

# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"Whenever politicians attempt great good, they invariably inflict great harm."

—H. T. BUCKLE

## CONFERENCE PROPOSE, GAITSKELL & CO. DISPOSE AND NOW WHAT?

"IT was painful today to follow the debate on defence in the knowledge that nothing said in the conference hall could substantially alter the result of the voting which had been settled before the debate began." Thus wrote Mr. Francis Boyd, the *Guardian's* Political correspondent of the Labour Party conference at Scarborough last week. Mr. Boyd must have a very painful occupation since such is the pattern not only of Labour Party conferences but of every parliamentary debate—with the exception of those very rare occasions when the Whips are called off and the vote is a "free one". On those rare occasions it is said that the Member votes "according to his conscience". For the rest of the time he votes to the crack of the Parliamentary whip.

AT Scarborough last week, on the day preceding the Defence debate, the question of the extent to which Conference decisions were binding on Labour M.P.'s was argued at length, and for a very good reason. In view of the Executive's impending defeat on defence, the National Agent remind-

ed Conference of that passage in the constitution which says that "No proposal shall be included in the party programme unless it has been adopted by the party conference by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the votes recorded on a card vote". This it was clear the unilateralists could not achieve. On the other hand Conference carried, by 3,586,000 votes to 1,874,000, the motion that

while acknowledging that the day to day tactics must be the job of the parliamentary party, declares that Labour policy is decided by the conference which is the final authority.

The National Agent, Mr. Williams, insisted that the executive was only withholding its opposition to the motion on condition,

that everyone understood that no change of policy was involved and that no one at all would have the power to "instruct, control, or dictate" to the parliamentary party.

Mr. Williams secured the rejection by 5,627,000 to 767,000 of a Nottingham resolution asserting such a power of instruction.

We confess to being unable to connect these two motions both of which were passed by a large

majority. For if Labour policy is to be decided by the conference, which is defined as "the final authority" subject to the two-thirds majority clause, then presumably it has the power to "instruct, control or dictate" to the parliamentary party. If it has not the power then the Annual Conference is even more of a farce and a facade than one had already assumed it to be.

The argument put forward by the Parliamentary L.P. to justify its independence from party control just does not stand up to examination. They argue that they are responsible to their constituents and not to the Constituent parties, and least of all to a handful of Trades Union leaders who between them control several million votes at Conference. Now it is notorious that, on the major issues the Parliamentary Labour Party meet in private in the House of Commons and decide there what line they will adopt in the debate. And as we pointed out earlier, when the Division is called they vote according to the Party whip. At no stage have their constituents been consulted on the subject of the debate or on the line that each individual M.P. should take in order to represent the views of his constituents. M.P.s in fact vote on the Party line every time. What valid objection can they have then to the Party, at Conference, determining the Party line for them? After all is it not the party which nominates them in the first place as its candidates, and supplies the funds and the workers to secure their acceptance by a majority of the electorate? (The high-handed attitude of M.P.s to the Party conference when it seeks to control them is no different from the situation in the Trades Unions where the Union officials though ostensibly the representatives or the spokes-

Continued on p. 3

### The Government's Interest

SANTIAGO, OCTOBER 5.

The Chilean Government is thinking of taking steps to order back to work 6,500 copper miners who are on strike for more pay at Chuquicamata, Northern Chile, as the copper industry provides most of the country's foreign exchange, and the Government also gets about three-fifths of the profits.

British United Press.

## The World of Money The Land Racket

The Bengeo Working Men's Club at Hertford became Britain's richest, at the fall of a hammer yesterday, for its 10½-acre allotment site, half a mile from the corrugated asbestos club-house, was sold for 98,000, to a Waltham Cross builder, Mr. Hubert C. Leach, who is building 280 houses on a neighbouring 80-acre site.

Seven years ago the 180 club members paid only £100 an acre for the site. Mr. Leach said: "I came with £100,000 in my pocket and was determined to have the land although it was more than I expected to pay. I made several private offers earlier but they were all turned down." The club secretary, Mr. Bill Taylor, said: "We know our onions—we turned down offers of £5,000 and £6,000 an acre for the land and now we have got nearly £10,000 an acre. The members are all more than pleased, and now we can go ahead with our plan to build an ultra-modern two-story club house."

Only 50 men attended the Salisbury Arms Hotel at Hertford for the sale. Colonel Robert A. Humbert, a London auctioneer, said before the sale began: "There is a great shortage of green belt building land and this is the only sizeable plot left in the whole of Hertfordshire". Bidding began at £50,000 and quickly leapt by £2,500 bids to £75,000. The "onion patch" was nearly sold at £95,000 before Mr. Leach reopened the bidding.

Afterwards Mr. Leach said he had to have the land. He will build another eighty houses on it after the allotment holders leave in September, 1961. [So the land alone for these houses works out at over £1,200 per house and we can

imagine that Mr. Leach and others will get their rake-off and we don't suppose it will be either chicken-feed . . . or onions!]

## GERMAN 'AID' AT 6 per cent!

BONN, OCTOBER 6.

The Federal Republic is proposing to raise loans totalling 1,800 million marks (about £153 millions) in 1961 to assist underdeveloped countries. This compares with a total of 1,150 million marks (£98 millions) of West German aid to underdeveloped countries during the last six years.

The immensely increased 1961 aid programme has a dual purpose—to increase the West German contribution in face of American criticism, and to reduce the swollen foreign exchange reserve held by the Federal Bank. These reached a total of 25,426 million marks last month. The loans which Western Germany will make available next year to underdeveloped countries are expected to carry interest rates of between 5 and 6 per cent.

Of the 1,800 million marks, about 1,000 million marks is to be provided by several hundred industrial firms which are members of the West German Federation of Industry. Spokesmen of West German industries, including Herr Fritz Berg, the president of the Federation of Industry, and Dr. Hermann Abs, the chairman of the Deutsche Bank, have already approved this loan in principle. Details will be worked out in co-operation with the Federal Government.

Guardian.

## The U.S. Election Campaign £35 m. to Brainwash the Public

WASHINGTON, Oct. 1.

Across the nation this week, housewives were ringing doorbells and asking neighbours to hand over "dollars for Democrats."

On the Republican side, some 40,000 party supporters paid \$100 (£35) each to attend dinners Thursday night which featured a \$5 menu and speeches by President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon.

Just how much the two parties will collect and spend in the national, state and local elections must of necessity be only a guess because complete reporting of campaign spending is not required by the laws, and politicians have well recognized and approved ways of circumventing the legal restrictions that do exist. It seems certain, however, that the cost of the 1960 campaign will well exceed \$100,000,000 (£35m.) and probably will approach \$200,000,000 (£70m.).

