

FREEDOM

JUNE 9 1962 Vol 23 No 18

'Be it or be it not true that man is shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin, it is unquestionably true that government is begotten of aggression and by aggression.'
—HERBERT SPENCER

In this Issue:

- QUEENIE'S COLUMN
- THE BATTLERS OF BUKA
- STRIPPERS
- SEE NO EVIL
- CORRESPONDENCE

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY - 4d.

THIS week we propose to sit back in our most comfortable chair and take a cool look at the domestic battle raging between the Labour Party hierarchy, on the one hand, and the army of rebel members, critical supporters, disillusioned infiltrators, ambitious politicians, frustrated would-be politicians, and small-time exhibitionists, on the other. Only the anarchists can sit back and cast an objective glance—as well as enjoy a hearty laugh—at the antics on both sides, since we have never cherished the slightest illusion as to the possibility of achieving socialism through the Labour Party, and even less, in the chances (where we have no reason to question the motives) of the innumerable splinter- pressure- progressive- groups and parties bent on putting the doddering old gang of Transport House on the straight and narrow path to "real socialism", and to peace in our time! The Party's history is studded with similar battles, and its generals can pride themselves not only with having won them all, but that the efforts of its rebels to push it towards the Left, have all foundered dismally. The Labour Party with the passing of the years, steadily, inexorably, respectably marches Rightwards. And in the process it either casts its "revolutionary" hotheads into the political wilderness or destroys them in another way—by absorbing them. To achieve the latter it relies mainly on winning a general election now and then. "Ministerial responsibility" has a magic effect on all but a very few political tub-thumpers. Hence the almost pathological determination of the Party hierarchy to win the next general elections. As the Leader himself put it, when addressing the Young Socialists' rally at Skegness, last Thursday: "This is a very critical moment in the history of our party, for it is vital we should win the next election". Vital for whom? Mr. Gaitskell would undoubtedly reply "for the people and the nation". We would suggest that it was vital for the homogeneity of the Party and of course for a bunch of ambitious middle-aged politicians; that apart from some minor reforms nothing would be changed: I.C.I. and power politics would rule our lives as before, and the cake of pro-

'Vital to win the next Election'—FOR WHOM?

Top level only

duction would still be shared out to their advantage by those who didn't produce it, and though we all believed in equality it was obvious that some were "more equal than others".

★

THE "issues" which appear to be disturbing the, apparently recently acquired, "unity" of the Labour Party are—if one is to judge by the publicity given to them in the Press—(1) the organised disturbances at L.P. May day rallies in Glasgow and London (2) the sponsorship of the World Council of Peace's Disarmament Congress to be held in Moscow next month, by four prominent members of the Labour Party (3) The influence of the C.N.D. (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament) within the Party, and the Communist infiltration of the Campaign (4) Communist infiltration of the Young Socialists movement (5) The creation of INDEC (Independent Nuclear Disarmament Electoral Campaign) by members of CND and the Labour Party against the electoral interests of the Labour Party.

Not having attended either rally personally this writer must rely on the Press reports, the most detailed of which appeared in *Tribune* of May 18, and was subsequently reproduced in the *Guardian* as an £800 "advertiser's announcement" (financed by indignant friends of *Tribune*—that is anti-Gaitskellians—to counteract the misrepresentations in that august journal's report of the Glasgow meeting as well as to scotch any attempt by the Party hierarchy to proscribe the CND on the grounds that its youth section had organised the counter-demonstration in Glasgow). We will not attempt to unravel the Glasgow affair where not only Catholic ramifications in the Party apparently play an important part but also, according to the *Tribune* writer, the Scottish Committee

of 100 is "anarcho-syndicalist" and has a "decidedly ambivalent attitude to Labour". According to Messrs. Gaitskell and Brown it was the Communists in C.N.D. clothing; for the *Daily Herald* it was Trotskyists. All the accused deny responsibility and claim that Gaitskell's severest critics are his own party members. *Solidarity* (a lively duplicated journal, whose political affiliations we ignore, though we imagine it to be one of the multifarious one-and-only Marxist or Trotskyist groups which "truly" represent the workers' interests) supports them by suggesting that most of the hecklers were "clearly Young Socialists—many of them known to us." Undoubtedly, that would be the healthiest explanation. One cannot, however discount the views of Alan Clayton, a young Socialist, who resigned from being secretary of the Scottish Youth CND following the Glasgow May Day disturbances, in spite of the fact that his letters to the Press, and in particular his long article in *Peace News* last week, not to mention his various allegiances, political and religious, do not create the impression that he is an objective witness of the

situation and incidents he describes. However in his *Peace News* article he does point out that whatever the National Press may have reported him as saying, at "no time did he use the words "Communist infiltration". If any particular body was responsible for the disturbance, it would seem to have been the Committee of 100. On the other hand

Playing the political games

TO expel Bertrand Russell, Canon Collins and others from the Labour Party for being sponsors of a World Disarmament Congress because it is organised by the World Council of Peace, a recognised Communist-front organisation, is the same as saying that when Gaitskell for the Labour Party, or the late Nye Bevan, pressed the Government to accept Krushchev's proposal for a Summit conference they were supporting a proscribed Party and should be expelled. Yes, it is as silly as that! For years, in Geneva, representatives of Russia and the Western Powers have been meeting to find a formula for disarmament which will be acceptable to both

in most of his article he attempts to show that the YCND was being worked upon and influenced by the Communists, and was "imbibing an alien philosophy carefully prepared for it".

Now to proscribe the CND because of Communist infiltration would be a silly as proscribing the Labour Party itself for the same reasons! The Communists seek to infiltrate every movement of any importance either to capture it or to destroy it. They have been doing this in the Labour Party and the Trades Unions for decades. Why be surprised when they try the same tactic in CND.

We do not for one moment assume that the intentions of the nations concerned are "honourable"! They are simply playing one of the many games of politics which provide profitable jobs for "the boys" and hoodwink a gullible public. And if and when the Labour Party are in office they will do no less than their predecessors; indeed, even in opposition they meet the Heads of State of East and West. It will be argued that whether one approves of their political ideologies or not one has to deal with them, etc. . . . Agreed! But why should dealings, attempts at "understanding" at "top level" be in order, yet

Continued on page 3

"Society is produced by our wants."
—GODWIN.

IT is a long time since the Anarchists could flaunt the crest "By Appointment to the Royal Family", the aristocratic strain of Prince Kropotkin of the late Czar's Court of Pages Count Tolstoy and Count Bakunin have graced the Almanac de Gotha, but the stock is running out. The last of the Malastas and the presence of the first anarchist knight make the creation of anarchist life-peers a political 'must'. . . . The season has opened with a jumble sale in aid of the Distressed Anarchists' Benevolent Fund, receptions at the Spanish, American and Russian Embassies, presentations at Court (Bow Street and Marlborough Street), a charity drive for Spanish refugees, a matinee at Hyde Park to open the glittering season, intimate jazz soirees at Morningson Crescent, and 'charge' parties at Finborough Roads, visits to the Café de la Paix and of course, Aldermaston, the fashionable event of the season. "A Glyndbourne for the feet" as charming, vivacious Peggy Duff described it. The debutant of the 'sixties is glad of an occasional sit-down to relieve the mad whirl. . . . A coming out party was held at Wandsworth for Joseph (Joe) Soap on completion of a nine-month stretch for incitement. He is an old Wormwood Scrubbsian and during the war served with the N.C.C. (Stake Hill and Colchester) in which he was C.O. He fought through the war but ultimately he was joined by the military. . . . John Doe and Rose Roe celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of their free union at Battersea "off-centre" Group. Their six children, fourteen grand-children and twenty great-grand children attended and presented them with an orgone box. . . .

