

Comment on a Macmillan Puff of Hot Air 'SHARE PROSPERITY'



THE OBSERVER last Sunday headed its "Sayings of the Week" with one by Mr. Macmillan in which he declared that

unless the free world can both produce and share prosperity it cannot expect to claim convincingly that its way of life is superior to Communism.

Of course Mr. Macmillan, when he speaks of the "free world" is referring to the Western bloc, and when he speaks of "Communism" he means Russia and her allies. Rewritten in unequivocal terms Mr. Macmillan's saying of the week should read something like this:

Unless the Western powers can devote some of their technical and material wealth to the development of the backward countries in ferment, such as in Africa, Asia and South America, they will be ousted by Russia and members of the Eastern bloc, who see the long term advantages to be derived from such aid. This is to be deplored both from the power political struggle as well as in terms of future markets.

Mr. Macmillan's statement as it stands is a contradiction in terms. A free world can only be one which shares its prosperity equally among all the people. At the same time such a world could not enjoy a way of life which is "superior to Communism" for its way of life would be communism, *par excellence!*

It may be argued that you can share without sharing equally. To which we would reply that if we are talking, as Mr. Macmillan did, of the actions and morality of a free world then sharing can only be on a basis of equality, otherwise such a world could not be free for it would presuppose there is a hierarchy empowered to determine that, in Orwellian terms, "some are more equal than others."

In the minds of simple, unsophisticated honest people, to share means sharing equally, whether it be "the last crust of bread", a house or an income. But the industrialist who prides himself that his employees "share" in his Company's prosperity; the landowner who permits his labourers to "share" in the productivity of his land; the shopkeeper who gives his employees a bonus at the end of the year—all claim to be "sharing" their prosperity, and it would be churlish, as well as indicative of a pessimistic approach to human behaviour to which most anarchists would not subscribe, to assume that in some cases this "sharing" was not motivated by a conscience, and an enlightened approach to human relations. But generally speaking employers have adopted the idea of sharing some of their prosperity with their employees as a means of retaining their loyal services and of ensuring their continued subservience. Not, therefore on the grounds of conscience through a recognition that the working man is entitled to the product of the whole cake of production the employer might well dissuade him from fighting for his right to dispose of the whole cake.

THE fact that in the West the State has consolidated its "indispensability" by taking over certain basic services, and that the employers have succeeded in buying-off the workers with a few gadgets* which which are now within their economic reach (with or without H.P.) does not, to our minds, alter the nature of the

social and economic system under which we live

And if we still possess the critical faculties to observe the system in its true light in our own country, what grounds have we for assuming that there will ever be any sharing of "prosperity" with those "underdeveloped" countries which for centuries have been drained of their natural wealth while their people have remained in abject poverty and ignorance. In certain respects the "natives" are materially worse off than they were before colonisation

*According to a Central Office of Information publication just published on "Britain, an official handbook, 1961", the average married couple in this country has a television set and a vacuum cleaner, possibly a washing machine and refrigerator. But most of them do their own house decorating and though one-third of the married women have paid jobs (and represent half the female labour force in this country) less than 5 per cent. of housewives employ paid help and fewer than 1 per cent. have a "resident servant". How much of the "prosperity" of working class families depends on the fact that both the man and woman of the family go out to work?

Continued on p. 3

THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY

A Christmas present "for the woman who has everything else" was offered for sale in the *New York Times*: a diamond-and-ruby studded gold automatic coffee-maker. The price: \$50,000.

The advertisers describe it: "The only one in the world... the famous universal Coffematic rendered in 14-carat gold with 250 diamonds and 150 rubies... Private showings by appointment."

Reuter

An Irish International Airlines Boeing jet flew from New York to Shannon Airport in 4hr. 54min. recently, beating the record set up by the same aircraft five weeks ago by three minutes. The pilot, Captain William Cuffe-Smith, of Dublin, said that at times he was "skipping along" at 780 m.p.h. assisted by tailwinds. He had 115 passengers aboard.

I like to think of myself as a small business man.

—MR. PAUL GETTY,
(Multimillionaire financier).

On their return from a 10-day holiday in Eire, Mr. & Mrs. Tony Armstrong-Jones did not travel, as they did on the outward journey, by a tourist class Vic-count. This time, to quote the *Daily Herald*, "They had a spacious lounge and a 12-seat cabin all to themselves.

A temporary partition with a sliding door separated the royal party from 67 other passengers who were in their seats before the Princess arrived."

Labour Party Politics Prolonged Labour

(from a Correspondent)

AT the end of the first parliamentary session since the Scarborough Conference, the Labour Party is in a state of suspended disintegration. It is still there, all of it, but it might well have been better for everyone involved if it weren't; the trouble is that the sustained effort to keep such a monster alive uses up so much energy that survival becomes the only thing the beast is fit for.

The cold war between the various factions that have maintained an uneasy co-existence within the Party for sixty years has not flared up in the Commons as might have been expected and was certainly feared. Although a third of the Parliamentary Party voted for Harold Wilson and abstained in the defence debate, there has been no split for very good practical reasons. Nevertheless, there has been a definite shift away from the official leadership since Attlee went—Wilson got three votes more than Bevan did five years ago, while Gaitskell got thirty less than himself and Morrison combined, and the defence abstention was the biggest in the same period.

We might put a similar question to the T.U.C. which has just agreed to lend £50,000 to the Belgian Trade Unions. A fine act of political solidarity which the British Trade Unions have not extended to their little known brothers in Africa and other parts of the world.

No doubt there are individual trade unionists troubled by this fact, but in common with most of us they find it easy to forget the powerless groups in distant places whose plight briefly touches our conscience, and is soon forgotten.

We would like to ignore today's headlines—*Big War Danger in Laos; Big Muslim Turnout—Ten Die in clash with Army—America Hoping to Isolate Cuba*—and confidently start the New Year on a cheerful note. To do so we would have to forget political realities, and though to do this might well increase our popularity, would change nothing.

But however hard the Gaitskellites try, Parliament isn't really important; while the cold war has rather hung fire in the Commons (and not come to life in the Lords at all), there has been a mounting arms race in the country. The factions in the unions and the local parties are preparing busily for the 1961 conferences; the Gaitskellites know they must win at Blackpool if they are to restore even the *status quo*, and the unilateralists know they cannot afford to relax their pressure for a long time yet. Both sides are in silent agreement that Scarborough was not by any means the final engagement—a much more decisive vote is necessary before the Party can be clearly committed one way or the other on the defence issue. Both sides also know that the longer the row goes on the lower the election prospects become, but neither is really prepared to give way an inch.

