

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Freedom is the will to be responsible for oneself.

NIETZSCHE

In this Issue :

The Law: Problem

Maker - p. 2

The Hanging Debate - p. 3

Vol. 17, No. 8

February 25th, 1956

Threepence

They Came to Bury Stalin, Not to Praise Him END OF STALIN MYTH

IN Moscow last week Harry Pollitt, secretary of the British Communist Party, delivered his speech of comradely greetings to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

He said: 'In Britain, where a handful of monopolists is ruling over the entire economic life of the country, doubts, confusion and uncertainty exist.' Now apart from the fact that precisely the same words could be used about the Soviet Union, we cannot help wondering if there is any body of people in Britain among whom there can be more doubt, more confusion or more uncertainty than Mr. Pollitt's own Party.

For at this conference, a line has been taken which five years ago was absolutely unthinkable. At last the discernable tendency to allow the memory of Joseph Stalin to fade quietly away has come into the open as forthright criticism and indeed condemnation of Stalin, his policies and his practises.

The present-day leaders of the Russian Communist Party have—now that the bloody-minded old tyrant is dead—found the courage to criticise his works. And for them, this is probably a very good move. But for the parties abroad—what of them?

The Soviet Government can say what it likes to its own people and can gag any criticism and opposition that may result. But the C.P. in—

The Bread and Milk Budget

FRANCE can boast of having had more governments in the past ten years than the rest of Europe combined. But which country can challenge the British achievements of *Four Budgets* in twelve months? As we write the debate on the government's economic policy is taking place, and the vote will be a "confidence vote" on the government, which is a foregone conclusion since the government will not take any risks of hanging itself by removing the Whips. And we shall proceed from crisis to prosperity and back again with more cuts and an occasional sixpence offered to the professional classes. But when will the people hold their own vote of confidence not on this or that government but on the capitalist system itself?

There is a difference in the economic theories of a Gaitskell and a Butler. But it affects the means only; the ends it seems to us are common to the Tories and Labour: to save the capitalist system. Gaitskell believes in greater government control of the economy and a fairer distribution of wealth. The Popular Front government in France tried a similar thing in 1936. The 200 families were prepared to drive the country to bankruptcy rather than give in. So that apart from the fact that Labour's economic programme would not eliminate the crises that are part of capitalism it is doubtful whether even with a majority in Parliament they would be allowed to get away with such measures by the large industrial organisations.

The present government's latest measures are spiteful as well as futile. As for what will be "saved" by the cuts in milk and bread subsidies, it has since been announced in a Government white paper that the wages bill in the British Forces will be increased by £67 millions a year in order to attract more people to make the Services their career! We were told recently by some bureaucrat that the miners were being "coddled". At least they produce coal! Which can hardly be said for the new Army fed on our bread and milk!

say—Britain, has no such power. Khrushchev and Co. may make of it an Aunt Sally, and the British C.P. must just stand and take it.

And how stupid they are made to look! For twenty years the Communists built up the Stalin Myth. Created a picture of a mighty genius, benevolently guiding, infallibly, the destiny of the 'Socialist Sixth of the World'—and through that the common man everywhere.

He was Always Right

The gentle Stalin suffered little children to come unto him, like Jesus. Like God he was slow to anger but how terrible in his judgment of all who sinned against him. Great social thinker in time of peace; great warrior in war; no praise was too lavish, no servility unjustified in the eyes of the Communist Party, led by Harry Pollitt, to do homage to the one man above all others who knew what was best for every worker and peasant in the world.

For twenty years the Party jumped over Stalin's head. Liquidation of the kulaks? O.K. if Stalin says so. Massive purges of the Party and the Red Army? Must be correct if Stalin orders it. A pact with Hitler? Stalin knows what he's doing.

Russia groaned under a tyranny such as the most brutal Czars barely dreamed of. But for the British Communist Party everything was all right, for Stalin was directing affairs and Stalin could do no wrong. And all who dared to criticise were soon unmasked as agents of the workers'

imperialist enemies.