The closure of Ferrer Brow School will be mourned by many of its old scholars. Its proud traditions of non-conformity, disobedience, free thinking and free love have made it a byword in the English-speaking world (and in the press). Among the old boys sending condolences were several from Brixton, Wormwood Scrubbs, Pentonville, Wandsworth, in there, of course, for incitement, sitting-down, obstruction, and non-payment of rates. . . .

Queenie's Column

The first sit-down of the season was a huge success. It was held at the country seat of the U.S.A.F. (without permission of the Commandant). Members of the County police force were present



By Appointment

[Two excellent articles by Colin MacInnes on Anarchism appeared recently in the magazine *Queen*. Though this magazine has been radically transformed since the days when it was exclusively meant for the debutante circles and the dentist's waiting rooms, it still retains some of the old features including society gossip and the society faces. Our correspondent Jack Spratt not content to see the feature columns occupied by the Anarchists has also decided to rewrite Jennifer's "There and Their" column in the approved *Queen* style.]

in force, their blue uniforms contrasting splendidly with the duffle coats and jeans of the younger set. The gathering was enlivened by the appearance of the Secretary of State for Air, the Home Secretary, and many prominent journalists. Among those not present were Countess Bunny Esterhazy, The Marquessa de Santa Cruz, Baroness Bentinck, The MacGillicuddy of the Reeks, Miss Minnie D'Erlanger, Lady Dynevor, the Marquis and Marquise de Miramon, Mr. Arpad Plesch, Miss Flockie Harcourt-Smith, Countess Wumbrand, Prince and Princess Cray, Count Czernin and Princess Belmont. Among others absent were the Hon. Mrs. de Zulueta, The Duchess of Wethersfield, Mr. Raimund and Lady Elizabeth von Hoffmannsthal, the Hon. Shaun and Mrs. Plunket, Mr. Paul Getty, Lord and Lady Primrose, Prince and Princess Weikersheim, Mr. & Mrs. Joseph Rank, Viscountess Lewisisham, the Earl and Countess and Rock-savage. It is understood that they were all otherwise engaged. . . .

I have been asked to deny the scandalous rumour that Adam Eve (of the L.A.G.) and Eve Adam are married. The truth is that they are still living in their country mansion at Sinn just outside Much Wedlock. . . . When Mr. John Goodhill was presented at Court he was told by the magistrate "It appears that you wish to live without doing any work except when you feel like it. You also want to indulge in all your personal pleasures. . . writing poetry, for example. . . ." To do this, Mr. Goodhill is desirous of being adopted by persons of good social standing with a secure income so that he may be a bohemian without any of the social stigma accruing to those of lowly rank and position. . . . Any offers? . . . I have just been given a recipe for *Bombe surprise*. Take two ounces of picric acid, three grains of trolene-nitrate, two ounces of sodium carbonate, one pint of carbolic acid, half-pound of sodium chloride, insert in a container with a strip of angelica dangling tastefully from the rim. Light the angelica and retire (preferably abroad). This should make any party go with a bang. Especially recommended for Royal occasions.

JACK SPRATT.

THEATRE BOSSES CAPITULATE

WHEN the Musicians threatened to strike for their demand of another £5 a week, Prince Littler, one of London's big theatre bosses was splashed all over the front page of the *Evening Standard* "LITTLER LASHES THE MUSIC MEN", "These demands are 'outrageous—Communistic'." For the reader who just reads the headlines, here was another example of the disruptive

hand of Moscow—even in our entertainment world! In fact he is reported as saying "We shall do our best to meet this rather Communistic attitude". Does a strike threat constitute a "rather Communistic attitude" for if so there is clearly more communistic attitudes in the Western world than in Russia! However, the other warning by Prince Littler was that "demands have been made for certain things which we as an industry cannot give them", and consequently though the "show would go on" strike or no strike, it might mean that the Musicals in London would have music supplied by a couple of pianos instead of an orchestra, until such time as the musicians saw reason.

But within a week, one of the impresarios, Mr. Harold Fielding, had broken with the Society of West End Theatre Managers and made his peace with the musicians on their terms. And by last weekend Prince Littler and the rest had capitulated too. And in spite of the fact that only a week earlier we had been told that the industry could not afford it, now the managements hasten to add that the £5 a week increase to musicians will not effect the price of seats. Curious, isn't it?

ANARCHY 16

(NOW ON SALE)

discusses

AFRICA

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month. ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

The Battlers of Buka

THE administrators of Buka Island, one of the Solomons Group in the Pacific, received unexpected publicity in February last when a violent battle occurred between native villagers and a large police patrol.

This is a report concerning the 8,000 villagers in the Hahalis area on Buka's N.E. coast and the punitive action taken by the Australian New Guinea Government against the entire Buka community. Their crime? The desire to live as they choose.

On February 19th, over 150 police moved into Hahalis village on the pretext of arresting tax defaulters.

Fighting broke out which resulted in over 60 casualties. The Government administrator, Brigadier Sir Donald Cleland said: "The Buka crisis has neared full scale war preparations."

But it was not the first police action which he had ordered. Over 10 days earlier, on February 6th, a force of 70 native police under an Inspector W. Burns made camp in the Hahalis district. They were armed with batons and firearms.

Although officials stated later that their orders were to apprehend over 80 Buka villagers for non-payment of taxes they did, in fact, seize only 5 men on this occasion.

They included John Teosin one of the leaders of the Hahalis Welfare Society—which had been formed last year by the villagers themselves—for the improvement of their living conditions and agricultural efficiency in the area.

This Society the Government refused to recognise.

The arrest of the 5 men was the actual cause of the clash which followed when more than 2,000 villagers converged upon the police.

"They were yelling and screaming", said one witness, "and the women thrust

their babies in front of them shouting 'Go on!! Kill us!! Kill our babies!!'"

The police were forced back over 300 yards before using their batons to disperse the demonstrators.

(The presence of women and children would seem to indicate that the villagers were unarmed.—F.W.)

The five prisoners escaped.

At this stage the Government seemed to realise that some careful conditioning would be necessary if they were to justify their attacks on this Buka community.

The public were certainly not prepared for such measures in what they had been told was a trivial tax dispute involving a few hundred pounds.

There had been no lack of funds for Government projects.

Only a few months before the Government had dismissed criticism of an over expenditure of £20,000 on "publicity" alone because it had been ordered by the Minister of Territories, Mr. Hasluck. How had this £20,000 been spent?

