

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

Vol. 20, No. 15

April 11th, 1959

Threepence

Our Invisible Prosperity

WHOSE WEALTH IS IT?

WHY financial years end on or around April 1st may be a matter for cynical conjecture. The fact remains that this is the time of year when our Government lets us know how much it has dunned us for over the past twelve months and what methods it proposes to use to 'tip' us over the next twelve months.

The details of the Budget need not concern us. In fact they cannot since these words are being written before Mr. Heathcoat Amory has used for the inevitable photograph of the steps of No. 11 Downing Street and then walked round the corner to break his glad sad news to the House, the nation and the world.

We should be as foolish as all the other financial wizards if we attempted in these circumstances to prognosticate in detail what Mr. Amory's little tricks would turn out to be. We can only refer to our guesses at the turn of the year that this would be an election Budget, by which we mean that it would be a baited hook to catch the floating voter with 'advantages'—all of which can be reversed by this time next year after the General Election has been won. And by which party doesn't matter.

A Bumper Year—For Some

The opportunity to present this kind of Budget has been made easy for the Chancellor by the publication last week of the Economic Survey and of the balance-of-payments White Paper, which have shown that Britain had a bumper trading year last year, ending 1958 with a record surplus of £455 million.

This disclosure has of course been hailed by the Conservative papers as a great triumph for the Government and as irrefutable proof of the brilliant manner in which the 'nation's housekeeping' (which is the homely way by which they like to relate it to a housewife's domestic budgeting)

has been managed by Mr. Housekeeper Amory.

The odd thing is that this apparent prosperity has accompanied a trade recession at home. All through 1958 the figures for unemployment crept upwards. Overtime fell off, short-time working increased and in general there was a halt in the rising of material standards of living, while in many cases it actually declined. Employers showed a toughening attitude towards their workers and their wage claims, while trade unionists have shown a toughening attitude towards non-union workers who become a threat to standards in time of recession and job shortage.

Things were getting tougher, while a record trade surplus was building up. This apparent paradox is, however, easy to explain. The recession at home immediately reflected itself in a falling demand for goods. So much of our raw materials come from abroad that this immediately

affected imports, the prices for which have tended to go down over the past few years.

A Fine Balance Sheet

All this has meant a reduced bill for imports. At the same time Britain's exports have kept up. This country's exports consist more significantly of capital goods (including of course armaments) which sell to governments and the capitalist companies of other countries rather than consumer goods selling to individuals—with the two great exceptions of motor cars and whisky.

What this has meant therefore is that a fine balance sheet has emerged. By driving down prices paid to Africans, Asians, South Americans and the other primary producing peoples; and by reduced demand at home due to recession, less British money has gone abroad. But foreign money has continued to come in—not least, incidentally, because of the 'invisible' exports in which Britain specialises. This mysterious item

includes, of course, the capital Britain invests abroad, and it is the most important part of her international business.

In fact in this great year of 1958, the gain on exports over imports of visible goods for the first half of the year was £141 millions but for invisibles it was £186 millions, while for the second half of the year, invisibles brought in £149 millions but on import-export balance of real goods, Britain lost £21 millions!

In other words, it is Britain's exploitation of the wealth and workers of other countries which has resulted in the much-boosted surplus on which Mr. Amory can base his election Budget. For the British worker 1958 was not a good year, but for the British investor it was bumper.

The Beginning of the End

Such, however, is the British public's gullibility, that it is proud to identify itself with this 'invisible' prosperity. It has been told by the press that things are going fine, therefore that has to be believed rather than the evidence of our own eyes—the increased prices and rents, the empty cupboards and stockshelves and the tightened belts.



'Now's our chance, Charlie. Hide yer razor—just needle 'em with a spot of conspicuous consumption and they'll be out for a month!'

"It is easy to believe in justice when you have not been caught in its workings."

—PETER WILDEBLOOD
A Way of Life.

It is a fool's paradise, the frontiers of which are gradually closing in. As the peoples of the primary producing countries catch on to what is happening they resent the exploitation of their resources by the gentlemen in the City of London. African, Arab, Asian, Central and South American nationalism has to be seen for what it is: the beginning of the end of Britain's financial domination.