But last week Harry Pollitt sat in the Kremlin and listened to the present leadership of the Russian Communist Party condemn Stalin's policies and the whole basis of his Big Brother act.

Put in His Place

He heard Khrushchev put Stalin in his place by mentioning him in the same breath as Klement Gottwald and Kyuchi Tokuda, and dismissing all three dead leaders in the same moment's silence. Khrushchev affirmed the principle of 'collective leadership', which was taken up later and steered by Anastas Mikoyan, a First Vice-Premier, who launched into an open attack on the late dictator.

'For nearly 20 years,' said Mikoyan, 'we had in fact no collective leadership. The cult of personality flourished, a cult which had already been condemned by Marx and then by Lenin. And this could not fail to exert an extremely negative influence on the internal situation of the

ANOTHER VICTIM OF THE HIROSHIMA ATOM BOMB

HIROSHIMA, FEBRUARY 17.

The Kyodo News Service to-day reported the death of "the fourth victim of the atom bomb this year." He was Sanetoshi Hamashiro, a farmer, who was near the railway station when the atomic bomb was dropped on August 6, 1945.

The news service said he appeared in good health until November, when his gums began to bleed and his white blood cell count dropped. He was sent to hospital and never recovered.—Associated Press.

Jim Crow in British Africa

THE reaction to integration of Whites and Negroes in the Southern States of America is violent and obvious. No less deplorable are the discriminatory measures adopted both officially and by the European community in some of the British protectorates. The monopoly of violence against the Black man is not held exclusively by the Southern States or the Union of South Africa; the recent history of Kenya, to take one example, where tacit support was given to brutal acts against the native population, except in the more obvious widely publicised instances, show us that when the British constitutional methods fail to dominate, they will turn to the cruder forms of repressive measures.

Most people are also inclined to accept the widely held theoretical belief that there is no colour bar in this country. Yet a careful discussion, if indeed a reasonable discussion is possible, with the educated as well as the uneducated, will reveal a basic fear of the Black man, and the conviction that he is somehow different and inferior. This attitude as expressed in practical terms is obvious when we consider that few jobs are open to the coloured man resident in this country. The trade unionist who strikes against the employment of coloured labour with the specious argument that his economic rights are threatened, is saying in effect, that if jobs are scarce, the White man has a greater right to work and, therefore, eat than the Black man. On another level those who say that the Black man is equal to the White, but, we must draw the line at inter marriage, are merely saying that the 'purity' of the White man must be preserved.

We are often told in growing terms from political platforms how just Britain has been in conceding a degree of self rule to the indigenous peoples of the colonies, but we find on investigation that the concessions have been forced from them by a people no longer willing to be dominated (at least by the White

man).

Where the selected coloured representatives are co-operative with the British Government and likely to be loyal servants there is a greater measure of "self-rule" than in areas where there is less co-operation.

Southern Rhodesia

A few days ago, a member of the Southern Rhodesian Parliament, Mr. Aitken Cade, resigned from his membership of the governing Federal party in the Federal Government because the policies being followed by the Federal party were so liberal (?) racially, and that they must inevitably end in the transfer of political power in the federation from Europeans to Africans. But as if to console Mr. Cade in his fear of too much racial freedom, a few days later when Lord Salisbury was given the Freedom of Salisbury, the Indian and Pakistani diplomatic representatives were given seats in a different part of the hall from those occupied by other representatives. It is reported that some Europeans have come out in vigorous support of Mr. Cade and his policies, but that others have been equally strong in their condemnation of the treatment of the Indian and Pakistani diplomats.

