Mac Rides Again!

LESS than two months ago important sections of the Press were busily writing off Mr. Macmillan as a has-been, an embarrassment to the Tory Party and a failure in a general election. They did every thing they could to destroy him, short of actually publishing an obituary. As the Times famously pointed out in an editorial on “Politics of the Affair” (June 22): “Mr. Macmillan will have to be shot, but he is not yet out. In the game of politics he is more adept at winning than the cartoonists portray him and the Press tend to believe that Macmillan will not be ousted by the Parliamentary machine.”

Well there it is. Last Saturday, Macmillan addressing a cheering Conservative Party rally at Chilham, Kent, got headline treatment from the Sunday Telegraph: “Mr. Macmillan Reasserts his Authority—Critics Ignored”, and their political correspondent reported that: “A confident Mr. Macmillan reassured his authority as Prime Minister in a major speech... yesterday.” He ignored almost completely contemptuous of the controversy over his future, defying the growing impetus that he now feels confident that the party crisis over his leadership has passed its peak.

By brilliant tactics, and lack of any decisive revolt against him in the Cabinet, Mr. Macmillan now seems to have won through to the receipt of the summer recess in face of a bitter campaign against him.

Not only has there been no “decisive revolt” in the Cabinet but the fact is that the future further communications has not succeeded in producing a ripple of visible protest, even symbolic, such as mass demonstrations calling for his resignation, token strikes or sit downs. Does one have to ask in whose interests? Or that the anti to whom leads them? Or that the political parties and sections feel important to express its opinion because of the so-called approach and because the so-called channels available to it are useless?

**Government: Theory and Practice**

In our editorial we suggested the country who have no seats in the Cabinet who are in control of the financial destinies of the nation. Some of the three ministers the fate of any future Labour Prime Minister. So long as government control the armed forces but not the economy of their countries they are permanently obliged to continue the settled policies, no matter who hold the reins of economic power: the FBI on the one hand and the sectional rivalries of the Trades Unions, and the economic differences which undermine any possible trade of unity—these are the loopholes, the weaknesses, which the able expeditors will exploit for somebody’s advantage.

In theory it is possible to argue that a government’s policy could be voted for by the people in general. In practice this has not as long as economic power is not in the hands of the people. Can any legally elected government, given that economic power from the monopolists to the people by legislation? Again, in theory they can: in practice the “democratic” machinery is so designed not so much to permit of radical change in the name of the mass—“as to stifle change per se.” Thus it took the Conservatives probably as long to de-nationalise road transport as it took them to bring the government to nationalisation. Now while it can be argued that this conservative way has not helped the government to maintain its patience—any radical measures a government attempted to take, say, in the case of the railwayisation of British Steel, the most critical interest, could be neutralised by counter-measures within the law to such effect that the government would be dissuaded from proceeding further to attempt to legislate for steel. The government is rather like trying to destroy a rabbit driven by blocking up one hole a year.

**Public Opinion and the Bomb Test Ban**

The rank and file of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) are an example of the “well-meaning” reformists we refer to. Last week a “Peace Day” was celebrated in Trafalgar Square when the Parliamentarians that the trade union leaders, the two K’s for their “initiative” and Mac for his “effective response”. He honoured the three negotiators who contributed to making “agreement possible”. But declared the CND also deserves a pat on the back. We have been pooh-poohed, we have been written off and spoken down. Continued on page 3
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WORKSHOP FOR SKOPJE

It is ironically true that natural disasters call forth a huge fund of spontaneous and constructive effort which is hard to find in ordinary circumstances. With the August issue of Anarchy, drawn from several angles the idea of Do-It-Yourself Communal Workshops was being presented, we were discussing the application of these suggestions in countries—English, Latin America, Africa—the news came of the earthquakes at Skopje, and it occurred to us that here was a case where some of the flood of sympathy and aid that has been forthcoming forth, might be devoted to a project to obtain concrete-block-making machinery in Italy, ship it to Skopje, and form the basis of a workshop where people can make for themselves the material for rebuilding their homes.

We are making enquiries about the feasibility of this project in Belgrade, Milan and London, but would like anyone with further suggestions and especially with IVS experience in Yugoslavia to write to Communal Workshop, Freedom Press, so that they can be kept informed of any developments.

London: Bobo Nedeloevce
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The Day we invaded Cuba

Peace News and the Demonstration

One of the most interesting reactions to the war in Cuba was the fierce debate it generated in Peace News. The editor of the paper, John Bell, published an article entitled "The worst thing is having someone on your side that provokes possible supporters." This attitude seems to stem from two fake premises: (1) The misconception that the London Federation of Anarchists is fundamentally opposed to the Peace Movement in this country, and (2) That no one among our comrades are against anti-imperialist peace and the Peace Movement alone.

John Bell continued, "Without reservation, the Emancipist statement that we must stand firm in our support of Castro is wrong, as is the claim that we have not been doing enough in support of the Cuban revolution. Indeed, it has been true that those who have been doing the most work in support of the Cuban revolution are also those who have been active in the struggle against imperialism. As a matter of fact, many of the most active members of our federation have also been active in the struggle against imperialism."

Bell went on to argue that the Emancipist statement that we must stand firm in our support of Castro is wrong, as is the claim that we have not been doing enough in support of the Cuban revolution. Indeed, it has been true that those who have been doing the most work in support of the Cuban revolution are also those who have been active in the struggle against imperialism. As a matter of fact, many of the most active members of our federation have also been active in the struggle against imperialism.