When shall we see the beginning of the end of financial domination within Britain? When shall we see the British worker asking the same question as the conscious African is asking to-day: whose natural wealth is it? Whose labour is it? And who shall enjoy the fruits of their coming together?

When these fundamental questions begin to be heard, instead of giving importance to the superficialities of government fiddling at Budget time, then we shall cease to be April fools all the year round.

UNION BRANCH URGES BOYCOTT OF MISSILES

The Stevenage, Hertfordshire, branch of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers have decided to urge their members not to work on the construction of factories in the town concerned with the production of guided missiles.

Their decision follows an appeal from the Direct Action Committee Against Nuclear War, who are carrying out an intensive campaign in the new town, where many of the employed population work at two factories—English Electric and de Havilland Propellers—concerned with missile development.

The union's branch secretary, Mr. John Marney, said that at meetings to be called on building sites in the town next week the building workers of all unions (about 1,200 in all) would be asked to take part in a one-hour token strike on Friday and to hold a protest march to the town centre.

Observer (5/4/59)

When is a Liar not a Liar?

When He is a Crown Witness

LAST November, Rawson Mbogwa Macharia, a key Kikuyu witness at the Kapenguria trial in 1952-53 (which resulted in the seven-year prison sentence passed on Jomo Kenyatta for his part in the organisation of Mau Mau), swore an affidavit declaring that the evidence he had given at the trial was false. He declared that the alleged initiation ceremony on March 16, 1950, at a place called Kiamwange had not taken place and that Kenyatta had not participated in or been present at that meeting. The affidavit was presented to the Colonial Secretary by Tom Mboya, who is an elected member of the Kenya Legislative Council, asking for an 'impartial, judicial and public enquiry'. The Kenya government instead chose to put Macharia on trial for swearing a false affidavit "that the Government promised him a college education, a job and protection for giving false evidence against Kenyatta". The Crown brought evidence to show that Macharia approached the authorities on his own initiative and volunteered to testify against Kenyatta.

Mr. Isaac Rosen, the Nairobi magistrate, sentencing Macharia to 21 months imprisonment, described him as "a thoroughly wicked, unscrupulous individual whose love of limelight would lead him, and has led him, to pay any price—except money—to be considered important."

The magistrate may have been fully

justified in so describing Macharia, but what reason is there to suppose that if in the present instance he lied for his own ends, he was not also lying in 1953 when he is alleged to have volunteered to testify against Kenyatta?

The imprisonment of Macharia as a liar, far from removing any doubts as to the veracity of the "evidence" on which Kenyatta was sent to prison, actually increases them.

The Nairobi magistrate said that he did not see why the Crown had not brought a charge of perjury, which would have made Macharia liable to nine years' imprisonment. The Observer's legal correspondent points out that the question is significant.

Perjury is the crime of giving false evidence on oath before a court. The reference, therefore, to a charge of perjury appears to relate to Macharia's evidence at the Kenyatta trial, and not to the swearing of a false affidavit.

The Kenya Government chose instead to put Macharia on trial for swearing a false affidavit.

This entailed a more restricted inquiry than a charge of perjury would have been. Such a trial would have been tantamount to a rehearing of the Kenyatta trial.

They probably thought it best to let sleeping dogs lie! But one hopes that the imprisonment of Macharia will be the beginning, not the end, of a thoroughgoing investigation of the Kenyatta case.

What Comes First in Education?

A RUMOUR gained currency during the week after Easter, of a remarkable event at one of the schoolteachers' conferences. Apparently the N.U.T. delegates were so worried about the state of education in Britain that they gave it priority in discussion over their salary claims! However, looking at the week's reports from the conference as a whole, it is clear that no such resolution had taken place. The same old questions were trotted out for an annual airing: the failures of the Burnham Committee and the supervision of school meals; the need to attract more "recruits" to the profession, and the threat of comprehensive schools. The Women teachers demanded equal pay and the National Association of Schoolmasters denounced it. Were children mentioned at all? Yes, a paragraph did refer to an exchange in which speakers tried to place the blame for juvenile delinquency.