Liberal racial policies are not as obvious in Rhodesia—as Mr. Cade would have us believe. For instance non-Europeans are not permitted by law to occupy houses in European residential areas. In effect the freedom fills Mr. Cade with such indignation is maintained within certain clearly defined limits (as indeed as the freedom enjoyed by us all in this country). The Federal Government has however, allocated two Government-owned houses in a European residential area to the Indian and Pakistani representatives. It is reported that no serious objections to the two families concerned have been made, but that local white residents are likely to protest against the attendance of one coloured child from one of the families at the local Grammar School. The Cen-

tral African correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* writes that:

"In face of this difficulty the Federal Government has to choose between once more forcing an issue on which a large proportion of the European electorate which elected it feels strongly and retreating, the better to fight at some future date."

It would be foolish to assume, however, that the Federal Government is a forward-looking institution strangled by the prejudices of the European settlers. What we have to remember is that India plays an important part in International politics and the effects of discriminatory measures against her representatives are likely to have repercussions. As long therefore as the two houses are only occupied by diplomatic representatives, the European residents and the Government will no doubt swallow the bitter pill for the time being.

Northern Rhodesia

On the Northern Rhodesian copperbelt the European mineworkers' union has decided to 'permit' Africans to take up certain types of work hitherto exclusively held by Europeans. The proviso being that the union will not undertake to train Africans. It is reported that on two of the mines where Europeans are moving out they are in fact teaching Africans what they require to know, but in other mines the rigid official union policy is being maintained.

In face of these few examples of racial discrimination the general view will no doubt be that the British way is to move towards racial equality constitutionally and without violence, but that the process will take time in order to educate the backward peoples of the colonies to our civilised way of life.

What most people do not seem to understand, is that physical violence is in many ways no more degrading than the more subtle violation of man's dignity which expresses itself in the view that the Black man is after all inferior to the White.

Stalin's much-lauded essay, *Economic Problems of Socialism*, dominated the Party policy. Then Mikoyan described this essay as 'an inspired work', but at this Congress he has apparently changed his mind, for he now says: 'It can hardly help us and is hardly correct... The theory of the absolute stagnation of capitalism is alien to Marxist-Leninism... The wealth of ideas of Marxist-Leninism cannot be contained in this limited framework'.

Continued on p. 4

Letter from France

Algeria: Passion & Figures

EVERY day farms cultivated by French settlers blaze in the Constantine area. Every night the military units fall back on the forts or the villages, and the look-outs keep watch over little-known landscapes surrounded by populations of whom they know nothing. More than 200,000 troops from France are trying to maintain the authority of Paris over the three Algerian departments. Three thousand fellaghas, poorly armed and equipped, are holding half the territory. Certain regions belong to the army until sundown and pass under the control of the resistance forces until dawn. The operations map gives only the coastal zones to French authority.

What does this situation mean if not that Algeria knows stability no longer and that the whole of the Moslem populations are heart and soul with the insurgents, since only armed force permits the maintenance of metropolitan power? The official declarations about "the terror" that makes "banditry" prevail

over the "peaceful" Berber and Kabyle inhabitants may mislead those who think only in terms of words; they are in flagrant contradiction to daily events.

The trend of development is defined by two phenomena: the Algerian men of straw chosen by the French administration to provide stooges for collaboration are rallying the independence movement *en masse*; and the French population in the big towns is afraid, adopts an extremist attitude, and calls for repression because it knows that its entire destiny is now at stake.

The fact that the traditional interplay between autochthonous political and social forces on the one hand and the institutions and parties of the Europeans who have settled in Algeria on the other hand has broken down illustrates how, in a few years, the situation has been transformed. Until 1950 there was a sort of classical mechanism that controlled relations between the Moslem population and Paris. Among the indigenous Algerians there were two currents, one moderate, which had for its spokesman Ferhat Abbas and which demanded recognition of equal rights between metropolitan French and Moslem French, the other more eager and insisting on dependence, expounded by Messali Hadj, the old leader of the North African Star and an influential militant from the North Africans working in France. Among the metropolitan French there was indeed recognition of the power of the French in Algeria: the government appointed a Resident, who soon became a prisoner of the trans-mediterranean cliques and interests; if he showed any hankering for independence he did not have to wait long to be isolated, and he finished up by being recalled.

