become a go-getter.

If I would just carry the buckets of shit upstairs, I could rise to the top. As I was just a goddamned anarchist, and not mercenary, I saw that my 'face did not fit' and I left the Dorchester. This seemed to be the crime of the century. But that's another story. Thank you for the space anyhow.

ZENO.

P.N.

Dear Editors,
My letter concerning anarchist viewpoints on Vietnam, the March 17 demo and its effects and FREEDOM's comments on it (April 20) was largely misunderstood or consciously or unconsciously distorted by Christie and Co., Mitchell and Blakeman (April 27). Christie's letter also contained vicious libels. I'll show how. Please compare my letter with the critics' inaccurate versions of it. But first a concession.

LETTERS

Godfrey Featherstone replies to critics

the wrong and clearly reveal their true function and violence. We should learn lessons from the Leveller mutinies and those of 1797 and 1917 and the police strike of 1919, but, if we lie and use violence, violent or non-violent equivalents of these are never going to occur.

Police agents? I've been arrested many times for demonstrating and speaking, helped found the Yorkshire Committee of 100 and organised civil disobedience, helped to organise the Hampstead forces leaflet and have assisted troops to leave, was joint author of the Hampstead Mail Interception and Telephone Tapping which created a national outcry about police methods and am prepared in every way to assist US draft resisters. Christie, who is going on trial for possessing the Vietnam imitation dollar leaflet, should look among his friends and letter co-signatories for a police agent before inventing libels about people he's never met. Will his associates say how we can help him fight this ridiculous charge? One suggestion in previous cases was to present one of these leaflets to a bank asking it to be cashed and then to use the refusal as evidence.

(3) Christie writes: 'Medical aid "to both sides"; send money for General Franco's bedsocks.' No, not bedsocks, but aid for the victims of napalming and mass-bombing and torture by the US and the victims of NLF mines, mortar shells, flame throwers and the dependants whose relatives have been shot in massacres or tortured to death or disembowelled by the NLF, who desperately need help now. Christie and his friends brutally callous attempt at humour at these people's expense reveals their true worth very precisely. The appropriate comment on this (and on Mitchell's comment on the police: 'These people have no claims on our humanity, their lives count for little') comes from J.M.'s front page article on Powell and racialism: 'In politics expediency is all; and when the crunch comes, human beings are nothing.'

(4) Christie calls me a 'liberal' and an 'authoritarian' pacifist 'in the Dick Sheppard tradition' who 'equates anarchism with non-resistant Christianity'. An atheist, I believe in the abolition of all states and every hierarchy of authority by non-violent revolution and in all forms of non-violent direct action, civil disobedience, resistance, coercion and revolution. I disagree strongly with the small minority among pacifists who are 'non-resisters' who rely on and, in many things, submit to 'constitutional authority'. I connect up class, race and international conflicts and identify my pacifism with anarchism, because I believe that nuclear war can be avoided and disarmament achieved by the non-violent abolition of all states. Conflict and struggle can't be eliminated, indeed they must be created sometimes, but I believe the only effective methods to reach anarchist ends are those of non-violence. Christie calls me 'authoritarian', yet it is he who wishes to ban me from FREEDOM, not vice-versa.

(5) I pointed out that, if violent demos continued, some demonstrators or policemen might die. Christie evades the point about demonstrators and asks: 'What would their attitude be to a situation vaguely resembling Spain 1936? "A fascist might be killed..." Spain 1968, cruel and vicious though it is, is not Spain 1936 or Christie would be dead, tortured to death by fascists, or, if he escaped that, possibly killed by treacherous communists. (Comrade Featherstone forgets that Stuart Christie as a foreign national was in a different position to Delgado and Granados who were garotted.—EDS.)