There would not be time at a seaside conference to consider on a practical level the question of what schoolteachers are there for, nor would the delegates wish to waste valuable resolution time on such an issue, but it might throw a little light on the eternal muddle in which they find themselves, and which by some accounts is getting worse (e.g. on school meals the latest ministry circular was declared to be a retrogression from the one published thirteen years ago!) It might also be recommended to socialists of the National Association of

Labour Teachers and to the Independent Labour Party, whose conference witnessed a disagreement over the importance of increasing salaries in the teaching profession.

There are several tendencies at work alongside the development of attitudes towards teaching. One of these is a feeling the education can never take place without a good relationship between adults and children. Once a move has been made in that direction, as it has been made by some writers of psychological persuasion, the usual arguments about prestige, qualification and salaries are not so convincing; and so even the N.U.T. does not seem able to really get tough with its demands.

Instead of having the courage to get up and demand more money for themselves (such vulgarity is only fit for 'trade' unions) the teachers use the argument that they want their pay increased so as to attract more recruits to the profession and hence make it possible to reduce the size of classes and improve the quality of teaching. In using this argument they are implying that for most teachers financial arguments are the most weighty ones. This is in itself of doubtful validity; for many teachers the security and pensions on one hand, and long holidays on the other are just as attractive inducements. The question is: what will they do with their small classes once they have achieved them?

Despite the assertions that teaching is an art, which can be read in books and heard in training colleges, the teachers themselves are insistent that it is a profession. Hence their insistence on tightly controlled examination standards, security from personal factors in influencing appointments, and the demand for an economic differential over manual workers.

The front page comment of the Times Educational Supplement this week, in commenting on a proposal that teachers with families should receive allowances for their children, seemed to approve the declared outlook of the professional unions, that a teacher's salary was payment for a job done, but then pointed out that this made teachers appear *no better than labourers* (my italics). No wonder the general public, whose children are crowded into classes of forty and housed in tumbledown schools cannot find any enthusiasm for the educationists' cause, and probably agree with the I.L.P. delegate who said that "We are worrying far too much about the man who teaches in a school, rather than about the man who builds the school, or the caretaker of the school".

Despite its concern over the numerical shortage in schools, the N.U.T. heard a speech calling for a programme designed to gradually eliminate from schools all those without formal qualifications in

Continued on p. 3

THE American sociologist Edward Shils convened a 'seminar' last October to discuss the forces affecting the movement towards representative government and public liberties in the new states and old societies of Africa and Asia. Aware of the dangers that have attended many international conferences—over-organised and academic, suffering from the "mental calcification of the eminent, their tongues suffused with sonorous clichés, and at best discreet to the point of barrenness", aware of these dangers it was resolved that,

"We would have discussion, no papers would be read, there would be no speeches, set or impromptu—we would seek a free interchange of ideas already possessed, cross-questioning to clarify them . . . We would represent no governments or interests, and we would avoid both well-wishing optimism and ungenerous hopelessness."

Armed with this resolve and with a grant from the Ford Foundation, Professor Shils gathered together on the island of Rhodes, forty faces, "handsome with intelligence"; they included John Kenneth Galbraith, Raymond Aron, Asoka Mehta, Minoo Masani, Bertrand de

PEOPLE AND IDEAS: A More Effective Participation

Jouvenal, Ignazio Silone, Michael Polanyi, Robert M. Hutchins, and Gunnar Myrdal.

They began, says Professor Shils, in his account of the meeting in the March issue of *Encounter*,

"with an unspoken and disquieting problem: Is it reasonable to expect political democracy to take root in Asian and African countries which have not passed through the historical experiences of the established democracies of Europe and America? On the second day in Rhodes, when the party systems were being considered, it became clear that regardless whether there was a two-party system, or a multi-party system, or a system in which there was one preponderant ruling party and the numerous opposition parties were not serious contenders for power (as is the case in India and Israel), the really vital problem was whether the authority of the State had established itself, whether the population had been transformed from subjects into citizens, whether a civil sense had devel-

oped which united the population into a nation."