Gerrymandered elections always gave victory to the "francophiles"; the administrative machinery was completely in the hands of the settlers; the police placed themselves entirely at the disposal of

Continued on p. 3

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 7
Deficit on Freedom £140
Contributions received £174
SURPLUS £34

February 10 to February 16
Lakewood: S.M. £3/10/0; Burnley: F.R.S. 3/-; Kenton: R.S. 6/-; London: J.S.* 4/-; London: N.B.T.* 1/9; London: C.F.* 2/6; Tiffin: W.R. 9/10; Hype Park: Sympathiser, per P.S. 12/6; London: D.S. per P.S. £1; London: E.P. £1/10/0; Falmouth: R.W. 2/6; London: Anon. 10/-; Kingston-on-Thames: P.C. 10/-.

Total ... 9 2 1
Previously acknowledged ... 165 1 3
1956 ... £174 3 4

GIFT OF RECORDS: London: K.M.
GIFT OF BOOKS: Stroud: S.L.R., London: C.W.

*Indicates regular contributors.

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 17, No. 8. February 25, 1956

NOTES ON THE HANGING DEBATE

"I HAVE nothing to celebrate, have I? But I am not interested. I am more interested in darts." In these words Mr. Albert Pierrepoint the British hangman-in-chief summed up his feelings following the announcement that the House of Commons had, by a majority of 46, declared him redundant (or almost?). And because we prefer to be labelled as reformists rather than friends of the public hangman, we openly celebrated last week's news for anarchists have been intensely interested in the abolition of hanging for generations and rather less interested in darts!

The House of Commons vote is no triumph for politics, democracy or the system of government. Remember, the hangman's rope has supported our system for some 600 years, and barely a 100 years ago executions were still public spectacles. And remember too that the government in 1956 like all its predecessors (including Labour in 1948) "feel that it is their duty to advise the House that capital punishment must be retained".

★

THE actual debate which lasted six hours (an institution 600 years old voted out in six hours discussion or 120 columns of Hansard! Can the Americans beat that for speed—assuming they forget about the 600 years it took for these six hours to crystallise?)—the debate, we were saying, was a ding-dong battle of statistics, personal experiences of ex-Home Secretaries and their Under-Secretaries, and added colour was given by other speakers such as the former judge in India who agreed that statistics on the subject proved nothing but "everyone of us knows inside himself whether violent death is a deterrent to us and whether it will deter us from doing certain things". And this was an excellent opportunity for the learned gentleman to wander off into war-time reminiscences, and for Mr. Silverman to lead him up the garden path:

Sir P. Spens: . . . Of course we have been deterred by bullets and bombs. I am not ashamed to confess that I have been gravely deterred, almost to the length of turning my back and not going forward when I ought to be going forward—

Mr. S. Silverman: But the right hon. and learned Member did not do so.

Sir P. Spens: I did not do so but I did not go forward in the way I would have done if there had not been bullets flying about . . .

But the sensation of the evening was the member who implied that but for the death penalty he would not be addressing them. He recounted how at some critical moment in his life he was intent on committing murder and it was only the vision of the rope that prevented him from carrying out his act.

For cynicism a former Conservative Attorney-General, Sir Lionel Heald was hard to beat. The following exchange took place on the question of the guilt of Evans (who it will be recalled was sent to the gallows on the evidence of the multi-murderer Christie):

Sir L. Heald: . . . I was Attorney-General at the time and I prosecuted Christie. I knew all about the case and I think that Evans was Guilty—

Mr. Hale: Guilty of what?

Sir L. Heald: Guilty of murder.

Mr. Hale: Which murder?

Sir L. Heald: I will make my speech in my own way if the hon. Gentleman does not mind.