To answer directly, I'd have fought in Spain, but I'm a pacifist now, because the making and spreading of nuclear weapons has totally transformed the historical situation. The political naïveté in even remotely comparing the attempt to break into a London square to break a few windows with Spanish resistance to fascism is scarcely credible. In Britain, 1968, a tiny minority of anarchists divided into nine strands of belief and divided right across them by the violence-non-violence differences has to face its real situation. It must resist authority wherever possible, but its main task is persuasion and education, including non-violent propaganda by deed, in order to make the anarchist movement powerful in numbers. A punch-up, breaking a few windows, even playing with bombs, which may injure or kill innocent people: these are not just irrelevant, they are positive hindrances to anarchism's progress.

That's the situation we've got to work from and, for a long time, the main business needs to be persuasion,

through non-violent 'propaganda by deed' as well as words, to make the anarchist movement powerful in numbers. This won't be done by a punch-up to decide whether or not we can go into a London square to break a few windows—or by playing with bombs which, however careful the preparation, always risks the injury or deaths of innocent people who come on the scene unpredictably.

(6) Christie's confusion is finally exemplified by his description of anarchists 'ranging from the majority view that most anti-war demonstrations should be joined, to those who draw the line at working with the supporters of a Ho Chi Minh victory...' Of course most anti-war demonstrations should be joined, but March 17 was not anti-war, but pro-war, for the military victory of the NLF and the extension of a communist dictatorship. This was the main argument of my letter and the crux of my disagreement with the letters of Christie, Mitchell and Blakeman and the comments of Rety and Hicks in the March 23 issue.

I have no objections at all to anarchists going to the pre-demonstration meeting or to the place where the demo is going to be held to put, in argument, or by selling FREEDOM the 'Neither Washington nor Hanoi' case, but I do object to them joining in the demonstrations for military victory and a communist dictatorship just as I would to them joining 'the people in the streets', if they were dockers supporting racialism or thorough-going fascists.

We are, as Bob Blakeman says, anti-fascist and anti-imperialist, but equally, if we are, in fact, anarchist, we are against communist dictatorships and against communist (state-capitalist) imperialism. Those Marxists and Trotskyists who believe in a dictatorial state (and there are some who don't) are part of the same enemy, not our allies. And it is no good, as Blakeman does, melodramatically writing that 'We know the statist are our enemies, but this time we will be ready when they attack us'. It is during the struggle by such a 'popular front', not afterwards, that statist begin destroying anarchism and that communists destroy their allies, statist or not. This is the repeated experience from the time of the Russian revolution, to the communist attacks and take-over in the Spanish Civil War, to Ho Chi Minh's betrayal of some elements and elimination of all other elements in the Viet-Minh, to the Algerian FLN's wiping out of the MLN and the killing, imprisonment or exile of all other revolutionary elements which has led to Boumedienne's military dictatorship, to what is bound to happen when the NLF take over in Vietnam.

Both the Communists and the Ameri-

cans have already used the March 17 demonstration on their mass media for their own ends. In their reports which we have no effective way of countering, they'll both have given the impression to the majorities in their empires that 'the Left' in Britain is violent, pro-war and for an NLF victory. In the US, they'll have used it to smear our anti-war movement and theirs and to suggest that it was communist inspired and, in the communist countries, including North Vietnam, they'll have used it to suggest that the anti-war movement is communist or sympathetic to communism and to military victory. There will have been no mention whatsoever of anarchists or their policy of 'Neither Washington nor Hanoi'. In Britain we know for certain that the majority of the press have smeared the anti-war movement with the tuggery of a pro-war and violent minority who were a minority even on the March 17 demonstration itself.

(7) I. R. Mitchell complains of 'the repeated assertions that if you are not non-violent you are fraudulent and hypocritical to call yourself an anarchist' and that the formal anarchist movement has not traditionally been non-violent. First, Mitchell has misread what I said. I said and still say that it is hypocritical for anarchists to support in action and effect the extension of a communist dictatorship, while opposing it in words and proposing non-aligned demonstrations. I also wrote of 'thugs who fraudulently appropriate the words "anarchists" and "peace".'