In a long intervention Mr. Albert Hourani argued the prior necessity of what he called a political society—a conjunction of moral consensus and the machinery of government—"it involves at least the existence of citizens, the attachment of the citizens to each other and to some symbols of the entire society, and an effective government. The consensus (Prof. Shils writes),

"might be born out of awareness of a common language, of a common body of cultural and religious traditions; it might be a communion of tradition arising from common experiences in a common territory. Whatever its source, the consensus would have to include a sense of common nationality. Where the nation did not exist, it would have to be created—because the will to belong to a nation has a 'profound legitimacy' which the Asians and Africans took for granted. What of the excesses of fanatical nationalism? They were apparently 'the terrible frenzy' which explodes when nationalistic sentiment (as in the Arab world) finds no crystallisation in an organised political society.

"No less important than a consensus for the creation of the civil order, are a stable and effective machinery of government, a strong political leadership, and an able and respected judiciary. The travail of a new state without a well-qualified civil service was sadly portrayed by the Indonesian, Mr. Sjahrir, and the contrast between Indonesia and countries like India and Ghana which have the good fortune to have inherited (and to have maintained) outstanding civil services, was apparent to all"

Robert Hutchins emphasised that a constitution, extending its power over the whole country and capable of enforcing itself by the authority of those who spoke on its behalf, is a necessary part of the

'political society'. Bertrand de Jouvenal too, said that one of the chief tasks of the new states is to establish 'majesty', that relationship between the government and the citizens in which the rulers believe they are governing "for the whole society" and the citizens believe in the moral concern and competence of their rulers.

★

SO much for the theory. But when it came to the actual working of the institutions of political democracy, the colossi of Rhodes were less enthusiastic. Ignazio Silone's strictures on the nature of parties in his exchange with J. K. Galbraith (reported in *Volontà*, Jan. 59, but omitted by Shils as "more appropriate at an Italo-American Political Science Conference"), were followed by the deepest scepticism about the working of the political institutions which the same people had so earnestly recommended:

"M. Bertrand de Jouvenal set the stage for a devaluation of the representative institutions of modern states. Both he and Dr. Daya Krishna asserted that there could be no 'government by the people' and in a way they expressed the spirit of what was to come. Both John Strachey and Hugh Gaitskell claimed for the party system that it offered the citizen 'a choice of policies', but neither argued that the alternatives offered had much substantive affinity to the desires of the electorate . . ."

Raghavan Iyer of St. Anthony's College, laid equal stress on the poor quality of Indian parliamentarians and on the low esteem in which they are held. Minoo Masani . . . took a constructive outlook but his suggestions for improving the quality of actual participation consisted in recommendations for increasing the sense of participation in politics. The repeated emphasis on the need for a 'sense of participation' is, I suspect, a

consequence of a certain scepticism about ever improving the quality of actual popular participation in representative governmental institutions. "Not that anyone claimed this was undesirable. On the contrary. But actual participation seems so constricted by the scope of modern large-scale society that it appears almost unrealistic. . ."

In these circumstances, Mr. Albert Hourani phrased the problem as "how can we save liberal individual values when representative democratic institutions do not work?" At this stage the essential differences between society and the state appeared.

The question was opened around the awkward term 'infra-structure'. It was introduced by Dr. Gunnar Myrdal to refer to the complex network of civic and interest organisations, co-operative societies, independent local authorities, trade unions, trade associations, autonomous universities, professional bodies, citizens' associations for civic purposes, and philanthropic groups, through which a participation more effective than that afforded by the usual institutions of representative government could be achieved. He quite rightly pointed out that the absence of such an elaborate 'infra-structure' constitutes a great feeblement of democracy in the new states. In one form or another, the notion introduced by Dr. Myrdal has been coming back into the discussion. What Mr. Albert Hourani introduced the idea of 'political society, infra-structure' found its proper place. It came to be seen as an essential part of a political society which sought to control abuses of power, and which, even though it allowed much power to the government, retained the right to re-direct the use of that power to withdraw it, and above all, to restrain it. The 'pluralistic theory' which had over the years, degenerated into a fumes of antiquated syllabi of University

Continued on p.