My own view about the matter was

that both Christie and Evans were concerned in that murder and that it was only through a miscarriage of justice on a technical point that Christie was not hanged at that time. However we put that right later.

Mr. S. Silverman: Oh! But essentially the debate was conducted by both sides with a view to capturing the "marginal votes" and thus we find Mr. Silverman—who has worked so hard for abolition for many years—declaring in one breath, that the question is not of statistics nor can it be answered by the law books but is "a great moral issue" and in the next, he is wooing Sir Lucas-Tooth with arguments that do not do him justice (though he will perhaps justify his tactic by pointing to the fact that Sir Lucas voted with them!)

★

THE House of Commons was influenced less by the arguments put forward in the debate than by a noticeable reversal of attitude in certain sections of the Press which until a year ago were violently opposed to Abolition. The *News of the World* commenting on the results of the voting believes that "the majority of people . . . would have [in a referendum on the question] been willing, in the name of humanity and progress, to vote for suspension during a testing time", a concession to "public opinion" which this Sunday journal would not have made a few years ago.

How then did all this change come about? We would suggest that recent events have been all in the abolitionists' favour. In spite of the Home Secretary's "considered opinion" that no innocent man has been hanged the Evans case has caused many people to have doubts (including the former Home Secretary Mr. Chuter Ede who at the time refused to reprieve Evans). The execution of Bentley was the result of police evidence, which the Glinski trial, for one, has demonstrated can be pure invention for the purpose of obtaining a conviction, but his execution also confirmed a widely held view that there are no reprieves when a policeman is killed, and the significance of this came home when the Home Secretary recently admitted that three men sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for an attack on a policeman were in fact not guilty. It took two years to establish their innocence. If the policeman had died it is most likely they would have hanged since the Home Secretary makes up his mind in four days on questions of reprieve!

The Campaign against Capital Punishment led by Victor Gollancz therefore came into being at a most opportune moment for it added the weight of a public conscience to a shaken public confidence in the infallibility of British "justice". The growing support for the campaign; the plans for more mass meetings throughout the country; books by Koestler, Gowers and Gardiner; letters to the Press from eminent people in all walks of life as well as the new line adopted by certain newspapers, all indicated that the favourable circumstances would be fully exploited by the advocates of abolition. This probably explains why the Government decided not to wait for Mr. Silverman's Bill to take its course but instead themselves "found the time" to debate the issue now while the public campaign is only beginning rather than later when even the public as a whole might have been convinced! As Mr. Morrison (ex-Home Secretary and former supporter of hanging!) pointed out last week:

"I do not believe that we should be with the general tide of public opinion if we resisted this change, and I would prefer the House freely—and this is the day of freedom—of its own wisdom and of its own decision to face this major change without waiting until, in an undignified way, we are pushed into it . . ."

★

ABOLITIONISTS have still much to do—assuming that there is no double-crossing by the government over the abolition of the death

Algeria: Passions and Figures

Continued from p. 1

local government circles; and Moslem "connexions" were artificially maintained, profiting materially from their servile obedience.

In the space of a few years the partners have changed, and their opinions have been overtaken by events. The Arab awakening, proclaimed in Cairo and achieved in Damascus, transformed the passivity of the North African masses. French decadence, visible and obvious, encouraged them in their claims. The procrastinations and false promises of the French government wearied the Arab supporters of negotiation. The revolt in Tunisia and the resistance in Morocco showed that boldness paid. Illiteracy itself, the plague of colonialism, became the ally of Algerian nationalism: although the French press was not read by a single fellah or town labourer the Arab radio stations were sending the spoken word to Moslems in the tiniest villages. Arrest, prohibition of residence, and the exile of nationalist leaders drove the autonomists to violent action. By depriving the nationalist chiefs of their freedom and by stalling the Algerian militants who supported co-operation France deprived herself of "worthwhile interlocutors" and found herself suddenly confronted with indignant or rebellious mobs.