As always in such affairs, there is a large centre group that is being forced against its will to take sides. For a time it looked as if Crossman (who hasn't changed his mind about anything for a long time) and Brown (who hasn't lost his temper for a long time either) must mobilise this group, but Scarborough changed all that. At the moment everyone is waiting to see what everyone else is doing. Wilson is sitting around quietly, pretending to be an elder statesman, but no one is fooled. The conspirators may not be willing to strike until they know what will happen to them, but there is no reason to doubt that they will strike when the time comes; it is just that Brutus and Cassius want to make sure that Octavian and Antony are out of the way before they start granding their knives—there is also the little problem of seniority among the conspirators themselves.

All this preoccupation with leadership and the defence issue tends to obscure all the other issues (thus the absurd Clause 4 business is now almost forgotten). But in Transport House very different ideas prevail. An "arrangement" has been made to exclude the issues of defence and leadership and to concentrate on everything else. At the moment the policy-makers are trying to draw up a general statement on home affairs to present to the 1961 Conference, leaving

Continued on p. 4

Prospects for 1961—Unchanged

NEW YEAR is the time for personal resolutions (which, in time we will doubtless break) and optimistic prophesies for a "brighter" future; people seem to find comfort in this yearly ritual, a necessary boost to dejected spirits.

If one manages to escape to a place cut off from the usual forms of communications, this air of confidence is sensed more acutely. But alas the return to reality finds no justification for optimism about the future. Nothing has changed, except perhaps the names on newspaper headlines, and it is only a matter of time before hope gives way to passive acceptance.

In the areas of the world where the people are "on the march", the mood is violent and fearful, which might be interpreted optimistically; but a glance at the "troubled" spots leaves us unconvinced that this kind of action without real, constructive social aims will ever lead to permanent stability.

In the capital of the most powerful country in the world we are told there is a mood of expectancy consequent upon the presidential elections. Preparations for the inauguration of the new President are building up for the final spectacular show—the lighter side of American

politics.

Violence there is confined to the South, where the underprivileged Negro is fighting for equal rights, and to the seamy side of the vast cities where poverty is acute.

Will a new President have the will and the power to change conditions inside the country, or to alter the existing uneasy relationships which America has with other countries outside the Western bloc?

In his election campaign Mr. Kennedy openly acknowledged the defects of American life, but we could find no statement of policy which persuaded us that America was on the threshold of a new era in international politics. To be militarily strong with the nuclear power to flatten the U.S.S.R. if necessary is the aim of both Democrat and Republican.

Across the Gulf of Mexico to Cuba where, after the defeat of Batista, hopes soared on the wings of Castro's success, many of the people who aided his victory are now in opposition or jail.

Recently America cut off "diplomatic relations" with Cuba which merely put the official seal on a policy which has long since aimed at weakening the economy. Neither Mr. Kennedy nor his predecessor

have any sympathy with a revolution which does not give its allegiance to America. Fidel Castro on the other hand has proved that he can be as brutal and unimaginative as the man he deposed in the process of maintaining power.

In the Congo where, with the exit of the Belgians, it was hoped Africans would be united in a common cause, the age-old struggle for power rages on a primitive level which horrifies European observers, many of whom must nevertheless take some of the blame for the fact that poverty, illiteracy and ill-health flourished among Africans in a rich country ruled for decades by "civilised" Europeans.

In Belgium itself the unpopular conservative Government is faced with a general strike initiated by the socialist trade unions whose members are economically threatened by a new government "squeeze". As far as we can judge the strike has its political side, and indicates the potential power of the working class movement or any rate the influence held by its leaders. It seems reasonable to ask what action they took throughout the years of Belgian rule in the Congo where their black brothers were exploited in the interests of the Belgian economy.

Around the Galleries

THE weeks following Christmas are quiet weeks for the Bond Street dealers and these smooth gentlemen be- rell of dove grey waistcoats and hacking jackets are to be found in the little back rooms of their galleries sipping sweet tea from large cracked cups and check- ing their sucker list with the same care and attention that we, the horny-handed, give to our pools permutations.

There among the neatly stacked platoons of dead sherry bottles they weave their snide dreams of unloading popular junk onto some monied "collector" and of extracting talented work from some dim artist who believes that art in itself is enough and that the thirty-three-and-a-third per cent. plus extras that the dealer demands should be accepted without complaint for this is the time of the year when for at least two or three weeks most galleries are as silent and empty as the private church pew of George Amias Fitzwarrine Poulett, eighth Earl Poulett.

There are however two exhibitions that for lightness and gaiety are worth a visit. At Gallery One at 20 D'Arbly Street, W.1, they are showing the works of Scottie Wilson and Gimpel Fils at 50 South Molton Street, W.1, are having an exhibition of the water colours of Wols. It was in 1945 that Scottie Wilson first made his bow at the Arcade Gallery at the time when the surrealist movement in this country was in latent bloom and Wilson drifted into and out of the movement as he has done most of his life for he is the despair of the dealers and of the monied chi chi types that love to indulge in a little artistic slumming. For this short, Glasgow born man with the cloth cap and the broad accent is beholden to no man and while he could be marked down as a commercial failure, his gifts to us are these lovely tinted patterns.

Though overshadowed by the more sophisticated Crépin, Wilson has continued to draw his stylised birds and trees with his thousand rough pen strokes

that he tints in warm rich colours so that they glow like costume jewellery; for though Scottie Wilson can be judged as one of life's failures and an extremely minor artist to be used as small bait by any dealer seeking a small profit on a quick turnover his work will continue to give pleasure to collectors long after most of the large canvases of those earnest young men who clutter London have been used for their proper purpose, to patch the leaking mausoleum roofs of their patrons and their propagandists.

Wols, who is showing at Gimpel Fils, died about ten years ago and was part of the international *avante garde* of the thirties.

An associate of Miro, Ernst, Tzara, Sartre, de Beauvoir and the rest of the big boys, he worked his passage by virtue of the fact that he possessed talent. Born into the world in 1913 and christened Otto Alfred Schulze Battman, he spent his formative years at the Dessau Bauhaus. Tossed into prison by the French at the beginning of the second world war he was released after about a year and continued to paint in the south of France.

One feels that if Wols had drifted off to America he would have in the fullness of time been roped in as a major Zen Daddy for he had the whole works to offer. A brilliant colourist, a magnificent illustrator, a poet influenced by Chinese mysticism and a friend of the right people he was a dead ringer for the American art racket and canonisation in *Evergreen Review*; but instead of living as a cultural spiv as so many European artists have done since the war he died an artist. These sweet and tiny water colours bear testament to this, for Wols was one of the few artists who was genuinely influenced by Klee but with this difference, that while Klee worked in two distinct layers, that is that his foreground was drawn onto a separately conceived coloured background like unto one sheet of coloured glass being laid upon another sheet of coloured glass, Wols worked into his "controlled accidents". He would damp his paper and drop his water colours into it and when the spreading merging colours had dried he would carefully work upon them with pen and ink so that in the end they looked like coloured reproductions of microscopic specimens from out of a medical text book. Wilson and Wols are two very minor artists who possessed nothing in common when they sat with their pens, their ink and their colours before them, but though neither made any claim to greatness the pleasure that they have given us is the sweet music of a passing song not worth recording but always remembered.

