

THE CIVIL DEFENCE

FRAUD

THE CASE OF ANDY ANDERSON

HIS FIGHT AGAINST DARTFORD R.D.C.

SOLIDARITY PAMPHLET NO.9



FROM 'DARTFORD REPORTER', APRIL 6, 1962.

REFUSES TO PAY CIVIL DEFENCE RATE

'A FRAUD' SAYS ANDY ANDERSON

Two shillings and fourpence - less than the price of a packet of twenty cigarettes. But civil servant Mr. Andy Anderson would rather go to jail than pay that amount to Dartford Rural District Council. For the last two years, 42-years old Mr. Anderson has refused to pay his 1s. 2d. yearly civil defence rate to the Council. Now the council may decide to take legal action against him.

'But no matter what happens I will not pay the money', Mr. Anderson told the 'Reporter' this week at his modern council house, 1, Laura Drive, Hextable. 'If they take me to court and the case goes against me, I shall still refuse to pay. If necessary I'd be prepared to go to prison over this', he declared firmly.

Why does Mr. Anderson refuse to pay his civil defence rate? 'I do not believe they can supply this service', he said. 'And I am not prepared to pay for something that is obviously a deception and a sham. Not only is civil defence a waste of time, but it is a calculated swindle and a criminal fraud', he said.

Last October Mr. Anderson wrote to the Home Office asking for facts to support the reported Government statement that 'millions would survive a nuclear war.' A reply on behalf of the Secretary of State told Mr. Anderson that 'it would not be in the national interest for the Government to disclose their assessment of the scale and purpose of possible attacks with nuclear weapons upon this country'.

'I can tell you why this information is so secret', said Mr. Anderson. 'It is simply because neither the Government nor anybody else has any real information to support the theory that nuclear war can be fought and survived. Yet there is ample information - both theoretical and factual - to support the view that there can be no practicable organisation which can save the lives of even a small number of people in the event of a nuclear attack on this country'.

Mr. Anderson pointed out these views in a 3,000 word letter^{*} which he sent in January to each member of the rural council. 'It would be foolish to expect the Government to put an end to the hypocrisy of

* The letter referred to constitutes the main part of this pamphlet (p.3 - 10 inclusive).

civil defence. It is part of their psychological war on people's minds' he wrote. Mr. Anderson said that he did not expect the Kent County Council to take a stand because 'it is mainly composed of people whose morals have been psychologically subverted by the Establishment'. Mr. Anderson appealed in his letter to any councillor who claimed to be "public spirited" to publicly state that he did not associate himself in any way with the 'great public fraud of civil defence'.

He suggested that the council's civil defence committee should be abolished. And that the people of the rural district be told that 'there are no effective means of saving their lives or those of their children in the event of a nuclear attack on this country'.

'Three members of the Labour group told me that the group thoroughly agreed with my views', claimed Mr. Anderson. Mr. Anderson, a former member of the Labour Party, denied that he was a Communist. 'I have never been a member of or had any sympathies with the Communist Party', he said. But he admitted supporting the views and aims of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and the Committee of 100...'

* * * * *

Since the above appeared in the Dartford Reporter, the Dartford R.D.C. have decided to take Andy Anderson to court. He has been summoned to appear ON THE MORNING OF FRIDAY, APRIL 27.

Determined to 'prepare' public opinion in the area for the 'decisions' of the Court, the Dartford Reporter, in its editorial of April 13, 1962, launched a personal attack against Andy Anderson. We reprint this below.

Andy Anderson's case needs the widest publicity. We must get the facts known as widely as possible. Will you help? Individuals like Andy Anderson can only fight back if others - who agree with what he is doing - are prepared to lend a hand.

EDITORIAL IN DARTFORD REPORTER, APRIL 13, 1962.

'Mr. Andy Anderson of Hextable refuses to pay his civil defence rate. Why? Because he thinks it is a fraud. Because he thinks that civil defence would be useless in the event of a nuclear attack on this country. He would rather go to prison than pay 1s. 2d. a year of his rates to help safeguard his country.

Does Mr. Anderson have a crystal ball which tells him that the next war will be fought with H-bombs? Of course not. And neither can he be sure that if there is a nuclear attack he will die along with his neighbours.