There, I first meant those who do take these labels precisely because they need an outlet for their frustrated violent neuroses: some people calling themselves anarchists in Russia and Spain committed as vicious atrocities as any of their opponents. Secondly, I meant those anarchists who claim to be 'anti-war', but in actual situations are for violence and war when it suits them and against it when it does not. Of course many anarchists have, in the past, committed violence and often, though far from always, have been right to do so, though its effectiveness for their own ends was even then very questionable. In the nuclear age, the whole historical situation has been transformed and anarchist methods have to be transformed to put anarchism into effect, if they are not finally to serve statist ends as they did in all those historical examples Mitchell gives.

FREEDOM's editors wrote that there is 'a need for non-aligned demonstrations in sympathy with the people of Vietnam'. Again, I repeat that I agree absolutely with this. Let's begin to organise such demonstrations and not parasite ourselves onto the demonstrations of people who are as much our enemies as the Western capitalists, demonstrations which are used by capitalists and state-capitalists alike to give the impression to the majority of people who read about them or see them on newsreels that all the demonstrators have precisely the opposite ends to those of anarchists.

Fraternally,
GODFREY FEATHERSTONE.

WYNFORD HICKS.

FIFTH COLUMN

It can happen!

HOW VIOLENT were the students in last week's Battle of Paris? A lecturer who took part in the student demonstrations wrote to the Observer:

The students were neither trained nor armed, and on no occasion did they riot, attack the police or set fire to shops. To prevent incidents, certain students even created a 'service d'ordre', linking arms to hold back over-enthusiastic elements. This was a more or less spontaneous activity, as was the building of barricades on the Friday night (with the police just keeping their distance and trying to look unconcerned).

Cohn-Bendit, the student leader, was himself on the barricades calling for calm and asking demonstrators to refrain from any deliberate provocation of the police. To talk of 'political commandos' is ridiculous. The students' principal aim was simply to 'dig themselves' in until negotiations took a turn for the better. When the police finally attacked, at 2.20 a.m., some students were already asleep on the pavement.

Violence apart, the French students have gone further in a revolutionary direction than the Japanese, Americans, Germans. They have succeeded not only in forcing the state to make concessions but in spreading their revolt to the industrial working class. It is true that the official trades union and political organisations have asserted their own power by calling for strikes: the significant fact is that they were forced to do this by the action of the students.

The students have demonstrated on the streets that they will not accept the invasion of the university by the state. In the university itself they have begun to establish their own forms of organisation. And by their attempts to join forces with the industrial working class they have shown that their challenge to the state is serious.

De Gaulle's government may fall: the French state will not. But things in Europe will never be quite the same again.

It will not be possible for revolutionary theorists to say that students are a bourgeois counter-revolutionary force.

It will not be possible for opponents of revolutionary ideas to argue that mass action against the state cannot happen.

The bureaucrats have been given a warning—the people an example.

He's the Greatest!

I had doubts about using that inflammable word *bastards*. It has inspired one reader to send me, anonymously, a small torn piece of paper inscribed with the words:

You are the bastards. Enoch is the greatest of all men.

Indeed: the greatest bastard in Britain.

The Writing On The Wall

huge towers, fill them with misguided working middle-classes, the politics of these Towers in terms of votes depends on which Party is in power by the time the Towers are ready for occupation. A Conservative Council (since this is the one in power) build just enough Towers in any particular ward to swing the balance in terms of votes in their favour. This being done, they have a show-piece, and safe electoral support.

The Grove reeks with political robbers and social working subverters. And not one of them mentions the fact that the 'ghetto proper' is divided conveniently between three different local authorities. By dividing the area of discontent in this way, the powers that be make sure that 'the ghetto' remains divided against itself. Using race is the most effective way of keeping the whites and blacks divided... and similarly by calling the Irish 'drunken bastards' they divide the English working-class from the Irish... by mixing the Irish and the blacks together and giving each a slogan to use against the other THE MAN swings.