One indication of the campaign costs is the fund-drive quotas that have been set by the two national committees—\$4,500,000 for the Republicans and a minimum of \$6,000,000 for the Democrats. The Republican quota is lower because they already have spent about

\$2,500,000 during the year, while the Democrats, who, the Republicans like to point out, engage in deficit financing even in campaigns, started off the campaign with a \$100,000 deficit.

As party officials frankly admit, however, these quotas are but the visible peaks on the iceberg of total party spending on the Federal elections. In addition to the funds of the national committees, there is a multitude of special committees, all collecting money for their candidates. An estimate of one experienced party official was that each side will spend from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000 in the Federal elections—Presidency, Senators and Congressmen.

In the 1956 campaign, a Senate Elections sub-committee, headed by Senator Albert Gore of Tennessee, estimated after an exhaustive study, that \$33,185,725 was spent in the campaigns for Federal office—\$20,685,387 by the Republican party, \$10,977,790 by the Democratic organization, \$941,271 by labour groups mostly for Democratic candidates, and \$581,277 by miscellaneous organizations.

Where does all the money go? Much of it goes to pay the radio and television networks to project the candidates' face and message into American homes. In 1956, \$9,818,000 is estimated to have been spent for radio and television time.

The next biggest chunk goes to pay for the incidentals of any campaign—rent of temporary headquarters and salaries (the Republican National Committee, for example, has 400 persons on the payroll in six different offices around town), hotel rooms, travel (the Democratic National Committee has budgeted \$350,000 for this item) and election-day expenses of getting voters to the polls.

Other large expense items go for newspaper and political advertising (\$1,373,944 by the Republican National Committee in 1956, \$694,923 by the Democrats), printing and distribution of literature (\$2,187,199 for the Republicans and \$1,900,076 by the Democrats in 1956) and outdoor billboards (\$393,805 by the Republicans and \$195,507 by the Democrats in 1956).

(New York Times)

## Efficiency Dept 15,000 Tons of Coal by Road

British Railways in the East Midlands are sending coal supplies by road because of a staff shortage. They have brought in an emergency plan to transport coal from the pitheads to power stations and 15,000 tons are being carried each week by fleets of lorries.

Mr. R. D. Gardiner assistant rail traffic manager, said yesterday:

"Because of difficulties in the distribution of freight stock arising from the railway manpower shortage, the British Transport Commission made certain agreements to have coal delivered by road for power stations. It is organised with British Road Services as a planned operation and has been done to ease our difficulties. If we fell down in delivering supplies to power stations they would take the contract out of our hands and organise their own road transport."

The railways had enough wagons, he said, but because of a shortage of key

staff they were having difficulty in putting the trucks where they were needed. BTC was watching the scheme closely.

Commenting on the threatened rail strike, Mr. Gardiner said: "The mere talk of a strike makes our customers start looking around to make their own transport arrangements. We cannot afford this to happen—it damages not only our trade but also relations with our customers."

Guardian 8/10/60.

Mr. Gardiner cannot see the wood for trees. Strike threats may well frighten off clients, but well paid workers don't strike, and furthermore there is no shortage of skilled workers in well-paid jobs. The railways pay among the lowest wages in industry and are surprised that they lack key staff.

## BELGIANS RETURNING TO CONGO

According to a B.U.P.-A.P. report: Belgians are returning to the Congo in substantial numbers. The Minister of African Affairs, Count d'Aspremont Lynden, told the Senate in Brussels yesterday that 320 Belgian teachers had already gone back and that another 100 were needed in Leopoldville province alone.

He also said that Belgium was setting up a technical assistance programme for the former Belgian colony. Later he left by air for Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian-administered trust territory between the Congo and Tanganyika, to work on pre-independence problems. [It is curious that in spite of all the alleged atrocities committed against the whites they should now be returning in "substantial numbers". It makes you think doesn't it!]





## 'Independent' Nigeria

**THE PROMISE OF NIGERIA,**  
by Sam Epelle. Pan Books,  
3s. 6d.

THE recent independence of the Nigerian Federation has been acclaimed as a great step towards the complete emancipation of Africa. Thirty-five million inhabitants of this huge country, four times the size of Great Britain, are now ruling themselves.

Why is it that lovers of freedom, the anarchists, show such slight enthusiasm—if any at all? We have been crying for the end of colonial rule for many years, and yet now when Nigeria is independent of this rule, we are not interested.

To find out, I suggest you read this factual book from the pen of Nigerian Sam Epelle—member of the Institute of Public Relations, Acting Director of Government Information Services. It is not an easy book to read, or a good one—in fact it is downright dull, but perhaps by quoting a few passages from the book, our lack of enthusiasm will be understood.

Just take your fill of this:—“This salaried group of the middle class sustains the country's cultural nationalism,

for its members lead the tribal unions and political organisations. On the other hand, its members have adopted European ways: their houses are furnished in the European style, most times they eat European food, they listen to the radio and watch television, read newspapers avidly, hold membership cards in sports, social and church clubs, organise literary societies and old boys' associations. Progress, for this salaried group of the middle class, includes the office, religion, the family, marriage, the club, but one must add that some consciousness of social superiority and aloofness is growing.”

The middle class Africans, the bourgeoisie, the “freedom fighters” of the African continent, men who enjoy the support of John Stonehouse and Fenner Brockway, lead the country of Nigeria. Men of the middle class are seen by the Left in this country as the exploiters of the people, yet in Africa men of the middle class are supported as friends. But this, of course, is politics.

The constitutional changes in Nigerian rule are of no significance whatsoever; when have members of the Royal family, Governor-Generals, Prime Ministers and Parliamentary statesmen ever had anything to do with freedom? A black élite is taking over from a white élite to suit the “liberal” policy of the new style Conservatives. A political point has been won that can be thrown at the Russians and the neutral countries, and the people believe that now they are ruled by Africans and not Europeans, and will be free and wonderful. They will soon realize the black men in power are exactly the same as white men—but I fear that they will learn too late, although the possibility of a proletarian revolution to follow the rise of the middle class cannot be wholly discounted.

Let us hope Nigerians realize that the European Africans are dangerous and unpleasant men—soon.

R.J.W.

## d'Ami du Peuple

I should make it clear that we're not doing enough, that I am not satisfied as an American with the progress we are making . . . I am not satisfied when we have over \$9,000,000 of food, some of it rotting . . . even though 4,000,000 Americans wait every month for a food package from the Government . . . I am confident that the American people do not want to continue in this country poverty and discrimination and disease and slums. . .

—SENATOR KENNEDY (Democrat's Candidate for Presidency).