On printing and distributing copies of the speeches and proceedings at the opening of the Papua and New Guinea Legislative Council which Mr. Hasluck had attended in April.

The Government had even advertised for a Chief Press Information Officer for Papua and New Guinea.

In a territory where the legal minimum wage for native workers is £15 p.a. the Government was offering the applicant £3,000 a year!! The tax issue alone was clearly not enough.

So it was that the following information became available. The 8,000 Buka villagers had refused to co-operate with the Government or set up a local government council.

They had formed their own Hahalis Welfare Society which they intended to keep independent of Church or State officials. They refused to pay the head tax of £2 imposed in 1958. Villages had even combined in a form of group "Sande" in which their export incomes were pooled.

THE revival of "Lock Up Your Daughters", at the Mermaid will provide another opportunity for all the readers of this paper (who refused to see the play on its first appearance because it was too fashionable), to find out what all the fuss was about. "Lock Up Your Daughters" is a musical comedy, a medium that I approach with extreme suspicion myself, and one that the serious-minded readers of this paper usually find too frivolous for their lofty minds to bother with.

The aforesaid lofty minds would, however be making a great mistake in adopting this attitude towards "Daughters". Bernard Miles, in adapting the play from Henry Fielding's "Rape Upon Rape", has managed to retain most of Fielding's satirical attacks on the social and political follies of his time; attacks which put paid to Fielding's career as a dramatist and provoked Walpole to put through the "Lord Chamberlain Bill" which has emasculated the English Theatre ever since. There is plenty of good satirical meat here and the modern slant of the dialogue brings it home well.

The acting in this production is almost impossible to fault. Bernard Miles' brilliant portrayal of Squeezum, the corrupt magistrate ("if they can't pay for their sins like the rich, they must suffer for them like the poor") brings irresistibly to mind that childhood definition of a dirty old man as "a venereal old gentleman with horn-rimmed testicles". His performance is only exceeded by Hy Hazell's breathtaking performance as Mrs. Squeezum. In an outstanding cast one must also mention Peter Gilmore's healthily lecherous performance as Ramble and Colin Ellis's telling cameo of the old servant. Colin Ellis tends to be ignored by the critics but it is his excellent supporting parts that have created much of the impact of the Mermaid's recent productions. Lionel Bart's songs are excellent where they are supposed to be funny, but the love songs would have benefitted from the more astringent hand of his erstwhile partner Mike Pratt.

Henry Fielding quite obviously felt that sex and politics should be discussed on the stage and this brought him into considerable conflict with authority. The same attitude has brought Lennie Bruce

The Bukas had also refused to use schools, churches or the local medical post as all were operated by the Roman Catholic Church.

They had demanded their own medical post as the nearest hospital was 25 miles away.

Police reinforcements arrived on February 16th

A group of several hundred Bukas told the priests that they were not satisfied with the progress made under the present administration and that they had built their own village, near Hahalis, in which they intended to live as their ancestors did "before the white man came".

They were labelled "turn-back-the-clock-cultists" by the Press. Father George Fahey, an American Roman Catholic missionary on Buka said: "The cultists have almost broken the heart of Father Lamarr."

Bukas remained friendly with the priests but refused to attend the schools or churches.

"I told them, 'If you persist in your plans you cannot remain within the church.'" Father Lamarr told the press later "They just shrugged their shoulders and turned away". "Keep your church," they said.

The Government seem to have de-

cidied some time ago to punish the Buka community. The civil patrols were replaced by police over six months ago. Even so, this was not easily arranged.

Unlike the indentured labourers or plantation workers in the territory the Bukas were not at the direct mercy of an employing class. They lived in a self-supporting group of beachside villages stretching almost 40 miles along the N.E. coast of Buka Island. They lived on their own land, cultivated their own crops and produced copra for export which was sold direct to a marketing board.

The Government administration could not interfere with the cash payments which they received for copra without risking the antagonism of the entire New Guinea peoples.

Likewise their land tenure was secure for the same reason. Their housing standards were low and medical facilities primitive (life expectancy for Papua and New Guinea is still only 34 years), but compared with many resistors their position was not easily undermined.

The Bukas, however, still refused to form a local government council. In this move they probably feared a Government attempt to gain influence over them.

The Councils in Papua and New

Off-Centre Discussion Meetings

The London Anarchist Group's 'Off-Centre Discussion Meetings', started to provide local opportunities for discussion not possible at the Sunday evening meetings at the "Two Brewers" in central London, continue to flourish and multiply. As was originally hoped, they are beginning to provide the nuclei of local groups, and the LAG may soon find itself becoming not a single group but a federation, with activity like meetings, paper-sales, etc., going on in different parts of town.

As can be seen from the Announce-

ments column, another regular meeting will be taking place in the North London area (what's the matter with our readers South of the river?). This means that every Wednesday there is an anarchist discussion circle meeting somewhere in London, and also on the last Thursday and the first Friday of every month. We hope readers will support these meetings (they are social gatherings as well as educational!) and will bring along any interested friends, ban-the-bombers, etc.

STRIPPERS

prosecutions for obscenity in America and mass walkouts from his performances over here at "The Establishment". Bruce has been called a sick comedian, but the sickness, as George Melly has pointed out, belongs to the society that rejects him. The would-be liberal young men and women who patronise "The Establishment", are not prepared to hear the facts of sex, race, drugs, the phoniness of religion, and the nauseating hypocrisy of all of us, discussed in a way that strips every member of his audience mentally naked.

It is not his much advertised use of words like 'fuck' that causes the walkouts. It is his incredible ability to pull down the facade that all of us show the world as ourselves. He is someone that all the readers of this paper (whose smug belief that they are the sole members of a moral elite Bruce would tear to shreds) should try to hear somehow. His records give only a very faint idea of his stage act but nevertheless I am going to suggest that those who can listen to two of his LP's for Fantasy, "Togetherness" and "Lennie Bruce—American".

Lennie Bruce has now left England. I hope he will be given the opportunity to return.

JOHN PILGRIM.

FRANCIS WEBB.

Horsehair, paint and clay balls

KENNETH ARMITAGE'S recent sculptures at the NEW LONDON GALLERY, 17 Old Bond Street, W.1. has opened to a muffled roll of drums, for none of the top brass among our major critics troubled to go through the routine of throwing his hat in the air when ascending from this lush Bond Street anchorage. This is odd and unfortunate for Armitage's work is neither better nor worse than most of the stuff that has littered this basement gallery in the recent past. His huge blocks of animated clay have obvious affinities with the work of others digging in the same field, yet in his own fashion Armitage manages to hold our passing attention. But for all their weight, size and feeling of internal strength they are still the inert blocks and balls of clay that were dragged lifeless out of the yielding earth.

Here they lie like metallic crustacea shells in this large gallery and only the addition of a hint of boneless legs can suggest that a mindless animation might have-moved the originals, for they cannot arouse pity, awe or sympathy in the spectator for these half-formed masses of ductile earth still wait for the breath of life to transform them into the stone

mirrors of our vagrant dreams and emotions.