ARTHUR MOYSE.

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).

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

If you get tokens for Christmas they can be spent with us.

New Books . . .

The Rats Alan Sillitoe 15/-
Pioneers of American Freedom
Rudolf Rocker 14/-

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

The Russian Revolution
Allen Moorehead 8/6
Dr. Zhivago B. Pasternak 5/-
Fame is the Spur Howard Spring 5/-
Such a Simple Thing
Maxim Gorky 7/6

Second-Hand . . .

Sixteen Years in Siberia (1903)
Leo Deutsch 6/-
Soviet Communism: a New
Civilisation?
Sidney & Beatrice Webb 7/-
The Easter Lily (I.R.A.)
Sean O'Callaghan 8/-
Tito Speaks Vladimir Dedijer 10/-
The Meaning of Treason
Rebecca West 10/-
Studies of a Biographer
Leslie Stephen (2 vols.) 6/-
Ecce Homo: Poetry
Frederick Nietzsche 5/6
Ten Years After
Herbert Steinhouse 3/-
Little Essays of Love and Virtue
Havelock Ellis 5/-
The Crowd (Binding Broken)
Gustave Le Bon 3/-
History of England (Binding wk.)
Henry Hallam 3/6
Oliver Cromwell's Letters and
Speeches (ed.) Thomas Carlyle 3/6
Lenin, Selected Works,
Vol. 1, Part 2 5/-
Testimony of the Rocks
Hugh Miller 3/6
Coral Reefs Charles Darwin 3/6
Social Psychology
William McDougall 3/-
Tunis Diary Philip Jordan 3/-
Across the River and Into the
Trees Ernest Hemingway 3/6

Pamphlets . . .

Aristotle's Mother (Play)
Herbert Read 4/-

Periodicals . . .

World Labour News, Jan.-Feb. 4d.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

17a MAXWELL ROAD

FULHAM LONDON SW6

Tel: Renown 3736

CINEMA NOTES

WHENEVER Hollywood's British yes-men let us know by way of huge ads in every Tube station and evening paper that yet another multi-million dollar epic is about to be unveiled with a charity premiere before royalty, one is apt to groan and dismiss it as yet another ugly reminder of the frivolities of capitalist living, being a way of making further kudos for the Big Boys by parading sex, violence and religion as boldly and disgustingly as they dare. *Spartacus* at first glance may seem to be all of this, yet for several reasons it arouses more curiosity than a film of this type might otherwise warrant. The novel from which it is taken is by Howard Fast, a former Top Member of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., and a popular author despite the poison that the FBI and company spread about him. Moreover, the adaptation is by Dalton Trumbo, one of the unfortunate "Hollywood Thirteen" of black-listed "fellow-travelling" writers and artists who have not been able to find work in Hollywood since the McCarthy era, so we might expect that by using this Communist inspired novel he might take a swipe at his previous persecutors. The producer and director (Kirk Douglas and Stanley Kubrick) in addition, were the team who made *Paths of Glory*, that stimulating anti-militarist film which so embarrassed the French government that they saw fit to ban its showing there. (One confidently expects South Africa to do the same for *Spartacus*).

So, with such an array of dissenting talent one wonders just how "different" *Spartacus* is going to be. One is not altogether disappointed with the results, but being such a long film (193 minutes—3 minutes were deleted by our ever-watchful censors) the over all impression is a somewhat mixed bag. It is big and lavish true, but throughout these lush gaudy excesses are juxtaposed scenes of human misery and anguish on a scale that seems hard to imagine (were it not for the grim reminder the Nazis gave us) ever existed quite so brutally.

The total cost of this production is said to be about 12 million dollars, and with so much money at one's disposal the results could hardly have been better—with so much capital invested the production restrictions with an eye on the box-office are so much greater. It is ironic that so much money should be spent on filming a novel which Fast had to have printed privately when he first wrote it as no publisher dared touch it. Since then however, he has renounced the CP in book form too (*The Naked God*) and is established as part of the American "Radical" tradition. One always felt that this break was inevitable.

Like Robeson, the US Communists used Fast for all his fame was worth, and as he showed himself to be both a humanitarian and a rationalist the parting just had to come.

Fast has suffered a lot for what he believes in, and this shows in his writings. In 1949, after the terrible riots at the Lakeland Picnic Grove in Peekskill, New York, he co-operated in the production of a gramophone record telling the facts of the incident, and in the restrained emotional quality of his tone one senses his very genuine concern over brutality and human suffering. It is because of that that I do not feel that the scenes of great brutality and despair in *Spartacus* are included solely for the box-office, in

fact they justify their inclusion counteract the average audience's in sharing in the degeneracy which Rome.

The picture's main faults are in rather than execution. Most Communist seem to have this sentimentalism of the down-trodden, and a device that is so sharp as to make all the angels and all the Romans wicked devils. This black and white device might not have been so bad if it had been laid on so thick. For good measure we get a scene of Laurence Olivier trying to seduce Tony Curtis, which course the slave rejects—in reality there would probably have been

Continued on

'The Rats'

THIS* is Alan Sillitoe's first book of poems, and I'm afraid it may be his last. His heart is bang in the right place and he writes well—sometimes very well—but this isn't enough. He refers in one place to his "rough-shod song", and unfortunately this is an all-too-accurate description. He simply isn't much of a poet.

The title poem is a 45-page-long attack on English society, written from the vantage-point of Majorca. It is about the eponymous Rats and also about the "Ogads"—"Dagos" in reverse, i.e. English.

The Rats are government, and Ogads slaves

Who know not where they go nor what road paves

The way to Revolution.

Sillitoe is, as readers of *FREEDOM* who remember his St. Pancras poem will know, a revolutionary anarcho-nihilist (to put it in technical jargon). It is his hope that:

A hundred thousand may begin

To march one damp October dawn:

Find a Lenin waiting at Victoria Station

Uttering incandescent incantation.

But he does not seem to expect anything at once. Instead he simply points out that "Anger is not enough, young men," and advocates an intellectual scorched-earth policy before Armageddon:

Defeat is not the question. Withdraw into the hollows of the hills

Until this winter passes into thaw.

Dig-in no more. Turn round and fight

Forget the wicked and regret the lame

And travel back the way you came,

In front the darkness and behind the light.

The trouble is that this sort of thing

is no good unless you can write as well as Lawrence or Auden. As it stands would enjoy *The Rats* more if it were in prose—though I like the occasional phrase, like:

Anarchistic demons wielding nets
Nejoriously fishing television-seis.