At the same time the French colonialist cliques in Algeria felt isolated, for metropolitan public opinion, little interested in overseas problems, did not support a policy of force that would have to be sustained by the dispatch of contingents of soldiers, or recruits. In every sphere, in every sector of society, the breach opened between French delegates from North Africa and metropolitan delegates. Even at trade-union congresses the language of the representatives of civil servants established in Algiers or Oran differed completely from that

of working delegates living in France. The colonialist faction, representing privileges obtained in Algeria, had to bluff and call on the spent forces of the Empire, the French Union, and the Nation in the hope of preserving the old positions with the support of Paris. Until today, that is, for now the Poujade movement is being called in as reinforcements.

Among the Moslems of North Africa there is the consciousness of belonging to a wave that has risen from the colonial peoples and is breaking and subsiding over the old states of Europe. Among the French of Algeria there is panic fear of being massacred, or at the very least of having to quit a land occupied for three or four generations if equality of rights is recognized for all the inhabitants. Such are the two dominant passions that excite Algeria at the moment.

What are the basic elements of the reality? There are nine million Algerians, divided into eight million Moslems and a million Europeans. The Moslem population is growing with extraordinary rapidity: every year 250,000 children are born, and there are five million Moslems under 20. For them there is general misery with an average income of 20,000 frs. a year (the minimum figure in France) and widespread unemployment that drives hundreds of thousands of Algerians to come and work in the metropolis at the hardest and most unhealthy jobs. Among the Europeans a small minority is very rich, but the immense majority have incomes only equal to those of the average Frenchman and appear prosperous only in comparison with the extreme poverty of the autochthons and because they are assured of a livelihood as landowners or as civil servants.

All the drama of Algeria is there, summed up in a few figures—a drama that could only be brought to a satisfactory conclusion by ex-

propriating the big land companies for the benefit of the landless Moslem farmers as the first step. For in the fields of education, irrigation, industrialization, and putting the territory into production everything would still remain to be done.

It is the unleashing of passions, the open violence, and the fact that they have only slight influence on the basic problems that produces the hesitation of men so little suspect of colonialism as Albert Camus (himself born in Algeria), who appeal to all men of whatever origin to agree to get rid of the material and moral exploiters without resorting to war, which strikes indiscriminately at those accountable and the innocent alike.

For our part let us realize France's total incapacity to carry out a policy commensurate with Algerian needs. According to the most careful calculations Algeria would require about 400,000 million francs a year to put its house in order humanly and materially—and to a very small extent at that, since the standard of living would thus be raised by three per cent. Now, the appeal made by the Socialist Prime Minister, Guy Mollet, refers to an exceptional loan of 200,000 million francs to Algeria, and we know that the cost of repression is approaching this very sum.

A century of colonization is being paid for at this moment—in blood, and in the pursuit of political systems without greatness and without power. France is no longer in a position to settle its own accounts.

Between an awakening Algeria and the metropolis in decline a third force must intervene with guarantees of Algerian autonomy and the financial and technical means to make it viable. The international labour movement, if it had any existence otherwise than on paper, would have a job to do in this direction.

S. PARANE.

CINEMA

Up the Rebels!

WHAT appears at first sight to be a new line in criticism has made its appearance in some of the more respectable sheets, whose critics have had frequent occasion lately to tell us of their antipathy to "nasty films about nasty people". The doctrine that the only worthy subjects for serious criticism are cozy little films about nice people with nice manners has not yet been propounded in detail, and I suspect that it never will be. For its origin is purely emotional, and any attempt to rationalize it would at once reveal its inadequacy. The critics who indulge in it are like those people who say "I don't know much about art, but I know what I like", adding under their breath "and I find this stuff embarrassing".