Across the road and up the stairs in the SEVEN ARTS GALLERY at 30 Old Bond Street, W.1 are the collages of the "nuclear" artist Enrico Baj. His "Ultra-bodies and furniture pieces" are as gay and as witty as anything that Steinberg ever drew but Baj, in spite of the catalogue blurb, is killing corpses, for despite his rave squad he is parodying and mocking an age now too old to care. The furniture knobs for female breasts, the old radio transformers for mouths, the coloured pieces of glass for eyes and the cooty looking horse hair for flesh has been assembled upon a background of ornate wall paper, bed spreads and chair covering to form his moronic subjects but the "nuclear" Baj has gone too far back into the past for his material and a giggle not a gasp is all they can arouse and a feeling that a can of D.D.T. is a literal accessory with so much recent work, for while the dustbin may be an invaluable source of material, summer is coming.

Karel Appel continues to splash around upon his huge canvases and his latest efforts are to be seen at GIMPEL FILS in South Molton Street, W.1. This

Guinea are controlled by a Native Affairs Officer whose task is supposed to be the training of natives for self-government. Some have been in existence for over 10 years and are still under this control. The Government finally used the Taxation issue to enforce its will on the Bukas. On February 19th the police party, now numbering 150, moved once more against the villagers.

Said one report: "The signal for action seemed to be the placing of an officer's arm on a Buka's and the words 'I arrest you!' being used." The villagers used sticks, stones and spears. No women or children were present.

The native police—under 9 Australian officers—used their batons. At the height of the battle two shots were fired "towards the sea" by one of the white officers.

Resistance was so fierce that the Government ordered 400 police reinforcements into the area. They arrived the next day. By this time, however, the villagers and their leaders had walked peaceably into the police camp and surrendered themselves.

An offer to pay £120 from their Welfare Society funds towards the taxes claimed was refused by the Assistant Administrator, Dr. J. Gunther. "We don't negotiate with law-breakers," he said.

The 400 police reinforcements were now used to transport the hundreds of prisoners from the scene of the police action to Sohano where the magistrate, R. E. Ormsby, had set up court after flying from Rabul.

At this time hostages were also being escorted to nearby villages to point out any of the "guilty" who may have escaped. The prisoners, all of them heavily bandaged, were then marched over 20 miles in torrential rain. 85 in one party arrived in manacles. On arrival several were taken to hospital with suspected skull fractures.

The men's trial was a final act of humiliation pushed through with indecent haste by the Administration before any assistance or protest could be organised.

Altogether in 7 days the magistrate heard over 600 cases. There were 588 convictions. 120 villagers were sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment, 50 received 3 months. Fines totalled £348.

Two of the leaders of the Hahalis Welfare Society, John Teosin and Saha were sentenced to 4 and 6 months' hard labour respectively for escaping from custody on February 6th, and 6 months each for riotous behaviour on February 19th.

Reports that the accused had not been represented by legal counsel led to several Australian Trade Unions advising the men to appeal so that the Unions could supply free legal aid. It is not known if this offer was ever conveyed to the prisoners. The prison sentences were probably the most vicious part of the Government's action.

In this territory cultivated land becomes overgrown within weeks. Such long absences could be ruinous to the Buka community.

This, then, is what the Australian Government's policy of "leading the people towards self-determination" means in practice.

How long can such hypocrisy be upheld?

BOOKS?

We can supply

ANY book in print. Also out-of-print books searched for—and frequently found! This includes paper-backs, children's books and text books. (Please supply publisher's name if possible).

NEW BOOKS

Franny and Zooey J. D. Salinger 16/- Pages from the Goncourt Journal (ed. R. Baldick) 38/- America and the World Revolution Arnold Toynbee 12/6

REPRINTS AND CHEAP EDITIONS

Poor Folk and the Gambler Fyodor Dostoevsky 5/- Selected Plays John Webster and John Ford 5/6 The Brave Cowboy (Lonely are the Brave) Edward Abbey 2/6 Two Weeks in Another Town Irwin Shaw 3/6

SECOND-HAND

Great Britain and the European Crisis (1914) 2/6; Burke's Steerage T. H. White 4/-; Religions Persecution E. S. P. Haynes 4/-; Christianity and Rationalism on Trial McCabe, Watts, &c. 4/-; Ethics of the Great Religions Charles T. Gorham 4/-; A History of Anglo-Soviet Relations W. P. and Zelda K. Coates 8/6; The Case of Rudolf Hess J. R. Rees 4/-; Joy in Work Henri de Man 5/-; Red Star over China Edgar Snow 4/-; The Triumph of Nationalisation Leo Chiozza Money 3/-; The Life of J. Pierpoint Morgan John Kennedy Winkler 6/-; The Modern Inquisition (N.K.V.D.) Hugo Dewar 7/6; The Sense of Glory Herbert Read (Sl. soiled and pencil scored) 5/-; Born in Exile George Gissing 5/6; Smoke Bellew Jack London (soiled) 3/-; The Civil War in France Karl Marx 2/6; The Journal of Arthur Stirling Upton Sinclair 4/6; Aurelian Louis Aragon 3/6; The U.S.S.R. speaks for Itself: Industry Varga, Joffe, &c. (sl. damaged) 2/6; The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti Howard Fast 6/-; The Intelligentsia of Great Britain Dmitri Mirsky 10/-; Why we Fight Arthur Greenwood (1940) 3/-; Empire or Democracy Leonard Barnes 2/6; The Forty-Second Parallel John Dos Passos 7/6; Isvolsky and the World War Friedrich Stieve 6/-; Anarchism: a Criticism and History of the Anarchist Theory E. V. Zenker 25/-; The Sickness of an Acquisitive Society R. H. Tawney 5/-; Miscarriage of Justice G. C. L. DuCann 10/-; Advancement of Learning and Novum Organum Francis Bacon 4/-.

Freedom Bookshop

(Open 2 p.m.—5.30 p.m. daily; 10 a.m.—1 p.m. Thursdays; 10 a.m.—5 p.m. Saturdays).

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM SW6 Tel: REN 3736

FREEDOM

June 9 1962 Vol 23 No 18

TOP LEVEL ONLY

Continued from page 1

similar meetings at "lower levels", say between Shostakovitch and Schweitzer, Picasso and Russell, Boyd-Orr and Sholokhov, Collins and Neruda (to mention the names of some of the sponsors of the World Disarmament Congress) be crimes in the eyes of the Labour leaders punishable by expulsion from the Party?