There are also 33 shorter poems, the model this time being Robert Graves (which probably explains why Graves likes them). They are quite good but not really worth publishing. The only one I really enjoyed was *On the First Swim in the Mediterranean*, which gives an excellent impression of a wonderful old sea:

Water that folded the wings of Icarus
Climbs your limbs, sharp with salt

That stiffened the beard of Odysseus

The only thing wrong with these poems is that they are in a book.

There is nothing discreditable about them.

They aren't really good enough to be.

I have a sad feeling that Sillitoe probably

cares more about his verse than his

fiction—sad, because it is his fiction

is outstanding, while his verse is

undistinguished. It is a pity that

someone writes something that catches

the public eye everything else he

is published without question (Aldous

Osborne, Wain, Wesker, etc.). It should

be the other way round—we should

demand higher standards from writers

who have already been successful, not

ones. I should think more of Alan

Sillitoe as a writer if his last two books

hadn't been published at all—they have

somehow taken something away from the

first two. Nevertheless, best of luck to

someone who has the right ideas!

N.W.

**The Rats*, by Alan Sillitoe (W.H. Allen, 15s.).

SOCIAL MAN

ONE of the more significant developments in the social sciences since the war is a growing interest in the borderland area between politics and sociology. 'Political sociology', as this new academic specialism is called, is predicated on the belief that politics can only be fruitfully studied as part of general sociology. It denies the assumption underlying much of traditional political science that the State and Society are two separate entities. The State, it asserts, is only one political institution among many and political institutions are only one of a cluster of social institutions. The relationships between social institutions of all kinds is the subject matter of sociology in general, while the relationships between political and other social institutions is the special province of sociology. Political man, from this perspective, can only be properly understood as social man. Until we have located a man's place in the social order, we cannot comprehend the political choices he makes since these are to a large extent influenced by his social attributes.

This attitude to politics owes much to the Marxist theory of historical materialism. Politics for Marx was an epiphenomenon, part of the 'superstructure' of society, reflecting its economic base. Ideas as such were unimportant in the making of history; they were only important as expressions of class interests, when they took the form of ideology. Much of the work of modern political sociologists may be seen as a generalization and refinement of this interest theory of political behaviour. For example, studies seeking to relate voting trends to various regional, ethnic, occupational and economic categories only make sense if it is assumed that these categories represent more or less enduring groups of interests.

In the present book,* Professor Lipset, doyen of American political sociologists, has collected together a number of his more important recently published articles in this field. A large section of the book is devoted to an attempt to synthesize the results of recent voting studies in Western societies. It is an essay in comparative analysis, seeking to establish generalisations valid for all Western societies. Although other factors,

**POLITICAL MAN*. By Seymour Martin Lipset. (Heinemann, 30s.).

such as regional, ethnic and traditional loyalties, need to be taken into account to explain voting behaviour, class, Lipset confirms, is the most important single factor. "In every modern democracy conflict among different groups is expressed through political parties which basically represent a democratic translation of the class struggle. Even though many parties renounce the principle of class conflict, an analysis of their appeals and support suggests that they do represent the interests of different classes. On a world scale, the principal generalisation which can be made is that parties are primarily based on either the lower classes or the middle and upper classes." This holds true also for American parties. The popular notion that party divisions in the USA are less related to class cleavages than they are in Europe is belied by the facts. Polling studies made from 1936 onwards indicate that in every election the proportion voting Democratic increases sharply as one moves down the occupational or income ladder.

The class basis of American politics is of some significance for the future politics of this country. The attenuation of overt class conflict has been a marked feature of recent years. As Lipset puts it, "The characteristic pattern of stable Western democracies in the mid-twentieth century is that they are in a 'post-politics' phase—that is, there is relatively little difference between the democratic left and right, the socialists are moderate, and the conservatives accept the welfare state." This does not mean, however, the end of class politics. The development of the so-called Affluent Society has brought with it a decline in objective deprivations, such as low income, insecurity and malnutrition, and this has reduced social tensions. But the class system remains. And "as long as some men are rewarded more than others by the prestige or status structure of society men will feel relatively deprived." The working class in the USA enjoy a standard of living only aspired to by most middle classes elsewhere, but they vote proportionately Democratic because they still feel worse off than those higher up in the social hierarchy. "The democratic class struggle," Lipset concludes, "will continue, but it will be a fight without ideologies, without red flags, without May Day parades."

This qualified conclusion is unlikely to comfort the

political Marxist. Nor will Lipset's interesting examination of a broad perspective workers' organisations have played a major role in extending political democracy, it is a mistake, he suggests, to see the proletariat as essentially a force for liberty, racial equality and social progress. It is necessary to draw a distinction between economic and non-economic 'liberalism'. On economic issues, such as income redistribution, the poorer strata are everywhere leftist but on non-economic issues, like support for civil liberties, racial equality, internationalism and so on, the correlation is reversed. The more well-to-do are more liberal, the poorer the more intolerant. In support of this generalisation, Lipset cites S. A. Stouffer's study, *Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties*, 1955, based on a national sample of 5,000 Americans. Respondents were divided into categories of tolerance by using a scale based on answers to questions about such civil liberties as the right of free speech for Communists, critics of religion or advocates of nationalisation, and the like. Tolerance was found to increase as one moved up the social ladder: thus only 30% of manual workers were classified as 'most tolerant' compared with 66% of the professionals and 51% of the proprietors, managers and officials. Similar results have been obtained from public opinion surveys in other countries.

The authoritarian predisposition of the working class is not really surprising. It stems from their social situation. Among the elements contributing to it are low education, low participation in voluntary organisations, little reading, isolated occupations, economic insecurity and authoritarian family patterns. All these produce "a tendency to view politics and personal relationships in black-and-white terms, a desire for immediate action, an impatience with talk and discussion, a lack of interest in organisations which have a long-range perspective, and a readiness to follow leaders who offer a demonological interpretation of the evil forces (either religious or political) which are conspiring against him." The success of Communism, Lipset suggests, is in part due to its authoritarian appeal. In this respect it is significant that it is the middle class intellectuals who constitute the most unstable element in Communist parties. The working class rank and file membership has been least disturbed by shifts in the party line and least likely to defect. "Their commitment, once established, cannot usually be shaken by a sudden realisation

Continued on p. 3

'Share Prosperity'

Continued from p. 1

that they have been driven off the land by the white settlers; are "happy" in that the white man introduced his values without ever giving the "natives" the ability of satisfying them.

Spraying the disease-infested continents of the world with D.D.T. Western nations thought they could also whitewash the evils of colonialism, and of capitalism, of the West. But whether the "natives" can see through the clouds or not, capitalism and its exploiters remain what they have always been: exploiters not co-operators. They will "share" their wealth and prosperity only to the extent that they are forced to do so.