But what will the Senator do if he wins? After all the problem of surpluses in the midst of poverty and need is a basic problem of capitalism which it can solve not by distributing these surpluses among the needy but by reducing the surpluses by cutting down on production. In the *New York Times* last week it was pointed out that the surplus of cotton from which the U.S. has “suffered” these past years has at last been solved partly by increased exports but principally by drastically reducing the acreage under cotton.

the senile Phoenix, the menacing head and the two crawling men of the pre-1905 period found their culmination in a lithograph entitled “Death for an Ideal” and dated 1915 and when we place Klee's later work such as his “Demented Dwarf”, etc., in the context of these paintings, they no longer remain gay and whimsical water colours but become messages from the mad-house.

George Jardine is showing eighteen paintings at the portal gallery 16a grafton street w.1, to ape the typography of the catalogue, and while he claims kinship with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood I found his work too slovenly for those exclusive brothers. This is unfortunate for Jardine is a fresh and welcome talent and while I feel that his work has more affinity with the imagery of Hieronymus Bosch and Carlo Crivelli, he could work his passage into the expired P.R.B. by cutting down his output and spending more time on detail.

The Hanover Gallery of 32a St. George Street, W.1., are showing the latest sculpture of little César the uncrowned king of the Parisian junk yards for Césars' sculptures are literally crushed metal junk, no more and no less. César's virtue is that he can laugh at this stuff so we can laugh with him. If you have a few hundred pounds to spare, a large flat, G Plan furniture and if you believe that the ultimate manifestation of physical science is the electric toaster, then dash down and buy one of César's crushed masses of bronze-plated metal junk but if you're short of money and the landlord is breathing down your neck then just find out the current price of scrap metal and flatten out your own oeuvre. But César has a gallic wit that saves these things from being pretentious rubbish, so I hope that he will return to visit us again with more of his sun-tanned junk.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

## ANARCHIST COMMENTARY

THAT polite paper of the left, the *New Statesman*, is like the proverbial “penis teaser”. Within its pages can be found sometimes the promise of a surrender to “progressive” principles but when it comes to a show-down it invariably dodges the issue.

Take, for example, the views expressed in *London Diary* (8th October opposite an advertisement from I.C.I.). The writer supports “the realistic arguments” put forward by thinking members of the *Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament* which he summarises thus:

It is illusory to hope that Britain has much influence on the arms policy of America and Russia . . . therefore, is it not absurd for Britain, the most vulnerable spot in the world, to present itself as a target . . . we are rather safer without nuclear weapons and bases than if we had them.

The writer goes on to say that this is an argument by which the British people may quite possibly become converted.

Fine so far. But his strictures on the newly formed civil disobedience committee headed by Bertrand Russell are decidedly weak.

He cannot see any advantage in “law-breaking” policies in the circumstances of modern Britain. Unconstitutional methods are alright for South Africa and were appropriate in Gandhi's India where the normal means of protest were not available. It is doubtful if even the suffragettes furthered the cause by

militancy, but, he argues, they had an excuse for their actions because they could not obtain a “fair hearing by ordinary means.”

Things are different in Britain today “where the opportunity of changing by persuasion is unrestricted”.

He asks if the advocates of civil disobedience are really convinced that a

British government would change its foreign and defence policy because a number of people, who are freely permitted to present their policy by argument, decide not to pay their taxes or deliberately to involve themselves in mass scuffles with the police?

The writer, who must know that all attempts to “persuade” the Government to change its arms policies have pathetically failed, is avoiding the obvious conclusions.

While it is agreed that it is still possible in Britain to express opposition to nuclear weapons in a very limited way (since unorthodox views are not often given a hearing through the mass means of communication) we would have to be very naive indeed to expect the present government to lay down its arms. Or indeed, any Labour Government, in the unlikely event of its being voted into power. It is clear that the majority of the Parliamentary Labour Party is opposed and will fight any suggestion of unilateral nuclear disarmament.

It is possible that “the British people may become converted” but there is no evidence that the majority of people have even begun to realise the enormity of nuclear war, much less are prepared to support a campaign for nuclear disarmament.

But if the people who are concerned about the future, directed their energies into an intensive civil disobedience campaign they could not fail to draw attention to the movement, and whatever government is in power would realise that the participants could not be brushed aside with polite acknowledgements to their pleas for disarmament.

Such a campaign may fail and its advocates may even be imprisoned, but the spectacular failure of what is described as constitutional

methods surely indicates that other ways of “persuading” governments should be tried.

Gandhi's methods are still applicable today in a country where the people are mesmerised by democracy and have for all practical purposes given their power to men who consistently misuse it.

With the big issues constantly in our thoughts we tend to forget that it is not only in the areas of internationalism that people are unenlightened.

When a race riot in Notting Hill is given a lot of publicity we tut-tut disapprovingly and forget all about it when “the incident” has been pushed off the headlines, but the problem of discrimination is ever-present for many coloured workers in this country—the fear of losing a job and the loneliness of men separated socially from their fellows by the accident of colour.

In the heart of the mother country, the City of Westminster, workers, slow to rebel against the follies of their leaders, are prepared to persecute a single fellow human because he is a Jamaican.

Previously employed as a dustman he has had the temerity to accept promotion to driver-dustman, and his superior mates don't like it.

The white drivers were meeting last Saturday to “consider the position”, doubtless with a great deal more enthusiasm than they would give the nuclear disarmament question.

Granting the classification of dust-man as an unskilled “dirty” worker, which, in our society means he is at the bottom of the social strata and therefore in a position unlikely to induce a sense of “fair play”, we cannot excuse workers persecuting one man on the basis of colour.

Democracy in France has a peculiar way of expressing itself. Perhaps the *New Statesman* writer mentioned above will explain to the French people how to “persuade” their government to allow them to march constitutionally now that they

Continued on p. 3

## Around the Galleries

THE Resurrection Men, after a triumphant season at Edinburgh, have brought their latest exhumation to London and the Tate and the back street Bond Street galleries are bathed in Teutonic gloom for this a major exhibition of men and women who were in the main second-rate painters but who, like so many other second-raters, owed their survival to the fact that at a particular moment in art history they chose the right coterie. This comprehensive exhibition of the work of the Blue Riders Group does however, have a salutary effect, for when, year after year, we are fed with the reproductions of only one or two carefully chosen paintings of a particular artist we base our assessment of that artist on those works but when the works of these people are shown in the mass a radical re-interpretation of them must take place.

The Blaue Reiter group came into existence in 1911 after Kandinsky had squabbled with the New Artists' Association and Kandinsky, Marc, Münter and Kubin high-tailed it to the motherly bosom of Maria Marc to form their own “little storm troop” to quote the admiring Dr. H. K. Röthel. Ernst Kirchner, the historian of the Brücke group, quoted Nietzsche to the effect that the artist of the time sought a new world “abundant in beauty, strangeness, doubt, horror, and divinity” and Dr. Röthel not to be outdone heads his introduction to this exhibition with another quotation from Nietzsche that “who wishes to be creative . . . must first blast and destroy accepted values”. The Blaue Reiter's held their first exhibition in 1912 and two years later found that most of their dismal adjectives were no longer the hot air of a group of pompous, bourgeois bores but the obscene reality of power politics.