We are not saying that the Labour Party should be expected to suffer known Communist Party members in its ranks; we think no reasonable person would expect them *not* to proscribe the newly created electoral group INDEC. A political party whose *raison d'être* is that of winning elections is in every way justified in protecting itself from infiltration by other political parties engaged in the same racket. For the would-be infiltrators to protest that political democracy and other equally meaningless "rights" are denied them in the circumstances is sheer hypocrisy. But the case of Collins and Russell is quite another matter; they are no more members of the World Council of Peace than Gaitskell is of the Comintern though they sponsor a World Disarmament Congress, and Gaitskell has supported Summit Meetings when the initiative has come from Krushchev. And from the statements made by Russell and Collins since the threat of expulsion they are no more naive about next month's Moscow show than Gaitskell or the Government are about Geneva disarmament conferences or Summit Meetings. At Skegness Gaitskell told his audience of Young Socialists, according to the

The danger they sense

IT seems pretty obvious that the Communist bogey is being used by the Labour Party partly in an attempt to smash the unilateralist movement,† partly to make clear to the public—the voting public—that the orthodoxy of the party on "defence" is beyond reproach and cannot be made into a party issue by the Tories at the next elections. To throw overboard a Russell and a Collins; to proscribe a journal such as *Keep Left* whose minute circulation is in any case mainly among those who cannot vote anyway; to lose the votes of those members of the CND, of age to vote, who would have voted Labour, these are sacrifices worth making if they reassure the "floating voters", those who don't know what they believe they should believe, but know that if they believe anything it should be respectable, and that they should only vote for a party which doesn't propose to change anything except to reduce taxation and improve their standard of living.

As Mr. Harold Wilson put it to his young audience: "As Socialists they must have *three aims*—to rededicate Britain to social justice; to bring back a sense of economic purpose into national life, and to restore Britain's place in the world". "Rededicate", "bring back", "restore". We never knew that we *had* had it so good. Did you?

Mr. Anthony Greenwood, M.P., Chairman of the youth sub-committee told them that in view of the fact that people were not turning to

†Which threatens to become a mass-movement without the control from above which would make it into yet another docile, spineless "disciplined" movement with which we are only too familiar in the western world.

Guardian report:

"They [the 40 proscribed Communist "front" bodies] have very nice specious names, and very often succeed in attracting to their ranks innocent, naive people who do not know they are being used for Communist propaganda. This drew an incredulous cry of: "People like Bertrand Russell?" to which he replied: "Yes, I'm afraid in this case that is true".

Yet Russell and Collins have been accepted at sponsors on conditions which should make the Western politicians' mouths water! Collins' acceptance was conditional on everything he said being included, unedited in any report that the conference may publish; Russell, that "leading members of the Committee of 100 should be present at the Congress and contribute to the discussions". Whether in the event the organisers will carry out their undertakings is another matter. If they do not, it will in itself be of propaganda value against them; and if other non-communists lend their names in future then they could indeed be accused of being fellow travellers or "innocents". Even Canon Collins is no more than "open-minded about the efficacy of the conference", so we will not, we hope, be accused of being agin-everything when we add our view that nothing will come of it, though we suspect that the organisers and the Russian authorities will fall over backwards to avoid giving the Gaitskells or Stephen Spender, C.B.E. (as from June 1st) and other official representatives of American-front "Congresses for the Freedom of Culture" any grounds for criticism of the proceedings.

them in the numbers they needed (not enough crosses on the ballot papers, that is) they had *two duties*, and we quote from the *Guardian*:

They must do nothing to foster the idea spread by their opponents that they were a harsh and intolerant party.

They must also face the fact that public opinion polls showed that half the electors could see no real difference between the Government and the Opposition.

The second "aim" as reported is so subtle that we can only surmise that Mr. Greenwood was suggesting that the Labour Party should start advocating socialism for a change. The first "aim", in view of the impending expulsions either means nothing or should lead to Mr. Greenwood's immediate expulsion from the Party as an infiltrator! But have no fears, the rebel politicians know how far to go, and when to come to heel. Gaitskell knows that just as does Michael Foot. All politicians hate each others guts. But what they hate more than their fellow politicians' ambitions are those people who advocate doing without politicians, for they, if they really got away with it, would put the politicians and the committees and sub-committees of experts and lawyers out of business. And where they sense any danger of that happening they close their ranks. (Observe the enthusiasm with which Mr. Foot supports the C.N.D. but ignores, or attacks the Committee of 100).

The political parties, like the State, must either be starved of support or destroyed by the revolutionary action of the people. To seek to mould them, to reform them, to use them, to infiltrate them is as naive as trying to teach your grandmother to suck eggs!

The Royal Commission's Report on the Police

SEE NO EVIL

HAVING read this Report, I call to mind the figures of the "three wise monkeys of the East". One monkey has his hands over his eyes so that he will see no evil; another has his hands over his ears so that he will hear no evil; the third covers his mouth with his hands to prevent himself speaking evil. Surely these three monkeys sat on this Commission; the first two interviewed the witnesses, and the third dictated the report through simian fingers.

The Royal Commission was appointed largely because of general disquiet about the police force. A number of publicised scandals contributed to this. In 1956 disciplinary action was taken against the Chief Constable of Cardiganshire following an outcry against the maladministration of his police force; this force was abolished as a separate unit and merged under that of a neighbouring county. In 1957 the widespread racketeering of a number of the senior officers of the Brighton police force eventually received publicity. The Chief Constable of Brighton was subsequently dismissed and two senior officers, who seemed to have been particularly greedy or particularly unlucky, received prison sentences. In the same year the Chief Constable of Worcester was sentenced to imprisonment for fraud. Soon after, the long-drawn case of the boy in Thurso who was a victim of police assault came to a head with the appointment of a Tribune of Enquiry by Parliament. In 1959 the Chief Constable of Nottingham was required to submit a report to the Watch Committee concerning some gestapo-like enquiries which he had caused to be made about the political activities of a member of the City Council. The Watch Committee, imagining that they had some sort of democratic control over the Chief Constable, attempted to suspend him, but the Home Secretary intervened on behalf of the autonomous right of a police chief. In the same year the Home Secretary kindly used £300 of public money to settle an action for assault against a London policeman. In the course of a debate of censure of such generosity, the Home Secretary announced that a Royal Commission would be set up to review the police. The Commission were given the task of considering four main points:

1. "the constitution and functions of local police authorities;
2. the status and accountability of members of police forces, including chief officers of police;
3. the relationship of the police with the public and the means of ensuring that complaints by the public against the police are effectively dealt with; and
4. the broad principles which should govern the remuneration of the constable, having regard to the nature and extent of police duties and responsibilities and the need to attract and retain an adequate number of recruits with proper qualifications."

It is significant that they attended to point No. 4 first. This has been the subject of a separate report which appeared last year, and the police have already received their increase in pay. The rest has been the subject of an elaborate whitewash. They have determined that the whole situation is just fine. There is no reason to suppose that relations between police and public are not cordial (except for "younger informants"

"motorists"). There is no reason to alter the position whereby Chief Constables are beyond the control of any local Watch Committee (although the latter may tender advice). The existing conditions in which the police themselves are both judge and jury in their own case, should the public complain, is entirely satisfactory! To be sure, three members of the Commission could not quite swallow this last finding, and they proposed founding a Commissioner of Rights who could, in certain circumstances *examine* (but *not* investigate) complaints from members of the public, M.P.s and others. In fact, what these three members of the Commission appear to want is a permanent auxiliary with a whitewash bucket who will head off any unfortunate moves towards a Tribune of Enquiry such as was set up in the case of the assault of the boy in Thurso.

To give the reader some of the flavour of how the Commission reported facts which awkwardly protruded from the liberal blanket of oil which they poured over the evidence, the following may be quoted:

"Any suggestions that the police ever took bribes, used unnecessary violence, employed unfair means of getting evidence, or gave false evidence in court were repudiated by almost half of those interviewed." (italics added).