But if there is to be a major nuclear conflict, so horrible that we cannot imagine the terror it will bring, 1s.2d. a year is too small a price to pay even if it brings relief to only a few men, women and children. It is not very long since this country was caught unprepared. We know how near we came to being invaded only 20 years ago. And if that had happened there would today be no Andy Andersons refusing to pay rates - in or out of prison. That we were not defeated was in no small measure thanks to the voluntary efforts of people at home.'

LETTER TO DARTFORD R.D.C.

1, Laura Drive,
Hextable, Swanley,
Kent.

The Rural District Council of Dartford,
White Oak, Swanley, Kent.

23rd January 1962.

Dear Councillors,

A cheque for £14.18.1 in respect of the general rate for the last half year has been sent to you, at the above address.

The cheque is for an amount which is 1s.2d. short of that shown on the notice. I understand that 1s.2d. of the yearly rate requested from me would go towards Civil Defence. Twelve months ago I refused to pay this amount. I STILL REFUSE TO PAY FOR SOMETHING WHICH, ACCORDING TO ALL AVAILABLE EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION, CANNOT BE GIVEN.

To support this contention, I sent the R.D.C. on January 18, 1961, a reprint of an article by Dr. M.C. Berenbaum, a pathologist who has made a special study of the Civil Defence proposition. The Dartford R.D.C. has never mentioned this in any of its subsequent correspondence with me on the subject. Yet Dr. Berenbaum's thesis was an almost conclusive argument showing the uselessness of Civil Defence in nuclear war.

In the last twelve months, even more facts and reasoned argument have become available to show that Civil Defence is a calculated swindle. But what reasoned argument have we had from those who support Civil Defence? What 'new information' have we had from the Government? During 1961 a 'new line' has been proclaimed, with as much supporting argument as is given to government decrees in the Soviet Union. This 'new line' is that "millions would survive a nuclear attack on this country."

Those who accept this 'line' fall mainly into three categories:

- 1) The Wishful Thinkers - who are unable or refuse to understand what a nuclear attack involves.
- 2) The Dishonest - who understand, but prostitute their integrity for their personal comfort.
- 3) The Wilful Deceivers - who, since they are committed to a nuclear war strategy, feel they must try to gain some public support for

such a policy or, at least, to minimize opposition to it. This they try to do with Civil Defence activities and the propaganda accent on survival. After all, fighting a nuclear war (for whatever reason) ceases to have even abstract feasibility if nobody can survive it.

They all know that if it came to the test, the vast majority of the people are more concerned with survival than with any of the reasons given for nuclear war. The W.V.S. wants us to whitewash our windows as protection against radiation. Through Civil Defence, the Government wants to whitewash its nuclear strategy as a protection against us recognising it to be a suicidal policy.

DARTFORD R.D.C. PASSES THE BUCK

Dartford Rural District Councillors are well aware that I have tried, in several letters, to get the R.D.C. to say where it stands on the question of Civil Defence. I have argued that if the Council collects the Civil Defence rate and is prepared to prosecute me for not paying it, then it is not unreasonable to assume that the Councillors agree with the Government and those whom it represents. I therefore told the Council that, as a rate-payer, I am entitled to an explanation of their belief in a nuclear war strategy and its essential concomitant: the Civil Defence myth. The R.D.C.'s reply (2.10.61) dodged the question by saying:

'The Kent Council are the Civil Defence Authority and the nett expenditure on Civil Defence is included in the Precept served by the County Council on the District Council.'

This of course is bureaucratic jargon for: 'We are only acting on the orders of a superior'. Perhaps one should be encouraged by the Council's embarrassment at being asked to give reasons for their Civil Defence actions. But then one remembers the excuse of those accused (at Nuremberg in 1946, and Eichmann, in Israel, in 1961) of the systematic slaughter of many millions of people in the Nazi concentration camps during the years up to 1945. They too said: 'We were only acting on the orders of a superior'.

However, the R.D.C. letter (2.10.61) went on to suggest that the information I require should be sought from the Kent County Council.