The Congo today 300,000 people including a large number of children who cannot be held to have any responsibility in the desperate situation of that country, are starving. Macmillan, who believes that the world must "share prosperity" on behalf of the people of the Congo the munificent sum of £100 to help relieve the situation! The United States in order to get a kind of government in Cuba which will be subservient to American power politics is quite prepared to take economic measures aimed at starving the Cuban people into submission (yes, we know that for the same reasons, Russia is prepared to offer advantageous trading and other facilities to the Castro government). It is surely unnecessary to detail the sordid list of facts which nullify the promises and the principles which pour from the lips of the politicians of East and West. They are as meaningless as the Treaties and Pacts which they sign and seal among themselves.

If Mr. Macmillan meant what he said then he should cease to be the mouthpiece for the City and for capitalism. There is today in the West a vast productive potential which is not being operated to its full capacity because the national markets are satiated and "foreign markets"—which means largely the "have countries"—are unable to absorb what is being produced. But there are more than 1,000 million people who do not possess the bare necessities of life let alone the refrigerators, television sets and vacuum cleaners; millions of them will die from diseases of malnutrition before it is possible to provide these necessities from local sources.

Nearly half the steel potential of America is idle; millions of acres of fertile land remain uncultivated (and farmers are paid by the government to commit such a crime). In industrial Europe factories are working three and four day weeks while half the world is denied the human advantages of mechanisation and technology.

The free world, declares Mr. Macmillan, must "both produce and share prosperity". It will. The trouble is that the British Premier has not stated the real problem. What we need first is to create the free world! Then there will be no problem of production or distribution. Both will be governed by needs. The world Mr. Macmillan lives in, and of which he is a sturdy pillar, produces for profit, and the only grounds for describing such a world as "free" is that a minority has the freedom to exploit the labour and talents of the majority for their narrow interests.

A 19th century view of capitalism? Maybe, but still as true as Man's love of freedom which is as old as the hills!

Ye Are Many—They Are Few

PART II

WITH the dual threat over the unions of the Taff Vale Judgment and the post-1926 legislation the unions became unwilling to venture upon official strikes. At the same time unions became more and more prosperous, invested their funds in industrial and government stock and became, as an institution, a vested interest in that which they ostensibly set out to destroy—the capitalist system. The American unions freed of the political ties with a radical party have accepted the logic of conventional unionism and set out to make capitalism work. The unions in this country embarrassed by a *mariage de convenance* with the Labour Party have made the worst of a bad job and oscillate between the capitalistic opportunism of the Xs to the communistic opportunism of the Ys.

Nevertheless, in the face of all this bureaucratic ossification, the worker can still use the strike weapon to good effect. In some cases it can be a double-strike against the unions and against the boss. Sociologists puzzled by this phenomenon of contented workers in ideal factories with idyllic conditions going on strike, produced a name—"wild-cat strike"—which was 'symptomatic of some deep-seated psychological disturbance'. The occurrence of such strikes is rather a sign of health when the worker revolts against the meaningless routine of pleasureless, pointless work for the benefit of the employer but quite without benefit for society or satisfaction (except that of the pay-packet) for the worker.

These spontaneous revulsions are reflected in voluntary absenteeism, in a high accident-rate and in psycho-neurotic illness, all of which have increased and in which, the body, as it were, goes on strike. Attempts by employers and unions to lay blame for these strikes at the door of sinister elements manipulating the workers are a testimony to the inability of employers and unions to understand the significance of work in the life of man and society.

The General Strike seems to recede further in the background, to be a myth in the absolute sense, not only in Sorel's sense. This it is said, is due to the increasing scale and complexity of the industrial units involved. But the difference between a little strike and a big one is only one of scale, and every small strike is an affirmation of the ability of the worker to strike and in the words of the syndicalist "every strike is a small revolution and a dress rehearsal for the big one."

The lack of imagination of unions with their obsessions with property, power and legality have blinded them to the infinite variety of possible strike action. The small strike can be settled, and then crop up again in another part of the factory, there can be 'sit-down' strikes to prevent employment of blacklegs, 'the

stay-in' strike to prevent dismissals, the 'stay-down' strike for miners (still practised), the 'lie-down' strike, the chimney-man strike (a Japanese climbed the works chimney stack to draw public attention to bad working conditions); a hunger-strike (refusal to use the canteen until conditions there were improved); the token-strike (the strike as a demonstration of power without alienating public sympathy, e.g. a bus strike by conductors refusing to collect fares), the 'running-sore' strike, the 'bumper' strike (a factor by factory strike), the circulation among workers of fair lists and black lists, the utilization of union financial machinery to collect levies for support of strikers.

In addition to these specific forms of strike most industries (particularly those nationalized) are so enmeshed with rules and regulations that a work-to-rule movement whilst completely legal would be completely disruptive. The absence of 'common-sense' in rules laid down at an office-desk for men on the job is easily exposed by such methods. The 'go-slow' strike is a possibility although the abomination of piece-work rates have made this difficult. It is also a sad reflection on the state of industry that 'no overtime' strikes can be listed as a weapon to be used rather than a privilege to be exercised continually.

'Soldiering' is industrial behaviour that conditions have produced voluntarily without the possibility of a widespread conscious demonstration of it producing anything but confusion. It would be impossible to recognise in many shops who had joined the movement, and who was behaving normally.

The boasted gigantic scale and complexity of modern industry have made it more vulnerable to strikes. Its lines of communication are stretched further and increasing specialization and interdependence have made it more possible for the crippling of one small unit of production to incapacitate whole 'chains of command'. But increasing specialization has made the technician the employers' trusted Mameluke and possibilities of industrial stoppage may lie more in the realm of the wielder of an inexperienced broom or of a negligent clearer of scrap metal which falls within the range of another section of my paper.

With the increasing complexity of society and nationalization of industry leading to the centralization of power there arises the tempting theory that the social revolution will be 'only like having the auditors in'. That the problem, in a fully mechanized industry producing affluence for all is merely a question of control, is a moot point.

One of the ironies of history is that the best time for strikes, in affluence, is when they are unnecessary. This may be the explanation of the apparent triviality of the claims and grievances for which recent strikes have been fought.

The need of the employers is the workers' best opportunity and conversely, the need of the worker is the employer's best opportunity.

Whether we are heading for a slump or not is an academic question to be answered by a crystal ball. Even if capitalism and the state worked (which is a ridiculous hypothesis) it would be necessary to abolish them, for the conditions necessary to their working involve human degradation.

The boycott was a social weapon frequently employed but it only derived its name from a Captain Boycott in County Mayo in 1880 during the Irish 'troubles'. It has been said that the 'curse of Ireland' is the presence of the absentee landlords and faced with an invasive force the social answer is the boycott. Benjamin Tucker in *Individual Liberty* pays a testimony to the success of the Irish boycott movement which included a rent strike. The boycott was used with some limited success against the occupying German forces in the 1939 war and basically it has the advantage that it is impossible for occupying forces to stay in a country without the co-operation of at least fifty per cent of the inhabitants.