Reviews

CINEMA

"EVE WANTS TO SLEEP" (at the Academy, Oxford Street) is a welcome return to the classic tradition of Eastern satire. Conceived in Poland, it resembles most closely the work of Capek, Karl Hynec Macha, and "The Good Soldier Schweik". The plot is ingenious, incredible, and quite delightful. A young girl student is stranded in a strange town, and is befriended in turn by a young thug, a policeman (whom she finally dates), and a safe-breaker. Most of her time she spends in and out of the jail, where a wholly Offenbachian gendarmery are engaged in making the police force work, and in a 'hostel for women' (whose male population outnumber the latter by ten to one).

Even more touching than the comic hyperbole of "Eve" is its lyricism. One hopes that in future Polish films like

this will be given freer play. A tough who talks in rhymed couplets is a novelty, and one which is worth taking a bit of trouble over the sub-titles. There is a nice irony in the dialogue between Eve and her various protectors, as when the thug who has intended to rob her, asks (about money): "Why don't you borrow some? You always need it on a journey." This is pure poetry, since money (in a country where it is almost valueless) becomes symbolic of personal worth, a commodity that contrasts strongly with the cliché-ridden world of local government.

Running with "Eve" is "Goha", a new work out of Tunisia. Goha is the fairy-tale Jack the Giantkiller who carries off the king's daughter; only in this case, Jack's only assets are a disarming naivety and a capacity for doing nothing. The result is not altogether authentic, since though its cast is Arab, "Goha" is directed by a Frenchman (Jacques Baratier). For those fond of technicolor, there is plenty of excitement in the market-places and outdoor scenes, and some of the studies (particularly the match-makers) are full of interest. The ending, where Goha commits tragic suicide, may depend for its effectiveness on a point of Islamic etiquette which is lost on me, but I thought it too like Gabin in "Pepe le Moko", where a placid ending would have been more in the spirit of the legend. A.F.D.

THEATRE

THE LONG AND THE SHORT AND THE TALL (Now at New Theatre) —

IF, as it has been admitted, the cinema has "taken a bashing" from TV, the theatre must have been pulverised. After a generation of cinema-going, the theatre has found a second rival in television, yet the theatre is in a more flourishing state artistically, than it has been for many years.

This is almost entirely due to the infusions of new blood from the unorthodox, 'little' theatres far removed from the big-business commercialism of Shaftesbury Avenue. In the past the theatre has received sustenance from the repertory theatres of Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester; from the theatre clubs of the Group Theatre and Unity (to name only two) and in more recent times from Theatre Workshop and the Royal Court Theatre.

The latest production of the latter, "The Long and the Short and the Tall", is now being transferred to the West End where it will draw the wider audience it deserves. It is a war play but unlike "Journey's End" and "What Price Glory?" (the plays of another war) which started with idealists made cynical by war, it starts with a cynical appraisal of war and ends with a plea for humanity.

The acting, production (by Lindsay Anderson) and setting are all first-rate. The all-male cast has a wonderful variety of accents and flow of language. Even the silence of the Japanese prisoner (played by Kenji Takaki) is eloquent. One may, at times, doubt if a small patrol like this had such spell-binding orators as Private Bamforth (Peter O'Toole) and Sergeant Mitchem (Robert Shaw) but there is "a willing suspension of disbelief" and the emotions planted in us by the author (Willis Hall) are those with which we may leave the theatre feeling more like members of the human race. J.R.

impressions - from Aldermaston to London

'This is for my Sister Julie, who couldn't come'

ONE of the gooniest 'lollipops' at the Aldermaston-London march in which we participated, was carried by a girl with a daffy hat of black with a white pom-pom and who wore a knee-length string of beads. It read, "This is for my sister Julie, who couldn't come". So for those who couldn't come these impressions are passed on.

It was obvious from the start that there were two groups in the party. Those who came last year and those who didn't. Last year was obviously the march. The weather was worse, blisters were bigger and there was (to quote a phrase) "a different spirit then." There was a slight resentment at the "Johnny-come-latelies" which was increased as Trafalgar Square was reached. Mussolini's "March on Rome" had the same trouble.

Perhaps the whole matter could have been solved by issuing military decorations. A bar for London-Aldermaston, a stripe for Aldermaston-London, a Victoria Cross for Swaffham, and a double-cross for the voter's veto; there could be a series of pips for grades of attendance Aldermaston-Reading, Reading-Slough, Slough-Chiswick, Chiswick-London.