I spoke with the Mayor of Kensington recently (I was a 'heckler', he was his Lordship) The Mayor said: The Farmer and the Ploughman should be friends. He was introducing the interracial council to 'The Grove' in the Town Hall. Together with cops from Scotland Yard... local Superintendents, and welfare workers. I asked the

Mayor if he would like to take the opportunity to discuss with all the blacks in the audience the reason for his being at such a meeting. He told me to shut up or else he would use the police to evict me. Bellowing deep into his microphone he shouted, 'You can't shout me down in my own Town Hall, I've got a microphone. I can shout louder than you.' I said, 'Yes, baby, let me hear you...'

Back in the jungle slogans begin to appear on the walls. Big red and black letters sprayed in jungle type.

DYNAMITE IS FREEDOM
NEVER WORK
NAMELESS WILDNESS
HANG ALL LANDLORDS—
BLACK AND WHITE
EXCESS LEADS TO THE
PALACE OF WISDOM
BURN BABY BURN

There is only one thing wrong with all this. I live in 'The Grove'. If anyone wants to burn or dynamite any place, please leave where I live because by burning down 'The Grove' you won't affect the MAN in the least.

In the meantime there is a film being made in ST. STEPHENS GARDENS called 'Two Gentlemen', all about blackness and whiteness. I got a telegram from out of the sky offering me the leading role. I phoned up the source and turned it down. Lots of 'The Grove' black hustlers have landed parts, and I read some place of another being made up Portobello Road.

I expect the cultural programmes to follow, and the summer camps, and the black candidate, and the black headmaster. BUT it's all leading to one thing, 'BACKS AGAINST THE WALL MOTHER FUCKER'. I wonder whose voice will echo thus.

COURTNEY TULLOCH.

MOVING FUND

Target is £500.

Received to Date—£400 18s. 2d.

PREMISES FUND

Target is £1,000 per year.

Pledges received to date—£398 18s. 0d.

Pledges honoured to date—£318 16s. 7d.

The amounts are the same as last owing to the move.

KEEP IT UP!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Estimated Expenses:

20 weeks at £90:	£1,800
Income: Sales and Subs.:	£1,608

DEFICIT: £192

PRESS FUND

Oxford: Anon* 5/-; Tenterden: H.H. 10/-; Doncaster: J.R. 10/-; New York: B.S. 4/-; Leeds: D.S. 2/-; Derby: P.M. 5/-; Bushey: J.P. 10/-; Ingatstone: X.P. 10/-; Western Australia: C.K. £1/5/-; York: P.C. £3; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 4/-; J.L.* 6/-; Peterborough: F.W. 3/6; Bedford: M.T. 15/-; Brighton: F.J. 2/6; Sydney: K.M. 6/4; Manchester: A.P. 5/-; Los Angeles: J.E. £2/12/-; Sheffield: P.L. 10/-; Pittsburg: L.K. £1.

TOTAL: £13 5 4
Previously Acknowledged: £349 8 11

1968 Total to Date: £362 14 3
Balance B/F: £192 0 0

TOTAL SURPLUS: £170 14 3

*Denotes Regular Contributor.

Facing the Same Problems

TOKEN STOPPAGES are very rarely a successful method of attacking an employer. They are really only a way of letting off a bit of steam. They dislocate production, but this can soon be made up and profits are not really affected.

This is what happened on Wednesday, when the engineering unions came out on strike in pursuance of their claim for a substantial increase in basic wage rates, not based on increased productivity. The strike was 'pretty well 100% success throughout the country'. In many cities, marches and meetings were held and at a number of these a call went out for an all-out stoppage. But for many it was just another strike, a day's holiday or at least a day off from work, when they caught up with the chores at home.

However, it did not hit the employer very hard. British Leyland might have lost 4,000 vehicles worth £2m., but, due to there being plenty of warning of the stoppage, much of the loss was averted or can be made up later on.