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL FOLLOW SUIT

I wrote to the K.C.C. on October 7, 1961. I asked them to give reasons why (1) they agreed with the bald statement in current official Civil Defence literature that 'millions will survive a nuclear attack on this country', and (2) why they believed their expenditure under the

heading 'Civil Defence' had bought something which could effectively be used to protect people in the event of a nuclear attack. The K.C.C. was not able to send a reply until a month later, on November 7th, 1961. Their answer to question (1) is: 'The County Council, as a local authority, has no information which would justify its expressing any opinion on figures related to survival of the national population after nuclear attack'. Question (2) was, significantly, not answered. But the letter did say: 'The organisation of Civil Defence is a matter of national policy determined by the Government after extensive study of the implications of modern warfare'.

ENTER THE HOME SECRETARY

I had anticipated such a demonstration of buck-passing, and on October 11th, 1961, had written to the Home Secretary. Referring to the much-propagated statement about 'millions of survivors', I pointed out that no attempt whatever has been made to argue a case, logical or otherwise, to give this statement some semblance of credibility. Why? I drew attention to the Glossy Government hand-out to the public (H.O. 6114) which, in the first paragraph, says the 'millions of survivors' theory is supported by 'scientific facts' and I asked what these facts are. After a month or so with no word from the Home Secretary, I made several telephone calls pressing for a reply to this letter. Ten weeks later, on December 21, 1961, the Home Office reply arrived.

I suppose one ought never to be surprised by the evasiveness of party politicians and bureaucrats. But the author of this reply deserves a knighthood for excelling in this respect. On the 'millions of survivors' question, he says: 'Civil Defence plans have to provide for a variety of possible situations and it is not practicable in view of the many varying factors, to give an official estimate of the number of possible survivors more precise than that to which you refer'. Now, you will no doubt appreciate that I did not ask for a 'more precise official estimate of the number of possible survivors'. The letter, which was presumably written on behalf of the Secretary of State, continues: 'It would also not be in the national interest for the Government to disclose their assessments of the scale and the purpose of possible attack with nuclear weapons upon this country. The Secretary of State regrets therefore that he is not able to let you have the information for which you ask or to set out the detailed considerations which support the Government's view'.

So, when the buck cannot be passed any further, the answer to the question becomes: 'Top Secret'! But, at the possible risk of being charged under the Official Secrets Act, I am able to disclose to the Councillors of the Dartford R.D.C. just why the information is so secret. IT IS SIMPLY BECAUSE NEITHER THE GOVERNMENT NOR ANYBODY ELSE HAS ANY REAL INFORMATION TO SUPPORT THE THEORY THAT A NUCLEAR WAR CAN BE FOUGHT AND SURVIVED.

However, as I have already said, there is ample information, both theoretical and factual, to support the view that there can be no practicable organisation which could save the lives of even a small number of people in the event of a nuclear attack on this country. Before briefly giving some of that information here, I suggest you consider from where a nuclear attack might be expected to come, what would be its purpose, and whether there would be any warning.

WOT, NO WARNING ?

It is generally believed that the Soviet Union is the potential enemy. In a nuclear attack on this country, they could have only one purpose: to eliminate the means of counter-attack by destroying all rocket and aircraft bases (it is hoped that an explanation of the logic of this is not necessary). Russia would want to make certain of doing this. They could make certain by using less than 2 per cent. of their nuclear stock-pile, for this would obliterate the British Isles. The Government says we would have warning of such an attack since it would come as the result of the build up of a world crisis (e.g. Berlin). Apart from the ever-increasing possibility of accidental war, I believe that a nuclear attack is at least as likely during a period of international calm as during a crisis - perhaps more likely. Because it is recognised that 'We move for the first time in our history through an age in which two opposing powers have the capacity to destroy each other',* there is a strong school of thought among the rulers of East and West that he who strikes first has the best chance of winning a thermo-nuclear war. If this view were to prevail in either East or West, we in this country would obviously get no warning - or, may be, 4 minutes when Fylingsdale is ready. Clearly, any adequate warning would nullify the purpose and destroy the 'first strike' theory.

HERE ARE THE FACTS !

The total case against the perpetuation of the 'callous fraud of Civil Defence' ** is book-length. But here is a random selection of comment on it:

(1) The 1955 Defence White Paper states: Following a nuclear attack, it would be 'a struggle for survival of the grimmest kind'.

(2) The Minister of Defence told an audience of Young Conservatives that modern weapons could wipe out civilization. (Guardian, 18.10.61)

* President Kennedy addressing the University of North Carolina, Oct. 12, 1961.