The same piece of evidence might well be expressed in the following terms:

"More than half of those interviewed agreed with the suggestion that the police took bribes, used unnecessary violence, etc."

The Commission had perhaps made the tactical error, considering their manifest bias, in employing the Government Social Survey to collect evidence for them. What we are presented with in the report is a selection from the Survey's report. To get anything like a complete and fair picture of what the Survey found one would have to go to the original material and not to the short quotes and interpretations of them which are provided by the Commission. If one has a little practice in detecting the art of How To Lie With Statistics, one can discern a glimmer or two of light even in the rehash of some of the Survey's findings which the Commission have used.

The Commission wish to demonstrate that relations between the public and the police have *not* deteriorated, contrary to a widespread belief to the contrary. They have to admit that,

"There was an acute conflict of evidence whether or not the present relationship between the police and the public is better or worse than in the past. The witnesses representing the central departments, police authorities, and chief officers of police, were unanimous in holding that there was no evidence of significant deter-

ioration in recent years . . . Yet a further group of witnesses submitted that there had been a significant decline, some even holding that the traditional standard of the police was in grave danger."

What the National Survey did was to draw a random sample from the electoral register, using quota sampling to equate for urban/rural differences, and differences between districts of varying economic level. These people were interviewed about their attitudes to the police. We are *not* told:

- (a) What the rate of non-co-operation was.
- (b) Whether non-co-operation was related to socio-economic level. For example, did the people in poorer districts refuse to discuss the police rather often?
- (c) How the questions were put. For example, the Commissioners report that "No less than 83 per cent of those interviewed professed great respect for the police", but we are left in the dark as to what actual statements the interviewees endorsed or did not agree with.
- (d) Why the electoral register, with the known bias it must introduce into a survey, was used. Precisely those classes of people who are most critical of the police are more difficult to contact through the electoral register. The Survey did take the precaution of adding a sample (number not stated) of young people aged 18-20, and it appears that they were far more critical of the police than the sample contacted through the electoral register technique.

The Commission announce with satisfaction that in the investigations of the National Survey:—

"Most informants said that their feelings towards the police had not changed over the past 10 years, but of those whose feelings had changed the majority thought more highly of the police now than they had done previously. Again of those who thought the police had changed in their manner towards the public in recent years the majority thought the change had been for the better rather than the worse."

So sucks to those witnesses who came before the Commission and alleged the contrary! But is this so? Do the social statisticians who run the Government Survey seriously maintain that this is a social fact—or have they already warned the Commission that this is an artifact in the expected direction? For if in a social survey you investigate people's estimated change of opinion over 10 years or so you will invariably find that the majority of people allege a change in themselves in a *conservative* direction. If the Survey asked people "Do you consider that policemen tend to look younger nowadays compared to 10 years ago?" I will confidently predict that the majority will say "yes—policemen do look younger now," but that will not demonstrate that policemen do look younger nowadays, it will merely demonstrate the known facts of observer bias. People change as they grow older.

So if we want to get at the facts established by the Government Survey, it is to their report we must go. It may prove that the Commissioners have caused to be established evidence quite other than the interpretations which are contained in their Report.

(To be concluded)

LETTER

CONDITION OF WORKERS' IN INDUSTRY

DEAR COMRADE,

The discussion of snobbery has obscured John Boyle's main point, I think. I agree generally with what his critics have said. Even if freedom does not mean exactly the same in industry and in art, an anarchist would work for it in both fields. And where art is content to produce what is 'acceptable' or what is demanded of it, industrial workers are told they must make sacrifices for the sake of something or other.

But the condition of workers in industry still offers the hardest questions for anarchists; and also, I think, the most important ones. Industrial workers themselves are the only people who can understand these questions well or say much about them. And if Boyle was reminding us of this, I am grateful to him.

It is not true that *everything* we do depends on how industry is organised, or on whether it is in private ownership or public. If we used to think that questions of economics and questions about property would settle almost

everything, we were wrong. But anarchism is meaningless unless it makes the position of industrial workers central. I do not mean that there are more anarchists among industrial workers than anywhere else—although it may be that there are. I mean that we cannot know anything about liberty and oppression unless we know something about the condition of workers in industry. And what industrial workers have to say is particularly important.

Workers are exploited when wages are depressed in comparison with the prosperity of the industries they work in; or rather, in comparison with what is *possible* in these industries. But workers are also exploited by the methods of industrial production: by their relation to the machines, mass production, the splitting of jobs so that an apprentice hardly ever learns a trade in the old sense; motion study—the mechanisation of labour, so that what a man does depends less and less on his own competence as an engineer, for instance. Workers are there for the sake of the

machines—not the other way round. Not 'We need machines, to enable us to do this and that', but 'We need men to serve the machines.'

'The dignity of labour', said Ruskin. And someone else said, 'Well, Ruskin never cleaned out midden heaps, then'. He never worked in a modern factory either. A boy I know was learning a trade and was put to tapping nuts from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., every day and week after week. Then add motion study, someone with a stop-watch telling him how many more to do in an hour . . . and tell me what dignity or self-respect can grow from this. I know, it is all part of the system, and 'You get used to it'. Stop thinking about it. Just roll on five o'clock. And then people wonder when workers show no responsibility towards the work they are in. When the work *cannot* mean anything to them.

But what about workers' control, then? I do not see how industry can be controlled by the workers unless they *qof up to liipqisuodsar auos [ae] op*. And I do not see how they can, if industry is organised as it generally is at

Continued on page 4

Workers in Industry

Continued from page 3 present. Is it possible to change this? Suppose the workers elected their own managers. For one thing, they would have a limited choice. They have to choose someone with the experience and competence. And however they start, they are often hard-boiled by the time they get as far as that. Still, there are good managers and bad, and perhaps the workers would elect someone more ready to listen to their complaints and their suggestions. All right; but hardly workers' control of production. And the big difficulty lies in what the workers do when they are on the machines. How far are they in control of the productive process instead of being ridden by it?

This is a special difficulty of large scale industry. But it is no use saying today that we ought to have a general return to small scale industry. That would be side-stepping the problem; a way of saying 'Wouldn't it be nice if...'

We used to speak of 'production for use', and contrast it with 'production for profit'. But this is no help here. If 'production for use' means production of goods for workers to use outside working hours—it leaves on one side the exploitation of the workers during working hours: the ways in which they are degraded and made servile on the job itself, by a mode of production in which machines are primary and workers are secondary. This will not be changed by providing rest rooms, good ventilation, lighting and heating and so on. And—by what I hear of Russia—it belongs to industry, not just to capitalism.

Suppose less were spent on luxuries for directors or on space rockets, and more on amenities for the workers, including better houses—the workers would still be in servitude. They would still be servants of the machines. And they would be in a different position from the managers.

I do not know the answer. The Luddites—the 'machine wreckers'—may have been right. Maybe it would have been better if machine industry had never developed. But we cannot destroy industry now.

Swansea, May 22. RUSH RHEES.