For those who see Hugh Scanlon's

election to presidency as a major militant achievement, the decision by the National Committee of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering and Foundry Workers (AEF) to call for a token strike instead of a total stoppage, must have been very disappointing. However, it does show that the union machinery still remains in the hands of the 'right wing'.

NO PAPERS

What highlighted Wednesday's stoppage, at least in Southern England, was the failure of the national newspapers to publish, because of the unofficial sympathy action by Fleet Street engineers. Some newspapers, *The Times*, the *Telegraph*, *Express* and the *Guardian*, attempted publication, but were frustrated by members of SOGAT, who refused to operate machines without engineers present to carry out safety functions. Although the AEF leadership did little to dissuade the engineers, SOGAT militants did a good job of agitation to prevent other papers from printing.

The *Guardian* is very bitter about this. They think they are something special, a muddled liberal view of theirs, which should make for a 'loyalty to one's newspaper'. Their editorial says: 'The AEF is not in dispute with the newspapers, having come to an agreement with them last year. But it chose to involve them for the sake of a political demonstration. Even then, at least some of the newspapers might have appeared; they were near to doing so. But a sense of inter-union loyalty caused some printing workers (a minority, but enough) to prevent publication. Inter-union solidarity is a sound instinct, well warranted by past experience.' They then continue about the loyalty to the newspaper and 'to the public function it fulfils'. But recently the *Guardian's* loyalty only extended to the owners, when men were sacked in an attempt to stop the financial losses that were occurring then.

The inter-union solidarity is a good sign and a recognition that problems are linked. It is a mistaken view that because you are in different unions and work in different industries, your problems should be kept to yourself. This view leads to isolation and defeat.

That this is just another strike is also a mistaken attitude, because it is also political. The engineers'

claim hits slap up against the Government's incomes policies and its crusade for local productivity agreements. If the engineers fail, then the struggle is that much harder for the next group of workers. Industrial struggles are linked, we all have the same basic problems and we all now face the additional opposition of the State to our claims for higher wages and better conditions.

INCREASED EXPLOITATION

On top of this, we, as workers, are exploited either by the State or a private employer. The benefits of the wealth that is produced by our labours goes to a minority in our society. It is to maintain this that the Government's incomes policies were devised. Its aim is to increase profit, with greater exploitation of the worker. All workers suffer this exploitation to a greater or lesser degree, according to the strength of their union organisation.

Workers' problems are related. The incomes policies are a means to cure the current capitalist crisis. Other countries have faced the same situation and their Governments have carried out similar policies. France is an example of this and workers there are now in revolt against the consequences of these policies, which have brought them a lower standard of living, increased exploitation and increasing unemployment. So the problems facing the British workers here are basically the same as those of their French brothers. Students also face similar problems, with low grants, very little say in the running of their colleges, just as workers have little control over their jobs.

All are involved in the increased exploitation that is taking place and all should unite to oppose it and the system of which it is a part, with revolutionary ideas. Because we are Anarchists, we do not want to replace one system of exploitation with that of another. We want people to run and control the places in which they work, where goods would be made, under workers' control, for the needs of the community and not for the profit of the few.

It is no good looking to politicians or trade union leaders to do this, we should look to ourselves. We, the people, the workers in the factories, on building sites, on the land, in the hospitals, in colleges and universities, we are the only ones who can do it, by our own efforts. P.T.

THE MAY DAY COMMITTEE

THE LONDON WORKERS May Day Committee, which organised the march of more than 2,000 workers and students on Wednesday, May 1, will be kept in being. This was decided by a meeting of about 60 engineers, printers, building workers, teachers and students (most of whom had taken part in the

May 1 march). It was generally agreed that the May Day Committee should be developed into an organisation around which real socialists can gather.

The anti-working class policies of the Labour Government have completely discredited the Labour Party and caused the workers to reject it. The Communist

May Day in Melbourne

THE MELBOURNE Anarchist Group opened its action by participating in the Trades Hall May Day March and managed to muster 30 comrades which was admirable for a first effort. Especially considering the small amount of active comrades beforehand. Also members of the CNT were marching and together we appeared quite strong.