Of the paintings themselves, Kandinsky's are the most important, for here are his garish abstractions of raw colours and loose flowing forms and here too are paintings of Kandinsky's Oscar Wilde period that should have been taken out and quietly buried, for they are pure corn. If one wonders where the gothic-obsessed Walt Disney drew his inspiration from it is here in Kandinsky's men and maidens on high-strutting horses, crescent moons, star-studded skies and daisy-flecked fields or Marc's too cute animals, for make no mistake about it, most of the reproductions of these two men's work could be used as stills for “Snowwhite and the Seven Dwarfs”. Here are the little-known paintings of Kubin ranging from Wagnerian absurdity to the world of the slug and the maggot and the upturned stone. Of them all my preference was for the work of Gabriele Münter, a hanger-on of the group who while poaching the style of her associates managed to inject a little humanity into it. There is an atmosphere of viciousness and sadism in this exhibition that leaves a nasty taste when one has walked away and it pervades Niestlé's pretty pretty painting of a cute little cat holding the broken body of a dead bird in its mouth, von Werefkin's “Café” whose inhabitants have the deadly green of earthly corruption or Schönberg's soul-picking daubs. It is Klee who offers the biggest disappointment in this exhibition. Everyone is familiar with his twittering, gormless world of merging colours and wandering lines but in this exhibition they are absent and we are offered their forerunners.

Again that love of cruelty and physical degradation becomes apparent and we are among works that could be used for illustrations for an adult edition of Grimm's Fairy Tales. The armless hero,

## FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

## OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—5.30 p.m. and till 5 p.m. every Saturday.)

## New Books . . .

- Correspondence, Vol. 2  
Frederick Engels and Paul Lafargue 6/-  
Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (abridged)  
Edward Gibbon 36/-  
Newcomers: the West Indians in London D. Glass 21/-  
Practical Birth Control Methods N. E. Himes and A. Stone 21/-  
The Soviet Seven Year Plan A. Nove 10/6  
One Way Pendulum: Play N. F. Simpson 10/6

## Reprints and

## Cheap Editions . . .

- Notes on Indian History 664-1858 Karl Marx 3/6  
The Essential Left Marx, Engels, Lenin 7/6  
On Education Bertrand Russell 6/-  
Sceptical Essays Bertrand Russell 6/-

## Second-Hand . . .

- Sixty Years of an Agitator's Life G. J. Holyoake 12/6  
Freethinker, Vol. 59 (1939) 12/6  
The Usurpers Czeslaw Milosz 5/-  
Murder in Mexico (Trotsky) Sanchez Salazar 8/-  
The Doctrine of Saint-Simon (pref. G. D. H. Cole) 10/-  
Reflections on Violence Georges Sorel 17/6  
The Modern Inquisition Hugo Dewar 12/6  
The Shook-Up Generation Harrison E. Salisbury 12/-  
Britain Can Feed Herself George P. Pollitt 3/6  
Ask the Fellows who Cut the Hay G. E. Evans 10/-  
Under the Axe of Fascism Gaetano Salvemini 4/-  
German Diary (1946) Fenner Brockway 2/6  
Plough and Pasture E. C. Curwen 3/-  
The Chinese Communists (1946) Stuart Gelder 3/6  
A Village by the Jordan Joseph Baratz 4/-

## Pamphlet . . .

War Outmoded Anthony Weaver 2/6

## Periodicals . . .

Liberation, September 1/9

We can supply ANY book required, books searched for—and frequently fisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print including text-books. Please supply pub-found!

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

17a MAXWELL ROAD  
FULHAM LONDON SW6

Tel: Renown 3736

## CINEMA SHADOWS

THIS film was shown at the National Film Theatre in July in the “Beat, Square and Cool” season, it has now been booked for commercial showing as a result. (Another interesting film in this season, *Murder by Contract*, has been booked as a second-feature after its appearance at South Bank).

The series “Beat, Square and Cool” was a showing of “off-beat” American films and *Shadows*, which was directed by John Cassavettes, was more “off-beat” than most. Cassavettes deserves to be remembered as an actor in *A Man is Ten Feet Tall*, a piece of good, if slightly confused propaganda against racial hatred with an unnecessarily over-violent end. Mr. Cassavettes is too, if I am rightly informed, the protagonist in a soon-forgotten television series called “Johnny Staccato”.

This film was literally improvised during the spare time of the players. It was filmed in and around New York and it was necessary to dodge the police because of charges of obstruction during the making.

The subject of improvisation in art is an interesting one. No one accuses the writer, painter, composer or poet of “improvising” but that is just what they all do. On the stage the seemingly well-merited flop of Saroyan's *Sam, the Highest Jumper in the World* has brought that subject into discussion again with all the connections with “the Method”, Stanislavsky and Brecht. There was a small item *The Tent* in the Third Programme which brought the radio into this field. Myself, an unashamed “square” I cannot go into the virtues of improvisation in the field of jazz but I believe there is considerable scope.

*Shadows* grew out of a class at the Variety Arts Studio in New York, the themes of loneliness, colour-prejudice and lack of values are given to a cast of coloured and white actors. The actors' own first names are used so that the dialogue exchange is natural. Sometimes this is to the point of boredom as in the party scene. The revelation to the white boy-friend that Lelia is a mulatto has all the subtlety that the “slickie” *Sapphire* lacked.

Whether improvisation has any future in the face of the failure of the highly commercialised cellophane-wrapped, devitaminized cinema is debatable, but *Shadows* is certainly a film worth seeing.

J.R.



# Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 21, No. 42 October 15, 1960

## The Scarborough Vote AND NOW WHAT?

Continued from p. 1

men of the members of the Union, act as if they were their Bosses. An "unofficial" strike can only exist, surely in an organisation where the tail wags the dog! One M.P. in anticipating the defeat of the Executive warned the Conference that "it would be the first time in history that the conference has required the parliamentary party on an important subject to switch its policy between elections". The obvious way to avoid any undue embarrassment for such sensitive souls would be for the Party to hold its conferences once every four years or so as to coincide with an election spree. But then, we are assuming, or that M.P. was, that the Conference in fact instructs the Parliamentary party how to vote and to act!