The Boston tea-party of historic fame was the culmination of a boycott campaign which included a refusal to pay

Cinema Notes

Continued from p. 2

choice for Tony.

Nonetheless *Spartacus* is a film of protest, and of the oppressed spitting in the faces of their lords and masters, and for that alone it is to be welcomed. The fact that it is set in such remote times with all the grandeur of Hollywood spectacle cannot stifle its anti-authoritarian cry, and under the circumstances one cannot help think that this 12 million at least was cunningly and craftily used. It is further notable in being absolutely free of all religion save for a cynical reference by Charles Laughton—"In public I believe in all the gods—in private I believe in none."

If it doesn't appeal overmuch to the intellectuals it may well make an impression on the type of audience for whom it was made. The Christmas eve audience when I saw it were well boozed at the opening but left a little less frivolously and more soberly than when they arrived—and its ideas, if somewhat hidden or oversimplified are ones with which all readers of this paper agree—it may give heart to the faint-hearted (I think *Peace News* will discreetly ignore it however!) and remind the bastards at the Top that humans won't be pushed too far! Be it East or West.

In order to help whitewash the Nazis more, the British Board of Film Cen-

sors refused a certificate to the 20 minute film *Warsaw Ghetto* and it had to be shown at a private Soho cinema club. Since then however an uncut version has been granted an "X" by the LCC and so it can be shown in any London cinema. Made as an anti-semitic document to show how inferior Jews were as humans it is a Nazi-made reminder of the sickness of an era which no one (despite the censors' efforts) must forget. A wider showing must be demanded. A similar case in point is the full-length *Nuremberg Trials* which has only had one or two screenings at film clubs. Also refused a certificate by both the censor and the LCC, one can only hope that it will have as many private screenings as it can get, or even some courageous cinema to show it publicly and make a test case of it—for if ever there was a film to be shown widely this is it. In any case, since all newsreel material is supposed to be exempt from being submitted to censorship, one wonders why the distributors bothered to court refusal of a certificate in the first place. Most cinema clubs seem to exist to peddle commercial pornography, but any which shows these films deserves our support, for otherwise they would have to rot in the distributors' vaults.

D.G.

Continued from p. 2

that the party, after all, does not conform to liberal and humanistic values."

Communism Lipset classifies as a form of working class extremism. It is not, however, the only major form. In an illuminating chapter on Fascism, he argues that a study of the social bases of different modern mass movements suggests that each major social stratum has both democratic and extremist political expressions. This leads him to make distinctions between movements generally loosely labelled 'fascist'. Classical fascism, exemplified in the Nazi movement, represents the extremism of the centre—based on the middle classes. Contrary to the standard Marxist account, the Nazis were not fostered by big business and financial interests. With the exception of a few isolated individuals, e.g. Thyssen, German big business as a group remained loyal to the conservative parties until after the Nazis had won power. Nazi support in 1932 came from the middle class elements who had previously voted for centre parties strongly opposed—as are democratic or liberal centrists—to the power and influence of both big business and organised labour.

This kind of fascism is to be distinguished from Peronism on the left and conservative authoritarianism on the right. Peronism, found largely in poorer underdeveloped countries, appeals to the lower strata against the middle and upper classes. "It differs from Communism in being nationalistic, and has usually been the creation of nationalist army officers seeking to create a vital society by destroying the corrupt privileged strata which they believe have kept the masses in poverty, the economy underdeveloped, and the army demoralized the underpaid." Extremism of the right—of the upper classes—is exemplified by the Gaullist movement in France and also, apparently, by the present Gaullist movement in France and also, apparently, by the present Franco regime in Spain. Right extremism, although anti-parliamentary is non-revolutionary and non-totalitarian. "In a conservative dictatorship one is not expected to give total loyalty to the regime, to join a party, or other institutions, but simply to keep out of

politics." This, Lipset suggests, is basically true of Franco's dictatorship. "Although Franco is backed by the Spanish fascists—the Falange—his regime has been dominated by conservative authoritarians. The party has never been allowed to dominate the society; most institutions remain independent of the state and the party; and the opposition is not asked to conform or join, only to abstain from organised opposition."

The appeal of extremist movements, Lipset further suggests, may be a response by different strata of the population to the social effects of industrialisation at different stages, of its development. "Working class extremism, whether Communist, anarchist, revolutionary socialist or Peronist, is most commonly found in societies undergoing rapid industrialisation, or in those where the process of industrialisation did not result in a predominantly industrial society, like the Latin countries of southern Europe. Middle class extremism occurs in countries characterised by both large scale capitalism and a powerful labour movement. Right wing extremism is most common in less developed economies in which the traditional conservative forces linked to Throne and Altar remain strong."

Lipset's book has been sharply attacked by some reviewers on methodological grounds. It is true that he is not always sufficiently aware of the limitations of the data he uses. Often he appears to give as much weight to a small scale opinion study, local in scope, as to a large scale study based upon a carefully constructed sample of the national population. His facility at generalisation also leads him on occasions to make inferences which are not justified by the facts alone that he cites. These faults stem from his desire to produce a synthesis of a vast body of empirical information. Although the result is not uniformly successful, the attempt was worth making.

Perhaps more objectionable than some of his over-hasty generalisations is the viewpoint from which he writes. This is made explicit in a personal post script where he states that his basic premise is that democracy is not only or even primarily a means through which

different groups seek the good society; it is the good society itself in operation. Democracy, however, as Lipset uses the term, has little to do with government by the people, with self-government in the classical sense of the term. It is rather a society with a pluralist power structure, where there are regular constitutional opportunities for changing the government and where the electorate can choose between contending groups of politicians. It is in fact the kind of society we know in Britain and the USA. As far as Lipset is concerned, the good society is already here: the problem is how to preserve it from possible extremist threats from left, right and centre. The posture he presents is that of a frightened socialist, emotionally sympathetic to working class aspirations but fearful of the result if they should be wholly satisfied. This posture is basically conservative in the widest sense. Because democracy requires consensus as well as cleavage, he invokes the spirit of de Tocqueville to counter that of Marx. He directs our attention, for example, to the importance of the Tory worker and the middle class socialist—the deviants who prevent too clear cut a division of parties along class lines. We are almost invited in fact to thank God (along with Disraeli) for the Tory worker because if he did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him in order for democracy to survive! With this conservatism goes a curious complacency: "the fundamental political problems of the industrial revolution have been solved: the workers have achieved industrial and political citizenship; the conservatives have accepted the welfare state and the democratic left has recognized that an increase in over-all state power carries with it more dangers to freedom than solutions to economic problems."