FREEDOM PRESS PUBLICATIONS

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
- Vol 6 1956: Oil and Troubled Waters
- Vol 7 1957: Year One—Sputnik Era
- Vol 8 1958: Socialism in a Wheelchair
- Vol 9 1959: Print, Press & Public
- Vol 10 1960: The Tragedy of Africa

Each volume: paper 7/6 cloth 10/6
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of FREEDOM at 5/6 post free.

PAUL ELTZBACHER
Anarchism (Seven Exponents of the Anarchist Philosophy) cloth 21/-

CHARLES MARTIN
Towards a Free Society 2/6

RUDOLF ROCKER
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21/-

JOHN HEWITSON
Ill-Health, Poverty and the State cloth 2/6 paper 1/-

VOLINE
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12/6
The Unknown Revolution (Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12/6

HERBERT READ
Poetry and Anarchism cloth 5/-

TONY GIBSON
Youth for Freedom 2/-
Who will do the Dirty Work? 2d.
Food Production & Population 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND
The Expanding Environment (illustrated) boards 8/6

PETER KROPOTKIN
The State: Its Historic Role 1/-
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications:

Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A tribute cloth 5/-
Journey Through Utopia cloth 16/- paper 7/6

Letters

Summerhill and Anarchy

DEAR COMRADES,
A. S. Neill has asked why anarchists consider that Summerhill School is run on anarchist principles.

An anarchist community is one where there is an absence of coercion, that is —no authority and submissiveness in personal relationships, but an equality existing between all members. There is an atmosphere of co-operation, and decisions about the affairs of the community are made by its members. This sums up Summerhill, I think, and these are anarchist principles.

Yours sincerely,
London, June 3. DOROTHY BARASI.

Has Neill forgotten?

DEAR SIRS,

A man not dead not waiting for death is judged by his present sayings and doings, and by those standards Neill has slipped back some way from his earlier practice and writings. For a man who has been as far out as he has, minor deserts of principle take on the appearance of major heresies.

The remarks made about Ian Leslie's article in effect apply to Burgess Hill School for which Neill has never had a good word since, I suppose, he saw freedom growing there while he himself was trying to prune it. Licence of course is freedom that he personally cannot tolerate, and no more respect should be given to the idea than to anyone else's private mania. The word is a camouflage to indicate Neill's personal discovery of the ultimate formula, and serves to hide the fact that compared with some schools more permissive than his, he appears in the light of patriarch of progressive education, with the dogmatism and authoritarianism which often creep in with age, venerability and much public homage.

There were no rules at Burgess Hill, under that or any other name. Our agreements, unsupported by any kind of sanctions, were fluid compromises in which child and adult agreed in specific cases, to limit either his actions, or his resentment at those actions to a point where they no longer clashed. If a banger was let off on the upper floor when we had agreed only to let them off downstairs, it was the irritation of a moment; if it had continued to the point of interfering with someone's peace of mind, there would be another meeting, and a new attempt at agreement. If the person or persons continued to let off bangers on the top floor, and refused to agree not to, then it had to be accepted. In practice this never happened. We all liked each other too much to consciously continue with something some of us strongly objected to. As Neill said, each person depends on the approval of his fellows. Affection is a far better coercer and a more immediate one than token punishments that "do good in the long run".

To make laws for people means you think them inferior, and we all knew each other too well and too closely to believe that adults knew any more of the secrets of living and of happiness than children. No one was unhappy enough to smoke forty cigarettes a day, or drink themselves to death, or go without sleep until their eyes fell out; if they had, that unhappiness would have been the staff's concern, not the symptoms. Smoking and drinking for kicks, and staying up for convenience was the right of adult and child, as far as it didn't effect anyone else's rights, and no one translated their personal prejudice against smoking or drinking into a concern for the children's health. The "moral authority" Neill praises in his former headmaster looks like moral blackmail from some Jehovah figure, and if all it prevented was swearing, which is nothing important, mere sounds out of the mouth, not very pleasant. If Summerhill takes punishments for granted, that's because the outside world is steeped in coercion and compulsion. At Burgess Hill the idea would have been incredible and bitterly resented; no one felt any lack of approval from his fellows because they failed to vote him a sixpenny fine.

If I'm bitter in this letter, it's for good reason. The innovator of progressive education seems to have forgotten some of what he wrote in his books and practiced in his earlier years, and is spiteful about a school that had become the freest in the country, where values were taken for granted in daily living that liberals won't put in reforms for two hundred years yet, if ever. I'm bitter because about half a dozen parents could safely know the details of life at school. For the rest, they had prejudices and set values of one sort and another which sometimes cut across tolerance, anarchist belief and even the actual happiness of their children. Lastly, I'm bitter because a newspaper which by necessity is largely concerned with theory, should deny progressive schools, pieces of actual living anarchism, in some piddling little article on compulsory piano playing.

Yours,
Barnet. PAUL DE MILLE.

Burgess Hill School

To the Editors of FREEDOM,
A. S. Neill unfortunately has misconstrued what I wrote in my article. He has it that I said that at Burgess Hill they had "sanctions instead of rules" and, naturally, he cannot see the difference. What I actually wrote was:

"At Burgess Hill some years ago the imposition of sanctions was abandoned... henceforth the meeting produced 'agreements' rather than 'rules'."

Neill then chides me for my assertion that "we are still without experience of how a really healthy group of children would develop in an atmosphere of freedom." He says he had had "dozens" of healthy pupils. Of course, I did not exclude healthy individuals, but it is my belief that the healthy children in a group containing a large proportion of "maladjusted" individuals are generally hindered from realising their fullest potential. Is not this inevitable?

Neill himself has frequently, and rightly, deplored the fact that his school has often been used as a dumping-ground for difficult and/or unwanted children. I think all the "freedom" schools must at times have suffered in this way and, as I said, owing to their financial position they have seldom been able to select their pupils.

London, N.10. IAN LESLIE.

The Anarchist Cinema

DEAR SIR,

J.R. writes (FREEDOM, June 2) that Alan Lovell's current season at the National Film Theatre "promises to put anarchism on the cinema map." Frankly, I don't see how, considering the narrowness of Mr. Lovell's choice where full-length features are concerned. Are Buñuel, Franju and Vigo the only anarchists in this field? Or are they just the most typical? Mr. Lovell's NFT programme note doesn't say. Indeed, he doesn't really tell us what an anarchist is. The nearest we get to a definition is on page 16 of the programme, when the text—presumably written, or approved, by Mr. Lovell—

KEEP IT UP!

FINANCIAL STATEMENT AT JUNE 2nd 1962

Week 22	EXPENSES: 22 weeks at £70	£1,540
	INCOME:	
	Sales & Sub. Renewals	£ £
	Weeks 1-21	976
	Week 22	26
		1,002
	New Subscriptions:	
	Weeks 1-21 (172)	197
	Week 22 (5)	5
		202
		1,204
	DEFICIT	£336

DEFICIT FUND

Altrincham: J.E.M. £1/18/-; Glasgow: J.H.* 2/6; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* £4; Hounslow: L.* 2/6; Greenock: S.M. 1/8; Pittsburgh: O.S. £1/1/-; Minneapolis: D.S. 14/6; Belfast: Liam 2/6; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Surrey: F.B.* 5/-; London: P. & G.T.* 5/-; London: Anon. 8d.; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-; Detroit: "I Refrattari" Group (per V.C.) £10/10/-; Southend: P.O.* 10/-.