This particular critical canon has been invoked against the latest arrival at the London Pavilion, *Rebel without a Cause*, and it is easy to see why. The film treats of a subject that has become an awkward problem for our solid citizens, i.e., "juvenile delinquency". Any honest analysis of the problem inevitably uncovers facts that are a little too unpalatable for our comfortable suburban bourgeois, for whom life is simply a matter of fitting themselves into an already existing pattern. That some people might find the pattern incomprehensible and that others might even be unable to discern it at all has not apparently occurred to them.

penalty for murder. What of the death penalty for Treason, or in the colonies under Emergency Regulations. (In three years in Kenya more people have been hanged than in Britain during the past fifty years?) And when we have finally put our own house in order why not join with men and women of good-will in other countries to put an end to the death penalty for "political crimes" everywhere?

The protagonist of *Rebel without a Cause* is Jim Starke (James Dean), a young man burdened with problem parents. The father (Jim Backus) is dominated by his wife and seems to be incapable of giving a straight answer to anything. The couple's whole life is ruled by expediency. Their method of dealing with trouble is to run away from it. They have done quite a bit of moving around in the course of their running away, and they have now arrived in California, where they have provided Jim with what some sociologists, with an extraordinary talent for begging the question, would call a "good" home: it is well furnished (by European standards, luxurious), clean, and well cared for; and Jim has his own car. He seems to have pretty well everything that money can buy. It is the things that money can't buy that he is short of.

On his first day at college he runs into a delinquent squad, a gang of students who carry around with them an almost palpable atmosphere of menace. He is not looking for trouble, but it inevitably catches up with him. Judy, the girl next door (Natalie Wood), goes around with the gang, and Jim finds Judy interesting.

At college he also meets Plato, a lonely Puerto Rican boy desperately anxious to make at least one friend, who tags along like a stray collie that hopes he has found a new master. Plato (Sal Mineo) has been deserted by his parents, who discharge their obligations to him and society by sending regular maintenance cheques. He sleeps with a pistol under his pillow.

At the planetarium there is a lecture explaining the cosmic insignificance of our planet and its inhabitants, complete with a graphic demonstration of the end of the world. It will end one day, and there is not much point in it anyway.

This is an appropriate time to fall foul of Buzz, the leader of the gang. In this demi-monde toughness is everything, and the worst insult is the imputation of cowardice. In no time at all

Jim has accepted a challenge to a "chicken run". In this modern version of the time-honoured duel the combatants drive stolen cars at top speed over the edge of a cliff, and the first one to jump clear is a coward. Buzz gets his sleeve caught and goes over the edge with his car.

Jim and the girl, who also has problem parents, decide to hide out in a deserted mansion. They are joined by Plato, who brings the news that the gang are after them because they believe that Jim has squealed to the police. This provides one of the best scenes in a very fine film. Here, in their own make-believe world, for a brief period the three become themselves for once.

Then the gang arrive, and Plato, momentarily left alone, opens fire on them. And on the police who are the next to arrive. Finally he gets shot himself—unnecessarily, and in spite of Jim's efforts to save him.

This is an unusually honest film, admirably free from preaching or moralizing. The acting is of a high order, and the direction is crisp and straightforward. The film is in CinemaScope and WarnerColor, which unfortunately shows no signs of improving. E.P.

BACHELOR HOME

MR. JOHN GOULANDRIS, 28-year-old Greek shipping magnate, is seeking a house in the country. He has been considering buying Mr. Garfield Weston's 1700-acre Oxfordshire estate, Glympton Park.

"I have been to look at Glympton several times," Goulandris tells me. "I have decided not to buy it."

Mr. Goulandris is a bachelor. Canadian-born Mr. Weston has asked John D. Wood to find a buyer for Glympton. He wants about £170,000 for the place. He bought it in 1953 for £200,000 from the executors of Mr. Alan Good, the industrialist. Glympton is one of the most luxurious estates in the country. Mr. Good spent a lot of money on it; so has Mr. Weston. *Evening Standard.*