★

IN 1954 when the Party was once again meeting at Scarborough the burning question then was German rearmament and on that occasion the Executive, which supported the proposal, was saved by the skin of its teeth by the block vote of the Woodworkers who at the eleventh hour switched their vote—which only a fortnight earlier, at the T.U. congress, had been cast against the motion. The Labour correspondent of the then *Manchester Guardian* examining the prospects for the Party if the Executive were to be defeated on the German rearmament vote (for on paper it was inevitable; little did he know of the surprise that the Woodworkers held in store!) put it this way:

If the rebels are successful and the official policy rejected then the brain reels at the conceivable consequences. Political logic would insist: the alternative is the abdication of the leaders whose policy has been overturned or the acceptance by the leaders of a policy the direct opposite of their own. Either the party would be shorn of leaders (for their defeat would not be to the same extent a Bevanite triumph), or the leaders of their integrity (for if they bowed down before the will of the conference their new creed could only be an hypocrisy).

The brain reels, logic insists. But at your shoulder the nagging critic is there to whisper, "Don't be a fool. If they're beaten, nothing at all will happen. No one will resign. There'll be a few fine speeches about Conference being the policy and the need to preserve the unity of the party and accept majority decisions. For a month or two Dalton or someone will be the spokesman, and the situation will change, and there'll be room once more for another Executive resolution . . ." An imp, too, propounds yet another possibility. There are to be two votes on Tuesday, so both resolutions could be carried in spite of one meaning precisely the opposite of the other. Everyone would have won, and everyone lost, the roundabout would start turning again, and the swings swinging.

Will it be any different this time?

★

EVERY year, according to the Press, the Labour Party is in the process of breaking up. "The Labour Party is in grave and imminent danger of destroying itself" wrote the *Sunday Times*: "The Labour Party is in a desperate position" declares the *News Chronicle*. This is all nonsense. As a vote-catching machine the Labour Party can still command more than 10 million votes compared with the 2 million of the up-and-coming Liberals, whose conferences are marked by unity, unanimity and un-

MICHAEL YOUNG is the organisation man among the new social investigators. He joined the staff of Transport House in 1945, and was secretary of the Labour Party's Research Department and Secretary of its Policy Committee until 1951. Then he became Director of the independent research organisation Political and Economic Planning. In 1954 he founded the Institute of Community Studies, of which he is the Director, and in 1957 he started the Consumers' Association, with its magazine *Which?*, and has watched it grow in three years to a membership of 200,000 with people joining at the rate of 1,500 a week. Last August he set up, and became chairman of the Advisory Centre for Education, with its quarterly *Where?*. And now that Cambridge has discovered the existence of sociology, he is to be one of the first pair of lecturers in the new department there.

He was the author, with Peter Willmott, of *Family and Kinship in East London* (see *FREEDOM* 7/11/57), a study of family life in Bethnal Green and a comparison with the social and family life of the same people when they move to an L.C.C. out-country estate. Again with Peter Willmott he has written an intensive study of a middle-class dormitory suburb: *Family and Class in a London Suburb*, which will be published this Autumn. He wrote the satirical utopia *The Rise of the Meritocracy* (see *FREEDOM* 12/12/59) the point of which consists in taking current educational policy to its logical conclusion. He was

### The New Social Investigators—4

## The Consumer, The I.Q. and Dr. Young

the man who compiled that report recommending "adventure scholarships" for the young, and who undertook the recent BBC enquiry "Pressure at Eighteen-Plus".

What common thread connects all these preoccupations? He would probably say that it is a concern with the quality of ordinary life. Back in 1949 he wrote a Labour Party pamphlet *Small Man, Big World*, about the contradiction between the requirement of any genuine democracy, which is smallness of scale and face-to-face contact, and the increasing scale of social organisation in modern life. Returning to the topic under the same title but in more forceful language in 1956, in an article in *Socialist Commentary*, he spoke of the trend

"which could end by making the common man a rich man, but a man in prison, with no more initiative, spontaneity and freedom than a person whose every move is controlled by a benevolent governor. The ordinary man may, if things are left to themselves, become more and more remote from the mysterious, baffling and far-away people who control his life, the television companies, the knights bachelor, and the scientists at their Calder Halls and Bikinis. At the other extreme, those in the charmed circles and well-blessed cliques where the fateful decisions are made, may become more withdrawn from the lives of ordinary people, and more contemptuous of those whose present and future they influence so greatly."

★

TWO outstanding economic developments in this country in the ten years since *Small Man, Big World* was published have been that "first, the real standard of living of the average family has increased by roughly 20 per cent.; and, secondly, in this general move, working-class real incomes and middle-class real incomes have moved up at almost identical rates." (Mark Abrams: "The Home-Centred Society" *Listener* 26/11/59). This is sufficient explanation of the new interest in consumption. But Young's concern with man as consumer, unlike the glossy magazine cult of "gracious living", springs from his concern with a democracy of participants.

### DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ALGERIANS AT FREJUS

PARIS, OCTOBER 7.

Attention has recently been drawn to a startling discrimination against Algerians at Fréjus in the distribution of the nine milliard old francs collected in France and elsewhere for sufferers from the dam that burst at the beginning of last winter and drowned more than 300 people.

Among the dead was a small number of Algerian workers and soldiers. While the widows and widowers of Europeans have received from this fund 3 million old francs each, those of Algerians have received only 500,000. Other compensation has apparently been proportionate. It is no doubt true that the sudden bestowal of 3 million francs on an illiterate woman without guidance in an Algerian village might have unfortunate results, but trustees are an old invention of civilisation.

Since the Algerians' widows are presumably mostly in Algeria, the main protest has come from a Norman woman married to one of the Algerian sufferers. Nine Socialist municipal councillors have resigned in protest against the principles of distribution adopted by the mayor. It is not clear, however, how far the discrimination against Algerians is one of their objections. They are not attacking the mayor's integrity.

*Guardian.*

bounded love for their debonaire leader. Why?

The voting public is not influenced by the rows that take place at Labour Party Conferences, in which, generally, differences over foreign policy are used as the setting for the struggle for power within the party to be played out. Most people are interested neither in foreign policy nor the internal struggles of the political parties. When elections come along they combine a political conservatism with what they consider to be self-interest and vote accordingly. There can surely be no other explanation for the more or less consistent pattern of voting at the elections—including the consistent failure of the Liberals to make any headway.

What happened at Scarborough last week will leave no scars on the professional politicians. They will just carry on as before as the official opposition to the Government until the next general election, when everybody concerned will be full of the party spirit and united on the most important of all activities: vote-catching. As for the Bomb . . . the less said about it the better!

### Anarchist Commentary

Continued from p. 2

have been banned from staging a protest against German Army bases to be set up in France. A report from France says that:

A mass protest by former inmates of German concentration camps against the granting of bases in France to the new German Army has been banned.

The demonstrators had planned to march through the centre of Paris tomorrow wearing the striped prison uniforms the Nazis had made them wear.

Indignant protests have been made against the Government's arbitrary ban which prevents "men and women whose sacrifices contributed to save the country's independence and honour from demonstrating their opposition to a re-birth of German militarism which gravely menaces France."