** Bertrand Russell's term.

(3) The designated burial officer for the City of London has been officially told: 'Since the introduction of the hydrogen bomb, the whole question of burial of the dead has had to be reconsidered, but up to the present time, nothing satisfactory has been formulated'. (Guardian, 18.10.61).

(4) 'There is little reason to think that a real war will be fought by the rational strategies of game theory that are supplied as inputs to a computer... The "build-up" toward the ultimate catastrophe is already under way... Soon they (the major thermo-nuclear powers) will have others in their Jovian company. There will be bigger weapons and more of them, and earth satellites as well as rockets to deliver them. Across the continents and under the oceans, the weapons will be deployed in ever larger number and variety. The danger of totally irrational accidental war must mount as control over these weapons becomes attenuated over constantly lengthening chains of command'. (Gerard Piel, publisher of 'Scientific American', writing on the 'Illusion of Civil Defence' in the New Statesman, 8.12.61).

(5) On Accidental Nuclear War - On Sunday, December 3, 1961, south-east England was blacked out for several hours by a power failure due to an engineer at Northfleet power station throwing a wrong switch in a series of 37 operations which he has done regularly for many years. The Chairman of the C.E.G.B. commented: 'Human beings are bound sometimes to make mistakes'.

(6) A 10 megaton H-bomb equals 10 million tons of high explosive. If the latter were loaded into railway waggons, the train would stretch between 4,000 and 5,000 miles - or, in a straight line, from London to Chicago - or, nearly a quarter of the distance round the world. Recently, a 50 megaton bomb was tested in the Soviet Union.

(7) The (US Government) Holifield Committee, meeting in June 1959, considered the likely effects of a nuclear attack on the U.S. of 1,446 megatons. The casualties were assessed at 47 million dead and 19 million injured. The U.S. population is much more widely dispersed than Britain's. Russia's stockpile of H-bombs is believed to be in the region of 40,000 megatons. The assumed attack was therefore little more than 3 per cent. of Russia's stockpile. Some of the other likely effects of this 1,446 megaton attack reported by the Holifield Committee were: pasture unusable for 50-100 years; plagues of insects (insects survive radiation much better than their predators - and what about bacteria, viruses, etc.); deciduous forests wiped out; half the country's houses uninhabitable.

(8) Dr. Ralph Lapp, a United States atomic scientist, said today that a nuclear war between the U.S. and Russia would be over in one night. Both sides would be decimated if an East-West nuclear war unleashed 10,000 megatons of atomic explosives. 'Once a war like this starts, I believe that there will be few restraints!', he said. 'There is no difference really between a democracy and a totalitarian state once war breaks out because the President cannot consult the people as to how they feel about something'. (Guardian, 17.1.62).

(9) An American priest stated that a man would be justified in shooting his neighbour's children if they tried to enter his shelter during a nuclear war. (Guardian, 17.1.62).

(10) The kind of society that might emerge from the shelters may be guessed from the kind of society that is preparing to go into shelters now. (Gerard Piel, publisher of the American magazine 'Scientific American'.)

(11) It is a fact of nuclear physics that, although the power of an A-bomb is limited, there is no limit to how powerful an H-bomb can be made. In fact, it has been reported that a project is well under way in the U.S. to produce the 'Doomsday Machine' which will have a 10,000 megaton power.

(12) 'Just as the H-bomb has relegated Hiroshima-type weapons to "tactical status", so the Doomsday Machine could make an all-out thermo-nuclear war appear acceptable by comparison. And if it were constructed, the tensions which the Doomsday Machine would create would make its use very possible'. (from an article 'Towards a Doomsday Machine' in the New Scientist, 26.10.61).

(13) It has been said by so-called authorities that Civil Defence and a large-scale shelter programme add to the 'deterrent'. Even if the deterrent theory were not a fallacy, Civil Defence, etc., would clearly weaken a deterrent: a) the other side could legitimately assume that this was preparation for attack, and b) the more each side could believe in survival after nuclear war, the more willing they will be to play the game of brinkmanship.

(14) The American Government says shelters are useful only against fall-out. The cheapest American fall-out shelter for a small family costs £800. This includes cost of manufacturer's advertising, distribution and profit. If the British Government built family shelters at a cost of £500 each, the total cost to provide each family in Britain with one would be £7,000 million. This is about 4 times the present total annual arms expenditure.