This also would grade the significance of the days. Friday was the day of assembly, Saturday was the day of Slough of Despond, Sunday was the day the rains came, and Monday was the day P.F. (the film star) joined our contingent.

However Julie would be more interested in the facts.

* * *

We assembled at Falcon Field after a bus journey in which a marcher from Cheshire bored everyone extensively. We were told there was a meeting at which Dr. Edith Summerskill did not speak. Since very few people went to the meeting this did not cause much heartburn, but the explanation by Dr. Edith is one that even Dr. Summerskill cannot make us swallow.

We were interviewed by a pollster—there were two 'surveys' of the march—and we succeeded, no doubt, in throwing the statistics and categories into confusion by our reply to the question "are you political or non-political?"

All through the March we were worried as to under whose banner we should march. For a time we were in the ranks of a very useful and honourable professional group. We then found that our presence, far from diluting the professional representation, added to it, for a time. In respect for William Morris we marched under the banner of Hammersmith; for a perfectly dreadful time we were under a banner which said "Peace through Summit Talks" (fortu-

nately the banner fell out, for repairs), and once, with a glance at our non-conformist background, we were sited mid-way between the Methodists and the Quakers.

Our favourite 'lollipop' (apart from Julie) was "Do M.P.s Think?", but in the main the banners were uninspired.

* * *

After our night in the school at Reading we marched on to Slough. This was the longest section of the march and was made additionally arduous by the great detour, but for us the chief horror was the Socialist Labour League's chanting of "Labour to power, Out with the bomb!" These smaller fry-ers reminded us of "Four legs good. Two legs bad". Fortunately the chanting of slogans died out as the breath was needed for the long march round the inner circle to which the police of Slough had consigned us for what seemed an eternity.

The Sub-Utopia of Slough paraded its vital industries before us: the aspirin factory (patrolled by dogs), the glucose drink, the brasserie factory, this was the peak of ribbon development with its ring road (processions for the disposal of). This seemed to be the logical forerunner of the "authority whose buildings grope the sky" at Aldermaston. The values of Slough were those of the cash-nexus.

Slough was the place of encounter with an ex-member of the Malatesta Club who once wore duffle coat and jeans and who is now a proud mother. The March was in some ways like a programme in (to use a vulgar phrase) television called, we believe, "This is your life". There was A who went to school with us; and wasn't that B, who was last seen during the Spanish Civil War? That nice girl C, who was with us in I.V.S.P. was there, and so was that awful bore D with whom we served in the N.C.C. And of all people to turn up, at the Albert Memorial, was E, who we last saw across the landing at Wormwood Scrubs.

We have since heard that F and G, and for all we know the rest of the alphabet, were present on the march.

The March was notable for the number of photographers, amateur and professional, present. Most reels of films exposed on the route contained at least one picture of the march.

There was even a police-car with a photographer in it. The policemen were wonderful in their proliferation. They marched alongside the procession, directed traffic, and hopefully rode their Black Maria up and down. At one point a policeman was seen writing down the

slogans and inscriptions on the banners. Some high-ranking police officers were even seen to direct traffic.

It was in Slough that a small child led to the significance of the March. He had obviously asked his mother, "What was all about?" She replied, "What's all about? Can't you use your brains?"

The day the rains came we were welcomed by the Mayor of Isleworth, after marching round the park. There was some singing, but the British not only take their pleasures sadly, but also their sorrows. The only songs we could sing were sad little songs about death on Ilkley Moor and suchlike. The Campaign song-sheets were not much in use, the songs produced are not very cheering and a little stuffy. "The Saints", "It takes a worried man" and "We shall not be moved" were not original productions of the campaign and blues and coon-shouting are not for the singing of very young or very amateur groups. None of these songs measure up to P.S.'s "H-bomb Blues" for rhythm or wit.

Our dripping arrival was greeted with the wonderful doublethink headline of the *Daily Worker*, "Dalai Lama asks China for Aid", with this cheerful thought we retired to bed.

* * *

The last day dawned with its platoon of 'Johnny-come-latelies' who swelled the throng. Throughout we had been reminded of invading armies. A café in Reading had to close at 10 a.m. because they had sold all their food to the marchers. The march was planned like a military manoeuvre and now "the bearded ones" like Fidel Castro's troops advanced on the capital.