The protests against the ban are particularly strong because at the beginning of this week ex-Service men's associations and an outlawed Fascist Party were allowed to hold a mass demonstration at the Arc de Triomphe which turned into a riot against General de Gaulle's Algerian policy.

Marching in mobs is not necessarily an effective way of changing government edicts, but assuming the French people feel strongly enough about their protest and are refused permission by their government to indicate this in the "normal way", they can only do so by disobeying government orders—civil disobedience!

★ ★ ★

BONN, FRIDAY.

Alfried Krupp has been given permission by the European Coal and Steel Authority to increase the capacity of his Rheinhausen steel plant at a cost of £5m., reports *George Vine*.

*News Chronicle* Oct. 8th.

R.M.

Thus he is concerned with the "consumers" of public services, of education and of housing, as much as with the household goods which the Consumers' Association tests and evaluates for its members, and in *Family and Kinship*, he and Peter Willmott were able to illustrate the defects of LCC housing policy in consumers' terms, in the light of the way people actually live and prefer to live, for, as they put it, "the purpose of rehousing is to meet human needs, not as they are judged by others, but as people assess their own". The Advisory Centre for Education, similarly, aims at helping people through the bureaucratic facade of the educational system, so that they can find out what it can really offer them, and the true amount of choice they have. For as Young said in starting it, "in a more and more complicated world people need a new kind of service, an information service, if they are not to be overwhelmed."

The *Rise of the Meritocracy* purports to be an account written by a future sociologist in 2034, of the history of education and its effect on British society in the years 1870 to 2033, projecting the course of the Education Acts and the Labour Party's policy statements into the future. He looks back on our own day as one where "two contradictory principles for legitimising power were struggling for mastery—the principle of kinship and the principle of merit". Merit wins, and with the perfection of intelligence testing, and earlier and earlier selection in the schools, a new non-self-perpetuating élite is formed of "the five per cent. of the population who know what five per cent. means". The best jobs go to the best brains, and Payment by Merit (M=IQ plus Effort) widens the gap between top and bottom people. The people at the bottom are not only treated as inferior: they know they are inferior.

But to select the few is to reject the many, and new social tensions arise, though the new working class has no longer men of outstanding ability, since these have been creamed off in childhood by meritocratic selection. A Populist movement arises however, consisting of dissident intellectuals, mainly women. In the Chelsea Manifesto of 2009 they declare that:

"The classless society would be one which both possessed and acted upon plural values. Were we to evaluate people, not only according to their intelligence and their education, their occupation and their power, but according to their kindness and their courage, their imagination and sensibility, their sympathy and generosity, there could be no classes. Who would be able to say that the scientist was superior to the porter with admirable qualities as a father, the civil servant with unusual skill at gaining prizes superior to the lorry-driver with unusual skill at growing roses? The classless society would also be the tolerant society, in which individual differences were actively encouraged as well as passively tolerated, in which full meaning was at last given to the dignity of man. Every human being

would then have equal opportunity, not to rise up in the world in the light of any mathematic measure, but to develop his own special capacities for leading a rich life."

This was of course regarded as sentimental cant, but it led eventually to the disturbances of 2033 and the gutting of the Ministry of Education, though we do not know what happened when the Populists called a general strike in May 2034, because the author himself lost his life in the demonstration at Peterloo.

Evidence for the plausibility of the rise of the meritocracy is all around you. Ask any child. Dr. Young's radio feature programme "Pressure at Eighteen-Plus"—the first educational enquiry I have heard of to interview children and find out their opinions, revealed how aware they were of the endless process of selection, with its implied question: Will this horse run well enough to justify his place in the stable? Writing about his enquiry (*The Listener* 2/6/60) Dr. Young remarks:

"In a primary school I visited in the Midlands, a teacher told me that the downward pressure of the grammar schools reached as far as the infants' school . . . For me, the saddest experience of the whole enquiry was going into a classroom for five-year-old boys and girls. The room was divided by three straight lines of tables. At one extreme were the high tables, for the cleverest children who were already learning to read. At the other extreme were the low tables for the duds. At this school the teachers in effect labelled the children into groups when they were only five years old: one one hand the ordinary children who would become the world's workers and on the other the potential recruits for grammar school and university."

English education, he concluded, is an obstacle race from start to finish:

"If a child is put at the top table when he is five, he still may not get into the 'A' stream at seven. If he is in the 'A' stream at seven he still may be weeded out later. Many compete but most are rejected, and the sense of failure that results is sometimes psychologically crippling. The way things are going, the schools are in danger of making the Britain of 1960 a nation of failures with only a thin élite of super-trained people at the top."

★

A FORTNIGHT ago *The Observer* announced that it was distributing a pamphlet which the Fabian Society had commissioned Michael Young to write but had then rejected after it was in print. Hastily clad in a new cover with the title *The Chipped White Cups of Dover*, it discusses the Labour Party's decline and examines the possibilities for a new Consumers' Party if Labour fails to bring itself up-to-date and fulfil the two conditions the author feels are the requisites of a reforming party—that it should be an internationalist party and that its domestic policy should be concerned with the problems of today. His castigation of the defects of contemporary

Continued on p. 4

### FREEDOM PRESS

E. A. GUTKIND: *The Expanding Environment* 8s. 6d.

HERBERT READ: *Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism* 3s. 6d. *Poetry and Anarchism* cloth 5s., paper 2s. 6d. *The Philosophy of Anarchism* boards 2s. 6d. *The Education of Free Men* 1s.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI: *Neither East nor West* paper 7s. 6d., cloth 10s. 6d.

RUDOLF ROCKER: *Nationalism and Culture* cloth 21s.

PETER KROPOTKIN: *The State: Its Historic Role* 1s. *The Wage System* 3d. *Revolutionary Government Organised Vengeance* 3d. *Called Justice* 2d.

★

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications: *Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute* cloth 5s. *Journey Through Utopia* cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

### SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*  
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*  
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*  
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*  
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*  
*Waters*  
Vol. 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled*  
Vol. 7, 1957, *Year One—Sputnik Era*  
Vol. 8, 1958, *Socialism in a Wheelchair*  
Vol. 9, 1959, *Print, Press & Public*  
each volume paper 7s. 6d. cloth 10s. 6d.

The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

PAUL ELTZBACHER: *Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy)* cloth 21s.

V. RICHARDS: *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* 6s.

VOLINE: *Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed)* cloth 12s. 6d. *The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21)* cloth 12s. 6d.

17a Maxwell Road, Fulham, London, S.W.6



Reflections on Block Votes & Executives  
**The Anti-Democrats**

GREAT BRITAIN, like most countries in Western Europe, is supposed to be a democracy. That means that it is ruled by the people. But what happens when the people disagree about a question of national importance? Then, democracy prescribes that the view of the majority should be accepted. How can it be discovered easily, what the views of the majority are? For that we have representative government, by which people living in the same area elect a representative to put their point of view in Parliament, so that Parliament reflects the opinions of the majority of the people. But how do the people know that their representative will put forward their views faithfully? To ensure that we have the party system, by which candidates are put forward by nationally known parties, with definite objects and policies. How are the policies of the parties decided on? Oh, by democracy of course.