TOTAL 20 7 10
Previously acknowledged 617 5 1

1962 TOTAL TO DATE £637 12 11

*Denotes Regular Contributors.

speaks of the "passion and concern that are the marks of the true anarchist." They are also, unfortunately, the marks of the True Tory, the chap who writes aggrieved letters to the Daily Telegraph. A similar piece of Leavisian verbiage occurs when Mr. Lovell says that "the quality one responds to most" in all anarchist films "is the sense of what life, at its best, is like." Now, anarchist or non-anarchist, the cinema rarely lives up to this ideal. "L'Atalante" does, as do the acting of Raimu and certain films of Jean Renoir and John Ford, but to say the same of "L'Age d'Or", "Archibaldo" or any other Buñuel film I can think of is ludicrous.

What is anarchist cinema, then? It seems to me its chief characteristic is subversiveness. One way or another, an anarchist film will oppose society's laws, institutions and accepted ideas. For example, "Paths of Glory"—anti-war, anti-army, anti-capital punishment and banned in France.

This, of course, is negative anarchism. As an example of the positive kind, I would suggest "Le Crime de Monsieur Lange", which Renoir directed in his Popular Front phase and which is, among other things, propaganda for the co-operative system.

"Humour," (to return to the NFT programme) "plays a large part in the anarchist cinema." It does; that humour leans toward the subversive is a commonplace. The early film comedies, moreover, mocked natural as well as human law: not for nothing has Mack Sennett been called a surrealist. But it appears we shall have to do without the Keystone Cops, for

"... there is a great difference between the humour of the anarchists and the humour of the accepted comedians of the cinema (Chaplin, Keaton, Tati, etc.). The humour in, say, "Zero de Conduite" is an essential part of the way Vigo sees the world. In Chaplin, Keaton and Tati the humour is something they impose on the world; they want at all costs to make the world funny. It is the difference between the mature artist and the licensed entertainer."

Out the window, then, with such immature works as "Modern Times," "Monsieur Verdoux" and "Mon Oncle." Instead: "Spike Milligan Meets Joe Brown."

One last quote: "The season will end (appropriately enough on Bastille Day) with a special event. The organiser of the season, Alan Lovell, will talk about his reasons for putting on the season and try to relate it to what is happening in Britain at the moment. His talk will be illustrated by extracts from films shown during the season and some other special material. Then some British Artists will talk about their own work and in what way it could be called anarchist."

In short, a manifestation of the Higher Journalism, with art taking second place to the hunger for a sweet little gimmick. I wonder whether the whole weakness of the season does not lie in the fact that the subject of anarchism and the cinema is being exploited just as much, if not more, for its publicity value as for its cultural one?

Yours faithfully,
London, June 2. GEOFFREY MINISH.

The Writings of Armand

To the Editors of "FREEDOM",
COMRADES,
Few of the essays of the late Emile Armand have been translated into English and those that have are scattered through back numbers of various libertarian journals. It is now proposed to publish four of these essays in pamphlet form as a tribute to the life and work of this fighter for individual liberty. The pamphlet will be called "Anarchism and Individualism" and its contents will be: "Our Kind of Individualism", "Anarchist Individualism As Life And Activity", "Individualist Perspectives", and "The Future Society". Anyone interested in supporting this project is invited to contact me at 75 Cotswold Road, Bristol, 3. Fraternally,
Bristol, May 28. S. E. PARKER.

The Nature of Power

COMRADES,
Your recent article "Why are we Anarchists?" seemed to miss the basic argument for anarchism, we were left with nothing more than a common sense economic justification for Socialism, with many of its answers resting on legislative change. It seems to me to be much more important to concentrate our arguments on a genuine and relevant evaluation of the nature of power. Maybe I'm in a minority and my views stem from too little experience—I have arrived at an anarchist standpoint in the last year via the activities of the Committee of 100—(although I refuse

to believe it important if I am in a minority, and refuse to accept that experience is able to change my views for the better!) But I can only define it as this; I refuse to recognise any power that is exercised involving me, unless I personally exercise it, and then only if it has a genuine motivation and does not interfere with any other person's genuine freedom. That there is no power for good, only power, which will corrupt. And finally that 'freedom' means just that, and that anarchism can only come through self-reliance and the refusal to be a victim of phoney motives, the refusal to be steamrollered by States and society.

Anyway let's have plenty of discussion on the real arguments for anarchism, and I may discover that I'm just a deluded idealist. I hope so, I've had a belly full of political sophistication!
Yours fraternally,
Ipswich, May 26. N. DEAN.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP CENTRAL MEETINGS

meetings to be held at The Two Brewers, 40 Monmouth Street, WC2 (Leicester Square Tube) Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

JUNE 10 Raya Dunayevskaya: A Marxist-Humanist's Visit to West Africa.
JUNE 17 Nicolas Walter: The Committee of 100
JUNE 24 Maurice Goldman: Eros, Culture and Psycho-Analysis

Hyde Park Meetings

Sundays at 4 p.m. onwards (Anarchist time) (Weather permitting)

OFF-CENTRE DISCUSSION MEETINGS

1st Thursday of each month at 8 p.m. at Jack and Mary Stevenson's, 6 Stainton Road, Enfield, Middx.

1st Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Colin Ward's, 33 Ellerby Street, Fulham, S.W.6.

3rd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Donald Room's, 148a Fellows Road, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Last Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. Tom Barnes', Albion Cottage, Fortis Green, N.2. (3rd door past Tudor Hotel).

Last Friday of each month at 8 p.m. at Laurens and Celia Otter's, 57 Ladbrooke Road, W11 (for May and June).

NEW MEETINGS

2nd Wednesday of each month at 8 p.m. at Morris Bradley's, 15 Pyrland Road, Newington Green, N.5.

ANARCHY Nos 1-15

Still Available 1/8 Post Free

Freedom

The Anarchist Weekly

FREEDOM is published 40 times a year, on every Saturday except the last in each month. ANARCHY (1/8 or 25 cents post free), a 32-page journal of anarchist ideas, is published 12 times a year on the 1st of each month.

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM and ANARCHY

12 months 32/- (U.S. & Canada \$5.00)
6 months 16/- (2.50)
3 months 8/6 (\$1.25)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 47/- (U.S. & Canada \$7.50)
6 months 23/6 (\$3.75)

AIR MAIL Subscription Rates (FREEDOM by Air Mail, ANARCHY by Surface Mail)

12 months 52/- (U.S. & Canada \$8.00)

Postal Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

1 year (40 issues) 20/- (U.S. & Canada \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 10/- (\$1.50)
3 months (10 issues) 5/- (\$0.75)

Air Mail Subscription Rates to FREEDOM only

1 year (40 issues) 40/- (\$6.00)

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.