Political sociology as a discipline is not, however, committed to the values Lipset prizes. Read with caution and discounting the conservatism and complacency, this remains a valuable book, even when it is most provoking. The social bases of politics is not the whole of politics but it is an important dimension which requires and deserves further exploration.

O.

foreign affairs for 1962—by when it is hoped that the row will be settled one way or the other. Ironically enough, this statement—at least in its present draft—swallows whole most of the ideas of the New Left, which shows how far the Party machine has moved in the last four years.

It may be assumed that the New Left will not be placated by such flattery, but will instead make uncomfortable proposals for putting social planning and welfare into practice, for raiding the "private opulence" of the Affluent Society to relieve its "public squalor"—in fact, for socialism. At the same time there are more and more bright young men in Transport House and the unions who are sick of the old leaders and the old slogans. The big boys may imagine that home policy is pretty safe; but they may well be wrong.

REVOLTING YOUTH

Perhaps the best reason for thinking (and hoping) that they are wrong is the present attitude of young people. It is rapidly becoming clear that the Young Socialist experiment is going the way of the old League of Youth after only a year. It is related that poor old Hugh asked plaintively how much the Young Socialists had been "infiltrated" by CND and could hardly believe his ears when he was told that about 90% of the present membership was probably unilateralist. Since then he and his rather horrible hatchmen in the Transport House Organisation Department have been

muttering McCarthyily about "Trotsky" and "Commies" (all nuclear disarmers are assumed to be one or the other) and talking about looking for trouble. They will certainly find it.

Already the North London magazine *Keep Left* has been proscribed for being connected with the "Trotskyist" Socialist Labour League, and there are many other Young Socialist magazines with extreme left-wing views that have not yet been dealt with. Again, *New Generation*, the magazine of the "young Socialist League of the I.L.P.", which has just started in Leeds (Gaitskell's constituency), says nothing that most Labour Party Young Socialists would take much exception to. It is surely significant that thirty years after the I.L.P. parted company with the Labour Party the young people in both organisations should be thinking more or less alike.

There are three things the official Labour leadership can do about the dissident Young Socialists. The troublesome branches—or, as eventually happened to the League of Youth, the whole movement—can be disbanded and orthodoxy restored by order; or they can be given their heads in the hope that they will learn to keep them and orthodoxy restored by experience. Either of these two courses could be dangerous and even disastrous, so the third thing is to follow Lord Melbourne's advice: "When in doubt what to do, do nothing."

At this point in history, when in places as far apart as Germany and America,

Italy and Japan, Turkey and Korea—as well as in this country—the intervention of young people in politics is enthusiastic, often decisive and usually "non-party", it would be at best extremely unwise to move against them. It is worth remembering that the Young Socialist movement was formed a year ago when Labour had just lost the third election running, and when individual party membership had declined in seven years from over 1,000,000 to under 850,000; Labour depends far more than the Conservatives on its active members with time and energy to spare, and in a sense the Young Socialists were meant to restore the Party's fortunes. The politicians were trying to nobble the kids, so they would look pretty silly if they turned against them now.

But the kids have no intention of being nobbled. By and large, left-wing youth in this country is very left-wing indeed. The influence of Marxist parties is less than some of the organisation men imagine, but the great bulk of the potential membership of the Young Socialist branches is unilateralist, neutralist and libertarian. The politicians realise the importance of the young people, but at the same time the young people realise their own importance. This is the age of the "teenager"—the young unmarried adult—with more economic and social power than ever before. CND and NLR are two prongs of a youthful assault upon the entrenched positions of the Labour establishmentarians. If the tide of dissent is allowed to rise in the lower echelons of the local parties, it

may sweep away the upper echelons too. Whatever the Party's electoral prospects (which are at the moment pretty awful), the prospects of the leadership are by no means secure.

HITTING BACK

So between the Scylla of repression and the Charybdis of rebellion the Labour crew may decide to pretend nothing is happening. And barring any major rows in the immediate future, this is just what we can expect. A new membership drive is to be launched now, the campaign being given the motto "Hit Back" and a damn silly badge which looks like a cross between the CND lollipop and the Fascist flash. It is doubtful if even the people in charge expect such a naive idea to save the Party they love. They may be hitting back at the Tories in theory, but they spend so much time fighting and fighting and fighting again in their own ranks that their blows will not be very hefty ones.

At the same time an enquiry into the problems of advertising is to be set up along the lines of the inquiry into those of youth which reported in 1959, and no doubt the general statement on home affairs mentioned above will be given a lot of publicity. But all this will scarcely draw attention away from the fact that the Party is completely split on defence, on leadership, and—despite the present armistice—on public ownership; and it should also be noted that the Party has no policy (certainly no clear policy), on broadcasting, the European Common Market, education, and many other important matters. All this wouldn't matter if it had a recognisable

flavour, a definite attitude towards its leaders can't even behave towards each other. At the staff Christmas party in Transport House, almost painfully obvious that Gaitskell was being boycotted by most of his employees, while Cousins was affable and popular; Brown and Wilson talked to each other and to Cousins, but not when they talked to Gaitskell. (It is however admitted that the Gaitskell brought was what made the party a good one).

But no one had brought any suggestion for the Party—it is certainly difficult to think of anything else that would do it any good. The probable consequences in the immediate future—by a complete breakdown—is that the negotiations will go on preparing the references, leaving the parliamentary and the machine to go their own way; the former is unlikely to split, so would do the Gaitskellites no good, seem responsible and it would do unilateralists no good at all, and the latter will do all it can to keep the way. The real fights will be between big unions whose conferences are important but not yet quite over and in local parties where there are or less evenly balanced factions where there is disagreement between local leaders and the candidates. The right claims to have all the Reason and Sanity and Sense and Responsibility on its side, but what it really has is power and tradition; the left is a bit of pretty well everything in sight, but has in fact two crippling defects, although it is enthusiastic and passionate, it is disunited and confused; although it has most of the truth on its side, it is running against everything. The Acquiescent Society stands for the end, if we live, it will be swallowed or spewed out, and its members will come turncoats or outcasts.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

FAMINE IN THE CONGO

DEAR FRIENDS,

With reference to your editorial "Famine in the Congo" (7/1/61) let me explain that I wrote the letter with which it was concerned as an anarchist, as one who does not believe in the United Nations in principle and as one who is quite certainly NOT starry-eyed about that organisation. I argued however that lives saved are lives saved, whether the plight of the life concerned is due to the UN or not. I said that I thought "the social service given to guiltless African people is worthy of praise". I said no more and was careful not to.