If the reader still has any more appetite for cynicism, one could mention that the people are provided with information on which to base their judgments by the existence of a remarkable free press.

Now if this account of democracy were true, the annual conferences of the political parties would be occasions of lively interest, with press and public discussing the issues raised at them. At the same time the discussion would be expected to have some sincerity about it. The first concern of the friends of democracy would be to see that the majority points of view did actually prevail, and that discussion of the issues at stake was not obscured by organisational and personal considerations. Secondly, they would put their own ideas forward as forcefully as possible, keeping to the same canons of honesty.

How different from this ideal is the reality, as revealed in the conduct of the current Labour Party conference at Scarborough, and the reaction to it throughout the press. Openly, the problem is whether the British government should stop manufacturing and stockpiling H-bombs or not. The vote of the conference said it should stop. Now apart from an article by John Strachey in *The Observer*, the problem itself was hardly discussed at all. It was objected that the case for nuclear disarmament was being supported by Trade Union block votes. For decades these votes have supported the right wing of the party, and have attracted no criticism from

the press on that account. Support for conservative ideas does not constitute "meddling in politics." Now several unions have decided at their conferences to oppose the official party line, and their leaders are hailed as statesmanlike when they try to evade carrying out the decisions which they were mandated to represent. Headlines describe the debates as if they were merely clashes of personalities. It is Gaitskell *versus* Cousins. This may be part of the truth; at least Gaitskell and Cousins represent tendencies within the Labour movement whose distinguishing differences are not those of H-bomb policy; but if this is so the democrats should expose and attack the tendency to personalise matters of principle, not to exploit and aggravate it. Lastly, the unity and future of the Labour Party must be safeguarded at all costs. The Party can never have had so many well-wishers on the right before. The *Times* and the *Guardian* have been overburdened with sorrow at the possibility of the loyal opposition being saddled with a thought of disloyalty. It would be dangerous for our constitution if the opposition were not effective in Parliament. The hypocrisy is worse coming from the voice of Liberalism, since one of its permanent political criticisms has been that the parties are rigid and inflexible. It welcomes the flexibility of Labour when it takes a conservative decision, but abuses it when the delegates overthrow the platform and assert their point of view over the H-bomb. They are

all full of pity for poor old Gaitskell. "I will fight on" he announces after the greatest speech in his career (see close-up Wednesday evening papers), fighting against the decisions of the delegates who keep his organisation going, and announcing his unflinching defiance in the face of the people who, naively and without understanding the realities of politics, put his group into Parliament in their name. Educate, educate, educate, advises the *Guardian*, using the words of a socialist pioneer on how to achieve socialism in Britain; and with them urges Gaitskell to get his followers to agree to building socialism with H-bombs and American rocket bases, safeguarding it by military alliances including fascist dictatorships, and using the cult of the personality to silence opposition within his organisation.

Such is the reaction of the press and right wing Labourites when they are threatened by an adverse vote. The measures which they would take if threatened by anything worse than a vote can be appreciated by glancing across the channel to the growing threat of fascism in France, which is being whipped to a fury of arrests, imprisonments and persecutions of left wing intellectuals by a movement which might practically affect the power of the state to wage a brutal and vicious colonial war.

That is certainly not the position in England. The parliamentary Labour Party are almost all in favour of nuclear weapons, the Labour Party are out of office and will probably not be back for some

DEAR EDITORS,

Bernard Scott's letter on "Catholic Anarchism" and its plea for occasional contributions by e.g. Bob Steed, is characteristic of the old-fashioned and basically ignorant attitude of anarchists to "religion". Prof. J. M. Cameron in his third broadcast in the "New Left" recently drew attention to the fact that none of the writers of the new socialist school (MacIntyre excepted) seem to have read anything about religion beyond 19th century rationalism. There appears to be a kind of unconscious resistance, of the kind notably associated with sexual questions, to any deep involvement in spiritual issues. The result is an incredibly naive and adolescent understanding of religion. Bernard Scott talks as if all priests were reactionary and all

time, and experience has shown what happens to their revolutionary intentions when they do form the government. If Gaitskell has suffered a political defeat, the nuclear disarmament people in the party have only won a political victory. It will be a pity if advocates of nuclear disarmament were to rest on their laurels and ignore the need for continued propaganda and action against the bomb in real life. The democratic theory does not work, because in trying to elect representatives, and channelise political ideas through parties, it puts power into the hands of a few people who become literally conservatives. Direct social action takes power from the top people and leads each individual to take responsibility for himself, and its logical conclusion is therefore the abolition of government.

P.H.

anarchists were practical revolutionaries: this is the cry of a man living in a dream-world and dieting on last century liberals. Where are the anarchists to compare with Niemoller, Luther King, Michael Scott, Trevor Huddleston, Bishop Reeves, A. J. Muste, Father Groser and hundreds of others of whom you, living as you do in the 1850s, have never heard or shut your eyes to? I wouldn't dream of praising the Church for being revolutionary, on the contrary she has made a pretty mess of putting the "Magnificat" into practice, though one feels that her puerile effort is better than those of so-called anarchists. But if the dreamers who babble of their platitudes about the Church would come into the real world of social and racial conflicts, of war, hunger, poverty, and even—more to your liking perhaps—of serious theoretical discussions, they might see who it is who's doing the real work. If you add together the Christian radicals (who constitute the minority of the Church) I bet they'd easily treble the non-Christian anarchists in the country both in numbers, in dynamic and energy. Chuck it FREEDOM: you sound like religious cranks.

Yours on most things,  
 London, Oct. 4. KEN LEECH.

[If no reader answers the arguments put forward by our correspondent we will do so ourselves!—EDITORS].

I. A. C.

WHAT is this impressively-named body the "Secretariat for the International Anarchist Commission," and by what right does it claim to speak for all Anarchists, and if it does not, why does it make such a generalisation as "Anarchists . . . not sharing with them (Pacifists) a religious faith. . . .?"

Certainly many Anarchists, and notably the editorial staff of FREEDOM, have no religious faith. Equally certainly there are Anarchists who do have such a faith, and while these persons still exist the Secretariat's Statement On War must be regarded as, to this extent, untrue. I hope to read in FREEDOM soon that this misrepresentation has been deleted from the text of the Statement On War before it is presented to the War Resisters International Congress in December.

Woodley, Oct. 9. A.B.C.