At the Albert Memorial we were joined by P.F. the film star (why give him more publicity?). One could see the crowds that lined the pavement 'staring in wild surmise' and then turn to each other and say "Wasn't that P.F.?", there was no thought of nuclear disarmament, unilateral, quadrilateral or siderateral—just the thought of P.F.

So Julie, that was it.

And was it a famous victory?

A snatch of overheard conversation from a footsore matron. ". . . of all the lost causes I've ever supported" leads to the thought that the lost causes are the only ones worth fighting. It is up to us to see that this cause, like so many others once deemed lost—Christianity, Socialism, Communism, etc.—does not get found and then mislaid.

J.R.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

[Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.]

New Books . . .

They Steal for Love
Anthony Weaver 12/6
Political Philosophy of Bakunin
(ed. G. P. Maximoff) 42/-

Reprints and Cheap Editions . . .

The French Revolution
Anthony Goodwin 2/6

The Story of Medicine
Kenneth Walker 5/-

Dangerous Estate
Francis Williams 3/6

The Sound and the Fury
William Faulkner 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

The Culture of Cities
Lewis Mumford 15/-

The Frightened Giant
Cedric Belfrage 3/6

The Only Child
James Kirkup 3/6

Retreat from Reason
Peter Nathan 4/-

Art and Labour
W. Gifford 3/6

Elysian Fields
Salvador de Madariaga 3/6

Essays and Other Writings
H. D. Thoreau 3/-

Scottish Scene
Lewis, Grassie Gibbon &
Hugh McDermid 4/-

My Life
Isidore Duncan 2/-

Colonel Jack
Daniel Defoe 3/6

Ressurrection
Leo Tolstoy 3/6

Berkeley
Alex Campbell Fraser 2/6

The Perfect Wagnerite
Bernard Shaw 3/-

Episodes of the French
Revolution in Brittany
G. Lenotre 4/-

Speeches and Documents on the
British Dominions 1918-31
2/6

Time and Tide: the Crown of
Wild Olive
John Ruskin 2/-

The Kreutzer Sonata, etc.
Leo Tolstoy 2/-

The Poems of William Blake
2/6

Periodicals . . .

University Liberator, No. 8 1/-

Africa South, April-June 4/-

The Humanist, April 1/-

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

27, RED LION STREET,
LONDON, W.C.1

Comment

Shilling-in-the Slot Culture

ONE of the subjects discussed by the acting profession at the annual meeting of Equity held in London last week-end was control of the third television network when it arrives and on the kind of programmes it should produce. Unfortunately Equity, like any trade union doing its job was thinking first and foremost about the economic interests of its members and only incidentally about its potentially important role in the life and happiness of the community.*

Equity proposed that the third channel should be given neither to B.B.C. nor I.T.A. but to a third, wholly independent body financed some other way than by licences and advertising. Unanimously our friends decided that "the government should consider the issue of a 'pay-as-you-view' system. Slot machines would be attached to television sets, and to receive the third channel viewers would have to put a shilling in the slot. We assume that less successful programmes would be employed as Meter-making quarterly calls at all houses in Britain fitted with the slot machines to empty them! And could perhaps be arranged that in those houses where the slot machines were bulging with shillings the collector could show Equity's appreciation by entertaining the family to excerpts from Ibsen and Alan Thomas.

★

NOW it so happens that Equity's immediate interests, slot machines would enable the network to concentrate on minority audiences who appreciate Ibsen and other classical dramatists. And this—or so the argument runs!—would mean an entirely new field of television for work-hungry actors and actresses.

It do probably coincide with the immediate interests of a substantial minority public which has so far boycotted Television. But we suggest that the approach is hopelessly wrong in the long term. The link between actors and public in this P.A.Y.V. (Pay-As-You-View) system is a cold, black (or chromium plated?) slot-machine, which far from drawing us closer to those who entertain or stimulate us, creates a take-it-or-leave-it atmosphere which hardly predisposes us to overcome the inevitable limitations of Television as a medium for the living theatre.