As for the so-called "national security" bill, which was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Kennedy, Bell argued that it was a violation of civil liberties and that it was a clear attempt to stifle dissent and opposition. He went on to say that the bill was a clear violation of the First Amendment and that it was a clear attempt to stifle dissent and opposition.

In conclusion, Bell called on readers to support the Cuban revolution and to oppose the War in Vietnam. He also called on readers to support the struggle for civil liberties and to stand firm in our support of the Cuban revolution.

Below is the text of the leaflet, prepared for the FLA and the SWP, which we distributed at the Cuban Embassy demonstration.

Cuba-Revolutions or Counter-Revolution?

What is the Cuban revolution, and what is the American counter-revolution? This is the question that we decided upon in the FLA last week.

Below is the text of the leaflet, prepared for the FLA and the SWP, which we distributed at the Cuban Embassy demonstration.

Reprints

The Voyage of the "Belgica"

Charles Darwin

Books P

We can supply

ANY book in print

Also out-of-print books searched for.

Paperbacks, children's books and textbooks supplied on publication name if possible.

New Books

The Fire Next Time James Baldwin 13/6

Reprints

The Voyage of the "Belgica"

Charles Darwin 16/6

Pamphlets

The Conquest for South Africa

Sandel 2/6

Diamonds: Official Secret

Silver 2/6

Leung's Law

Law 1/11

Against the Law of Committee of 101

Nicolaiter Walter 1/11

Unarmed against Fascism

A. K. Jenkinson 1/-

Prisoners against the War

Truth About Vauxhall Ken Weller 6/11

SECOND HAND

Walter E. Holloway 2/-

Mussolini an Outline of Neo-African Oppression

From Ugo 1. J. Ferry 4/-

The British Empire and its Debts: The Colonial Reconnaissance of the Austere Court Queen

Arthur Koestler 10/-

Aldous Huxley 4/-

A World of One's Own

J. G. A. Pocock 10/-

An American Theorist Thoreau Deleuze

Gilles Deleuze 2/-

The Future of Democracy H. H. Hyndman 3/6

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.-2 p.m. daily)

17A MAXWELL ROAD

FR E DOM

(01) 299 7393

(01) 299 7393

We are "Examined"

Dear Editors,

In your issue of July 13, you complained that many of the advocates of "violence" want to make dagmatic that they have refused every appeal for arguments in favour of "violence". Very well, here is an appeal for arguments in favour of "violence".

Our first argument concerns the question of "violence" in itself. We believe that "violence" is the opposite of "non-violence". If we accept the definition of "peace" as a state of non-violence, then it is clear that there can be no "peace" if there is "violence".

Secondly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".

Thirdly, we argue that "violence" is a means of self-defence. If we accept the definition of "self-defence" as a means of self-defence, then it is clear that there can be no "self-defence" if there is no "violence".

Fourthly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".

Fifthly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".

Sixthly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".

Seventhly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".

Eighthly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".

Ninthly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".

Tenthly, we argue that "violence" is necessary to bring about a change in society. If we accept the definition of "change" as a change in society, then it is clear that there can be no "change" if there is no "violence".
Please Don’t Deform the Debate!

FRANKS ELLINGHAMs (three pages, far from examining our arguments, simply serve, in our opinion, to muddy the issue by confusing the reader with a mass of facts and information. The Committee of 100 was merely a protest against the use of violence. The immediate success of the sit-down movement in the United States has been considerable—but to what end? Is it not the case that the immediate success of the Moscow Treaty is that all these interpretations are sheen poppycock because they all rest on a stereotyped formula: 'The most of us such a position it based on some of the burden of terror', and refers to a 'moral breakthrough' achieved by the violence of Francis Ellingham and others.

We are not concerned with the question of the rightness or wrongness of the sit-down movement. In fact, there is no evidence to support this claim. The Moscow Treaty was something more than a mere face-saving provision; it was also a practical step towards world revolution. The Moscow Treaty is not the answer, but because they hated tyrants. It is this observation of practical situations as they are and not as they should be, that is of pretty well all our anarchist theorists. For the fact is that we are no more than the most of us such a position it based on some of the burden of terror', and refers to a 'moral breakthrough' achieved by the violence of Francis Ellingham and others.
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Sweden was one of the first states to recognise the Republic of South Africa, and its government has always been sympathetic to the anti-apartheid movement. The Swedish dockers have been active in supporting this cause, and have demonstrated solidarity with the South African boycott."
Dear Comrades,

Those of our friends who were arrested and bound over recently and have since been arrested and fined, (Many on false charges) will in all probability soon be caught up with for their bonds, most of which were set as high as £20 or more. One comrade in particular has been framed on quite a serious charge and his defence will cost a lot of money too, (over £50), which will have to be found.

Quite a lot of people in the recent court cases were forced to plead guilty because they had no money for their defence, (the costs of which are quite heavy, since British justice is the best that money can buy) and this is a tragedy which we must not allow to happen if we can help it.

Therefore we are asking you once again to dip into your pockets to help them out. Mutual Aid is expensive but it's what we believe in after all.

In the hope that you will give this appeal all the support you can,

FEDERATION OF LONDON ANARCHISTS

Cheques and P.O.'s to: J. STEVENSON 6, Stainton Road, EATON, HX, H.K.