The NLF flag wavers were out in force but their docile acceptance of the local Union hacks May Day platitudes left them overshadowed by the Red and Black/Black flag people who did not accept. Subsequently the Anarchist presence was noted and the response in terms of enquiries and arguments after

the rally, made for quite a worthwhile sojourn into the 'left wing' ranks. Next year we plan to hold our own May 1 activity with the view to bigger and better things.

The London May 1 rally made newspapers in Australia but was concerned mainly with the Powell incidents. A rider, however, cleared the Anarchists of such deviations and noted that they and the International Socialists marched under industrial-oriented banners. Also Octavio Alberola has made news space, though generally implying 'Anarchists can't be trusted Comrades'. Shades of the Stuart Christie publicity here.

S. JOHN.

Freedom For Workers' Control

MAY 25 1968 Vol 29 No 16

PUT YOUR HEARTS INTO YOUR WORK!

THE FIRST heart transplant operation in this country was commercialised into a national achievement, with flags and bunting. It was an outstanding medical and surgical achievement, but the 'I'm backing Britain' badges were sickening, especially as it was an Irish heart that was beating inside Mr. West.

The donor was a carpenter and he was fatally injured when he fell from scaffolding on the Southwark Borough Council's site in Peckham. This fact was hardly mentioned at the time of the operation. The papers that did only gave it a line or two. However, his workmates stopped work as a token of their sympathy, but also in protest against what they consider are inadequate safety measures on the council's site.

The Chairman of the site's Works Committee made the following allegations: 'That there is no full-time qualified first-aid nurse on the site. That a request of the foreman scaffolder to build a "bird-cage" — safety scaffolding — at the place where Mr. Ryan fell about 17 feet to a concrete floor, was turned down several weeks ago.' The reason alleged to have been given was that the engineers' specifications did not require such scaffolding. The men yesterday maintained that safety regulations required working scaffolding to be built when men would be working more than six feet six inches from the ground.'

'The safety officer on this site is a real safety officer,' said Mr. Brian Boggans, scaffolder, 'but he has been over-ruled time after time. The management say they can't afford the scaffolding.' The site lacks in other requirements, having only six toilets and two hot water taps for 400 men.

The men also stopped work on the day of Mr. Pat Ryan's funeral. On Wednesday, the whole site downed tools in protest against the sacking of Bro. Finn, Chairman of the Works Committee, and Bro. Boggan, a scaffolder. These men were sacked for 'misrepresentation', along with three other workers. One can only assume the Southwark Borough Council was embarrassed by the interview these two men gave to newspaper reporters. The only paper that printed it was the *Morning Star*, from which the above quotes have been taken.

At the time of writing, the strike is still on and workers have said they did not want to be sacked for 'talking to the

Press about anything'. Southwark's Town Clerk has said that the reports are 'without foundation and incorrect'.

On this occasion, the *Morning Star* should be congratulated for publishing the men's views, for safety measures on building sites leave a lot to be desired. This is equally true with the GLC and other local authorities, direct labour schemes, as well as the private companies.

There are many good safety officers, but their efforts and those of the shop stewards are frustrated by managements and the bureaucrats of the GLC and the Local Authorities. A strict vigilance has to be always maintained by the men, otherwise the management usually lets things slide. The provision that guides safety measures is not the wellbeing of the men, but how much it will cost.

Deaths on building sites are mounting. Twelve men have been killed in the London area already this year. The increasing mechanisation on sites and higher buildings now being put up have produced a heavy toll in lives and suffering. You cannot prevent accidents, but safety regulations must be adhered to and if the management fail in this, then the workers should force them to.