In your editorial you ignore my question so I will ask it again: "If, as you suggest, the United Nations had not intervened in the Congo what would you propose should happen to the people desperately in need of medical and technical assistance?" You evade this question by accusing the UN of causing all the trouble anyway. The Congolese did not have technical and medical experts because the Belgians left and drained the Congo of financial reserves. There was a vacuum, whether Belgium was in the UN or not is irrelevant. By intervening the UN might well have averted a worse carving up of the Congo—in my opinion they did. Thus even if one accepts the doubtful argument that UN intervention caused all the troubles which the UN

then tried to set to rights, even if one accepts this it still does not follow that the UN activity is worthless if they averted a worse catastrophe.

I believe this is an urgent matter for anarchists. If one is inflexible about one's opinions then no amount of argument will move one to see that LIFE is more important than purity. I am very much in favour of sticking to principles and not compromising but the situations must be judged as they come along. That the UN dealt so abominably with the terrible famine in the Kasai province is deeply distressing, the conditions there have been described by one observer as "like Belsen" and he knew both. But something is being done to alleviate this horror, which would have occurred in a worse way if the UN had not intervened.

R.J.W.

RELIGION AS A MENTAL ILLNESS

THE EDITOR,

G's article on "Religion considered as a Mental Illness" is a good enough assessment of the negative side, and I agree that the holding of religious dogma and creeds and the passing on of these to children is not only unhealthy but deprives adults of the fresh insight and viewpoint of these new fragments of the cosmos—and who knows what the unconscious of the free young will bring forth.

Mankind has always sought to formalise his experience in art and ritual and particularly has sought to crystallise his religious experience, which is a spiritual fact, not proven scientifically, but proven in artistic terms. That this is at the basis of most great religions is without doubt. That these religions have mostly

degenerated into creeds of a quietest or life negating nature is also true. But whether mankind will remain satisfied with his true spiritual needs unformalised as is the case at present remains to be seen. It is likely that he needs some serious community with his fellows in some way which will satisfy his rational needs and his wonder at the miracle of life (sorry—"G").

With regard to the spiritual experience itself it is described at great length by Dr. Suzuki who writes on Zen Buddhism—an offshoot of Buddhism which seeks to almost boot the searcher into "reality"—not the rather flat kind which "G" describes but one in which the searcher truly does discover himself to be a part of creation. This is described as "satori" in Zen and "enlightenment" in Buddhism. Incidentally Zen monks are not necessarily celibate and this has all been going on since 600 A.D., a curious fact for people of our repressive religious background to absorb. Creative inspiration comes under the heading of this experience, at least some of it, and I have seen a child of four draw "with the kick of 10 million horse-power".

Whether man must lose this power early (and power it is, it seems to have the drive not only of oneself but of the whole of creation) in order to run the material affairs of the planet according to rationality I do not know—and whether the psyche simply grows tired of this and demands to be flooded with the totality of the universe and to know by a reality which is not intellectual—that I don't know either and admit it. What I do know is that man is a spiritual animal and that this religious experience exists.

Readers of FREEDOM may not be anchored in religious dogma but they may well believe that the potential of life is barely tapped, that their feelings about all forms of life, the education of children—particularly the vigour and immediacy of children is perhaps expressed by "the Power and the Glory". I am not choosy—if a phrase serves my purpose I use it.

Hampstead, Jan. 7. N.W. LONDON, N.W.5. JANET ELLISON.

Thank God for the U.N.!

To the Editors of FREEDOM,

I don't know what effect your editorial articles on Congo and the United Nations have on your other readers, but by God they frighten me. You rebuke one of the few FREEDOM readers and contributors who knows anything at all about Africa, and go on to make three elementary errors yourselves:

First, you suggest that the British Press has ignored the Congo famines. True, you weren't to know that the *Daily Mirror* would choose this juncture to devote one of its "Shock Issues" to this very subject, presenting it in almost sensational terms to over 40% of the adult population of the country; but in fact pretty good information has been appearing in most left-wing and some right-wing daily and weekly papers, from the *Observer* to the *Daily Sketch*, for several weeks past.

Second, you seem to be unaware of the facts about UN relief in the Congo, which R.J.W. mentioned and which were given at length in the *New Statesman* last month by Ritchie Calder, who recently returned from the area. The simple truth is that this relief has saved thousands and thousands of lives and prevented the outbreak of famines and epidemics that the break-down of community services might have caused.

Third, you betray startling ignorance of the United Nations Organisation—or else an unwillingness to tell the truth about it. You write as if the member States, the General Assembly and Security Council, and the UN Agencies were all the same. But it is absurd to equate the initial Belgian sabotage of the Congo, the subsequent imperialist (in every sense) pressure on the Congo, the UN debates about the Congo, the UN forces in the Congo, and the UN relief for the Congo. You might as well say the Suez

War was caused by the United Nations, when in fact they stopped it.

That members of UNO behave badly is no condemnation of UNO—it is the best argument in its favour. That the UN forces have not been able to prevent all tribal fighting and external interference doesn't mean they have been useless. That UN relief hasn't been able to save every life doesn't mean it isn't invaluable. Frankly, your arguments would be more suitable in the *Daily Express* than in FREEDOM. We should all be glad that the more independent UN officials and Agencies have been able to redress some of the more revolting sins of national governments. To sneer at the people who are actually doing something is just disgusting. Do you seriously imagine that the situation would have been better if there had been no United Nations Organisation at all? Thank goodness the Congo isn't yet another place that has been left to the tender mercies of the British or French, the Russians or Chinese, to deal with as they think fit.

Hampstead, Jan. 7.

THANKS!

START OF A SURPLUS! WEEK 1

Deficit on Freedom	£20
Contributions received	£23
SURPLUS	£3

January 2 to January 9

London, N.W.10: E.L.T. £2/0/0; London, S.W.4: D.S. 10/-; Maidstone: Anon. £1/0/0; Manor Park: D.O. 1/-; San Francisco: Comrades, per O.M. £17/10/-; Wolverhampton: J.G.L. 3/-; Oxford: Anon. 5/-; London, N.W.8: R.C. 11/-; London, S.W.6: Anon. 1/4; London, N.W.3: N.E.B. 1/-; Reading: A.C. 11/-; London: Anon. 3/-.

Total	22 16 4
Previously acknowledged	- - -
1961 TOTAL TO DATE	£22 16 4

*Indicates regular contributor.

& PLEASE help us to secure many new readers for FREEDOM this year

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) Sundays at 7.30 p.m. All Welcome.

JAN. 15—S. Fanaroff on THE FAILURE OF IDEALISM

JAN. 22—Jack Robinson on THE LIFE AND WORK OF LEO TOLSTOY

All Welcome. Refreshment available after meeting.

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

Are you a cog or a king-pin? Do you want a rank and file movement free from political control?

A RANK AND FILE INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE is to be held on SUNDAY, JANUARY 29th (morning and afternoon) at Denison House, Vauxhall Bridge Road, SW1. (Admission 1s. at door).