**News from Slough!**

(From our Slough Correspondent)

BRAND new Warren Field Comprehensive School, first of its kind in Slough, got off to a very inauspicious start when its headmaster announced that children who did not wear uniform would be banned from G.C.E. classes and representing the school in sports. This move, which has upset most parents who don't care for uniform and a few who do, was taken in order to raise the prestige of the school to Grammar school level. It has received equivocal support from the *Slough Express*, the Marxist chairman of the Board of Governors and a leading local Fabian who is also on the Governing Board; silence from the Education Office; and vigorous opposition from the *Slough Observer* and a mother who wisely remarked that if they couldn't teach children out of uniform it was about time they found teachers who could.

Eton College, apparently, has not considered the threat to its own status sufficiently serious to oppose the move.

It is surprising that the vast majority of people think that uniforms are used (successfully too) to promote the brotherhood of man, when examples abound to demonstrate the opposite. School authorities give the game away when they say uniforms give a school distinction (n. act of distinguishing; separation or division; that which distinguishes; difference; eminence; superiority).

At the Slough Court, the manager of the Adelphi Cinema was refused a licence to sell liquor during Rock 'n' Roll show "Idols On Parade", starring Billy Fury and other top pops. Slough's police chief objected to the application on the grounds that the young audience would tend to get very excited about their idols. So the magistrates, one Major, one Alderman, two Doctors and a Sir, refused to grant the licence. Later on in the same Court proceedings, the same applicant was granted a liquor licence for a wrestling show.

Describing Fury's performance as unhealthy muck, a *Slough Observer* reporter wrote, "For ten minutes of his act the stage was taken over by a silent routine which overstepped the realms of mere suggestion. He stopped singing and the implication of his movements was obvious as he sank slow motion to the stage floor boards". When questioned about the performance, the Adelphi manager pleaded ignorance (he was backstage and did not see it) and the Granada circuit booking office said it was his usual act.

By all accounts it would seem that teenagers will pay to see someone writhing in agony. Beer, Blood and Brutality for adults; Soda, Sex and Sensuality for teenagers; Money for the Box Office.

Once famous as the Experimental Road Safety Town, Slough has been selected to try out the Oral Contraceptive. Local Roman Catholics, singing their ballad "We've Got Rhythm", have shown more alarm over murder in bed than they did over murder on the roads.

The big question here seems to be whether or not an ovum possesses a soul—or is it half a soul? Anyway it's the perfect murder—the one that Agatha Christie missed.

Hats off to Slough's DIS-illusionist, Dublin born Hugh Deeney, a male nurse who blew the facade away from Cliveden Hospital at its annual prize-giving ceremony. Invited to propose a vote of thanks to Lord Astor for taking the chair, this unpredictable Irishman took the opportunity to accuse the Cliveden doctors of treating nurses as handmaids and servants rather than as professional colleagues. Afterwards the Matron said she was "absolutely shattered". What a surprise for the Duke too!

What a pity Mr. Deeney is to do a disappearing trick back to his previous employment at Epsom.

And so life in Slough goes on. Officialdom and Business turn friends and neighbours into strangers and rivals; Status and Monetary Reward make for enmity between people who would otherwise co-operate. But that people are decent enough when given the chance is demonstrated well enough as in the case of a house fire in the district recently: almost before the half-gutted building had been brought under control neighbours had fixed the unfortunate family of seven up with shelter.

**The New Social Investigators-4**

Continued from p. 3

ary Britain is admirable and he discusses thoughtfully the proposition that future politics will become less and less the politics of production and more and more those of production. He produces ingenious arguments against the theoretical objections to a Consumers' party as a practical proposition: there is no *Poujadisme* about his approach, and to the idea that such a party would be merely acquisitive and materialistic, he points out that it "could be internationalist, for it is not as producers that we feel sympathy for Indian or Chinese peasants—rather the reverse since other producers are possible competitors. It is as consumers that we feel for them: they too are people, whose families are dying because they do not get enough to eat."

But when he describes the possible party organisation, we cannot avoid the feeling that the man who gets his fun by starting organisations, is at it again:

"The party would have little money, and if it had little money it would not initially have a strong political machine, with hundreds of paid officials, like the Labour and Conservative Parties. But would this be fatal? Election studies have queried the value of the old political machine; it is liable to antagonise as much as it is to attract support. What matters now is the kind of appeal that could be projected over television at the

national level and by small bands of enthusiasts in the constituencies. I do not think that a new party would find itself at a disadvantage if it was a much less elaborate affair than the old parties, with a less ponderous headquarters than the one where I worked, with less subordination of members to the national office, and above all with more plain speaking by M.P.'s emancipated from the Whips."

Well, let us say that he has simply got carried away with the idea. For this might be the voice of any crusading out-party—Frank Byers talking about the Liberal revival, or Mr. Martell on People's League, Michael Young is more worth listening to as a social investigator; the more so since the social changes he seeks are more likely to be the result of extra-political agitation and pressure from the kind of unofficial bodies that he has played such a useful hand in, while the changes in *direction* which we need, if we are to become something different from the meritocracy, demand different social values—something which no party could conceivably give us: the divorce of prestige from occupational status, the conviction that we exist for ourselves, and on our own terms, not for some imagined economic or national purpose, and the idea that the only free society is one in which we choose, not one in which we are chosen.

C.W.

**Autumn Windfall**  
 (continued !)

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!  
 WEEK 41

Deficit on Freedom	£820
Contributions received	£785
DEFICIT	£35
September 29 to October 6	
Received Sept. 30:	
London: D.B. 2/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-;	
Newcastle: H.B. 5/-; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-;	
Stockwell: Anon. 2/6.	
Total	19 6
Sheffield: H.W. 3/-; Margate: T.L. 11/-;	
Edmonton: W.E.W. 2/2; Brooklyn: E.F. 14/-;	
Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Slough: E.C. 5/-;	
San Francisco: L'Incaricato, part proceeds Picnic, Pleasanton £70/0/0.	
Total	72 17 2
Previously acknowledged	713 1 0
1960 TOTAL TO DATE	785 18 2
GIFT OF BOOKS: Edgwarebury: M.K.	
*Indicates regular contributor.	

**Meetings and Announcements**

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP and MALATESTA DEBATING SOCIETY

IMPORTANT

MEETINGS WILL BE HELD in basement, 5, Caledonian Road, N.1. (near King's Cross Station) at 7.30 p.m. All Welcome.

London Anarchist Group AN EXPERIMENT IN OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. At Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx. Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. At Dorothy Barasi's, 45 Twyford Avenue, Fortis Green, N.2. 1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. At Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

**FREEDOM**  
 The Anarchist Weekly  
 Postal Subscription Rates:  
 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)  
 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)  
 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)  
 Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies:  
 12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)  
 6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)  
 Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers  
**FREEDOM PRESS**  
 17a Maxwell Road  
 London, S.W.6. England  
 Tel.: Renown 3736