Unfortunately, the regulations are either inadequate or full of loopholes, through which the employers wriggle. It needs an all-out campaign to tighten up on safety. The Hammersmith and Kensington Trades Council is starting such a campaign to gain safeguards on screw jacks, used in jacking up tower cranes when new sections are added. A recent fatal accident on a council site in the area happened when this jacking process was taking place and the jack sheared through metal fatigue. The provision of a ratchet would probably have saved the man's life. Here again it is a matter of cost and the Board of Trade's regulations do not require such safeguards on lifting equipment of this sort.

Union organisation on sites is one of the best safeguards against accidents. Without the shop steward's vigilance and the threat of organised action, things would be far worse. However, more stringent regulations are needed, with independent safety officers on all large sites and regular visits to the smaller ones.

The building worker does not want to become the supplier of hearts, but wants to work in a safe industry. P.T.

are utterly opposed to bureaucratic orders from on high. Give us your support.

Below is a list of meetings that have already been arranged. If you have ideas for other sites for meetings let us know. Write to the **May Day Committee, 29 Love Walk, S.E.5**, or contact supporters in your area.

JOHN LAWRENCE,
Chairman,
May Day Committee.

MEETINGS

SUNDAY, MAY 26
Corner of Matthew Road and Cheshire Street, Bethnal Green, at 11 a.m. ('Club Row' Market).

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29
Corner of Ossulston Street and Euston Road, St. Pancras, at 8 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5
Camberwell Green, S.E.5, corner of Wren Road, at 8 p.m.

SUNDAY, JUNE 9
Corner of Liverpool Grove and Walworth Road (near East Lane Market, S.E.17).

(We urge all comrades who wish to speak and sell anarchist literature to go along to these meetings.—Editors.)

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Liverpool Vietnam Demo. Saturday, May 25, 2.30 p.m., St. Georges Plateau, Liverpool, followed by march to American Consulate.

Interesting and worthwhile work wanted for young male Anarchist/Pacifist. Anything considered. Barry, c/o Beachlands, Honey Lane, Frodsham, Cheshire.

Australian Comrades! Bronwen Lee, c/o Jansen, 48 Kyre Avenue, Kingswood, 5062, South Australia (forwarding address only), English comrade (girl) hitching around Australia wants to meet local comrades.

Walk-on at Upper Heyford USAF base with 'Green Beret', 'ACT' and various other leaflets at approx. 2.30 p.m., Sunday, May 26. Transport from Oxford. For details contact Chris Reeve, 12 Richmond Road, Oxford.

'Risinghill: Death of a Comprehensive School'. Posters advertising Leila Berg's book—for display on school or college notice-boards. Please enclose 6d. stamp. From Libertarian Teachers' Association, 36 Devonshire Road, Mill Hill, N.W.7.

Anarchist Symbol—useful for stickers/painting walls. Suggestions please. One colour (i.e. outline, not red/black) to Peter Neville, 12 South Grove, Erdington, Birmingham 23.

Flat wanted for two girls and two kids. Tired of being discriminated against by rotten landlords because of kids. Prefer Islington/Canonbury/Highbury area. Contact Barbara or Julie at 'Peace News', 5 Calendonian Road, N.1. Phone: 837 4473.

Loving foster home is wanted for boy (3½ years), pacifist family. Box No. 9.

Whitsun weekend camp. Manchester and Liverpool anarchists are having a weekend camp at Whitsuntide, near Llangollen, details from Ron Marsden, 9 Boland Street, Manchester, 14.

Family with four children urgently seeks unfurnished house out of London. Write 655 Fulham Road, S.W.6.

Hitch to Turkey, or thereabouts. July/August. Box No. 10.

Porton Demonstration. Saturday, June 1—Meeting at Salisbury Market Square, followed by march to Porton. June 2—Leafletting. June 3—Disinfectant Ceremony. Information from M. Dukes, 25 Cranbury Ave., Southampton.

East Anglia. If you're near Ipswich, call on us. We stock all Freedom Press publications, and have FREEDOM and Anarchy regularly. Orwell Books, 44 Upper Orwell Street, Ipswich, Suffolk.

If you wish to make contact let us know.