(15) Mr. Hurst, the American car magnate, has built a fall-out shelter for his family and servants - cost: £60,000.

(16) Sunday Express writer Marquis Childs, said in an article that shelters against fall-out are virtually useless. (12.11.61).

(17) It is significant that, in Britain, no Civil Defence official will debate the question publicly with an informed opponent.

(18) Question from Norman Dodds, MP, to the Secretary of State, 9.11.61.: 'At Crayford, the Civil Defence unit has to share a utility vehicle with Bexley and Erith. Would it not help them at least to decide who gets the priority if the balloon goes up, Erith, Bexley or Crayford, for the utility van?'. Answer: 'This is the K.C.C.'s responsibility'.

(19) 'The Government have no plans for providing families in Britain with nuclear fall-out shelters like those in the United States. Mr. Renton, Minister of State at the Home Office, told a Labour questioner in the Commons that protection of this kind over the whole country would involve a vast amount of money and effort'. - B.B.C. news broadcast 9.11.61. (I have the B.B.C. typescript of this item. It was not reported in the 'free' press).

(20) Dr. Herman Kahn, describing, in his book 'On Thermo-nuclear War' (Oxford, 1960) a Civil Defence programme which stands some chance of protecting large numbers of Americans, said it would cost \$200 billions over the 15-year period 1960 to 1974. Assuming the £ is worth \$3, this is nearly £70,000 million. Allowing for the difference in population between Britain and America, we get a figure equal to the current British Civil Defence expenditure for several thousand years!

THE HYPOCRISY OF 'CIVIL DEFENCE'

It would be foolish to expect the Government to put an end to the hypocrisy of Civil Defence - it is part of their psychological war on people's minds. It would also be foolish to expect the Kent County Council to take a stand, because it is mainly composed of people whose morals have been psychologically subverted by the Establishment. Would it also be foolish to expect Dartford Rural District Council to refuse to participate in duping the public? Perhaps so, as far as the Tory types on the Council are concerned. But some believe that the Labour Party group on the R.D.C. is one of the most radical in Kent. Yet the hope of this group taking action on an issue which is intimately tied up with the question of nuclear war and human survival appears to be slim. For if they do have any qualms about this particular public deception, it seems they are prepared to satisfy their consciences by trying to hide behind the statement that 'the Kent County Council are the Civil Defence Authority...' (R.D.C. letter to me Oct. 2nd., 1961).

Although the leader of the Labour Party group, Mr. L.L. Reeves, has publicly stated that he agrees with me about the uselessness of Civil Defence, hopes of his group showing in even a small way that they have not been completely tamed by those who really manage our society, are further dimmed by what he said at a meeting of the R.D.C. Finance Committee on October 24, 1961. During some discussion of my 'case', a Labour Councillor, presumably feeling the prick of conscience, suggested that since Mr. Reeves had paid the amount I owed (sic!) for Civil Defence out of his own pocket, the matter could conveniently be dropped. But Mr. Reeves quickly saw the dangers of so 'radical' a step. 'If this were done', Mr. Reeves replied, 'everybody would be entitled to withhold the Civil Defence rate - an intolerable situation would arise'. Mr. Reeves then groped for an analogy to show just how intolerable. He said that some people objected to paying

the rate for the education of other people's children, but they cannot therefore be allowed to withhold it. Now Mr. Reeves must know there is no similarity between such people's objections and mine. They are not arguing that their money is being collected for something which it is impossible to supply and that they are therefore being deceived; whereas it must surely be quite clear by now that this is precisely what I am saying about the rate for Civil Defence.

I APPEAL ...

Nevertheless, I appeal to any Councillor who claims to be 'public spirited' to follow the logic of this claim, to forget the Party line, to stop hiding behind the excuse of what the 'higher authority' says, and, at very least, to state publicly and unequivocally that he will not associate himself in any way with the great public fraud of Civil Defence. I also call on such intellectually honest Councillors to press continually for the abandonment of this fraud. I suggest a start can be made by using every opportunity to move two resolutions in Council:

(1) that the Dartford R.D.C. Civil Defence Committee be abolished.

(2) that the people of the Rural District be told (preferably by letter to each household or, at least, by an official statement in the press) that there are no effective means of saving their lives or those of their children in the event of a nuclear attack on this country.

There is always the 'good-natured soul' who opposes telling people the truth as it may upset them or cause a panic. In reality this is, at best, an excuse for inactivity. Hundreds of thousands of people in the country already see Civil Defence for what it is - but they do not panic. They are seriously searching for ways of preventing nuclear attack. This brings them into conflict with the Establishment. Some of them are learning political truths about the rottenness of our society. Bread and circuses, and the modern counterpart, steaks and telly, have in the past worked well in encouraging intellectual lethargy about the conditions in which we live. The Establishment and their tame Authorities want it to continue that way.

How much longer are we going to allow them to hide behind what they decree is 'in the national interest'? When will it become clear that by 'national interest' they mean their interests, and that their interests conflict with those of the majority of people? Nuclear war becomes more of a certainty every day. Some people work for unilateral nuclear disarmament by Britain as the only objective and sane policy. This is not simply in the true national interest. It is also in the interest of mankind.

Yours sincerely,

E.T. ANDERSON

COMMENT

At times a small and seemingly trivial event exposes, in a glaring way, the most elaborate of 'official' myths and deceptions.

At times a single individual, by taking a firm stand on a question of principle, can compel the authorities to state things openly which they would prefer to hush up.

Such defiance may force the authorities to repress. But it is important they be forced to do so publicly and that the maximum publicity be given to their actions. This compels people to think their own thoughts out to their logical conclusion. In this way even minority action may contribute to a general awareness of injustice - and a general recognition as to who are its perpetrators. Without such awareness no radical change in society will ever be possible.

The refusal of Andy Anderson to pay 1s.2d. to the Dartford Rural District Council has done more than just focus attention on the monstrous fraud of 'Civil Defence'.

Andy Anderson's stand compelled the Dartford R.D.C. to admit that decisions concerning Civil Defence were not really in its hands, that in levying the rate it was merely executing orders from above. Mr. Anderson prodded this mysterious 'above'. From the Kent County Council he elicited the information that they too were in the dark about the basic facts. Only the Home Office knew. From the Home Office, after weeks of further prodding, Mr. Anderson elicited some bureaucratic noises to the effect that all this was 'top secret'... and not to be divulged to mere rate-payers.

The whole absurd hierarchical structure of our society lay exposed. At the top, the 'decision takers', with their monopoly of 'information', their monopoly of power and the whole coercive apparatus of the State at their disposal.

A little lower down the ladder, the various bodies whose function is to 'implement' decisions taken elsewhere. Also other bodies designed to maintain the democratic facade and to protect the rulers from the ruled. Also endless side-alleys into which opposition can be diverted and talked to death.

Lower still, thousands of ordinary people, you and us, the order-takers, compelled in every action of our daily lives to carry out decisions over which we have had no real say.

'SOLIDARITY' seeks to depict our bureaucratised society as it really is. It attempts to develop a militant mass consciousness. And it aims, through action, to evolve effective methods of struggle, methods which can challenge the Establishment on a really broad front.

We are confident that ordinary people can take into their own hands the solution of the problems that concern them most. This struggle for self-assertion has a profoundly revolutionary meaning. It is synonymous with the struggle for socialism, for a society in which ordinary people are the masters of their fate.

'Socialism to us is about freedom. We do not mean freedom in a merely juridical sense. Nor do we mean moral or metaphysical freedom. We mean freedom in the most real down-to-earth sense: freedom of people in their everyday lives and activities, freedom to decide collectively how much to produce, how much to consume, how much to work, how much to rest. Freedom to decide, collectively and individually, what to consume, how to produce and how to work. Freedom to participate in determining the orientation of society. And freedom to direct one's own life within this social framework.'

* From 'SOLIDARITY' pamphlet No.6: 'The Meaning of Socialism'.

ANDY ANDERSON lives at 1, Laura Drive, Hextable, Swanley, Kent. Copies of this pamphlet may be obtained from him or from the publisher.

READ SOLIDARITY

THE MOST PROVOCATIVE PAPER ON THE LEFT TODAY. RECENT ISSUES HAVE CONTAINED ARTICLES ON CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND MASS RESISTANCE TO WAR, A NEW ANGLE ON INDUSTRIAL STRUGGLES, THE DOCUMENTS AND CARTOONS NO ONE ELSE WILL PRINT. Subscriptions: 9s. for 12 issues (post free)
Single copy: 6d. (or 10d. post free)