For apart from this question of slot machines Equity is trying to reconcile its understandable concern to secure more jobs for its members with the potentialities of Television as a medium, or a substitute for the serious theatre. And to our minds this is as insulting to the appreciation of "minority audiences", to whom they hope to address themselves, as it would be to tell a gardener that the taste of canned peas was as good as that of his morning-gathered crop!

Mr. Felix Aylmer, Equity's president, is reported as saying that

the announcement of the commercial companies' profits had silenced all the

*Mr. Gerald Croaswell, the general secretary is reported as saying that "television was the only expanding entertainment medium. More competition was needed for actors' services, but there would be no substantial increase in the profession's income if the contract for the network went to Broadcasting House or the I.T.A."

†According to a Manchester Guardian report of 6/4/59.

early doubts about their ability to capture the eyes and ears of the nation. Theatres and cinemas had been collapsing up and down the country; and many actors not firmly established in the new medium, had begun to wonder where their future meals were coming from. Television—although providing fresh work for the profession—was also threatening the theatres.

If all actors could find a niche in the new medium presumably Mr. Aylmer would have no complaint about theatres "collapsing up and down the country". For if the latter were his concern, Equity would not be trying to control the proposed third network on Television, but actively combatting it! And if Television is a threat to the living theatre why does Equity not instruct all its members to boycott B.B.C. Television and I.T.A.? Alternatively it could require that all members who perform on T.V. should hand over half their T.V. earnings to an Equity Compensating Fund, which would provide for actors out of work as a result of Television. There are all kinds of ways of protecting an "industry's" interests (pardon the term but it's how they view it not us!) assuming there is Equity in fact as well as in name.

★

OUR objection to Equity's proposal of "a wholly independent" Television network is that it could not in fact be both a network and independent. What they had in mind was clearly revealed by the General Secretary when he pointed out that "there is still an audience in this country for Ibsen and Maria Callas. People are willing to pay four guineas a time to see Callas at Covent Garden". This led him to think that "500,000 viewers would be willing to put a shilling in the slot to see her on television". We cannot but agree with the views of one speaker, Mr. Roger Snowden—and in spite of the official assurances that Equity's system "would not have to compete, as the two existing networks did, for mass audiences"—that the slot machine "would not deter the network from hunting for a mass audience". The B.B.C.'s Third programme, which for some programmes has a listening audience of less than 20,000 can obviously afford to be more independent than a shilling-in-the-slot outfit. But even the B.B.C. Third Programme falls short of our requirements, in spite of the excellence of many of its programmes, because its policy is directed by a board of governors with powers to curtail transmissions (as they have done in the recent past in order to devote more money for T.V.!) or change the kind and quality of programmes—without consulting the "consumers". In both cases—the take-it-or-leave-it slot machines and the paternalistic B.B.C. systems—there is no guarantee that minority tastes will be catered for. Only through the joint responsibility of "producers" and "consumers" at local level can cultural activities thrive and standards rise, that is, when they become an essential and integral part of everyday life.

★

TO hell with culture, culture as a thing added like a sauce to otherwise unpalatable stale fish" wrote Eric Gill. The wisdom of these words has been lost on the pundits of the theatre who blame T.V. for their misfortunes but look to it to make their fortunes.

Joan Littlewood that "rare bird in the world of drama or of anything else" thinks otherwise. Producer of Theatre Workshop in the East End of London she believes, to quote the *Observer's* excellent Profile (15/3/59) that

theatre at its best is classless and universal in its appeal, and wants to create in Britain a people's theatre that will supersede the West End drama of middle-class diversion.

Miss Littlewood is a stocky, combative woman in her mid-forties with a salty vocabulary and an aggressive disbelief

GANDHI AND ANARCHISM

A recent American book on Gandhi, *Conquest of Violence: The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflict* by Joan V. Bondurant (Princeton University Press, 5 dollars) discusses at length the relationship between Gandhi's ideas and those of anarchism. The account below is condensed from Ammon Hennacy's review of the book in the *New York Catholic Worker*.

"OPPRESSION ceases," Gandhi taught his followers, "when people cease to fear the bayonet." This refusal to value and depend upon a wrong weapon formed the basis of the faith that removed the mountain of British Imperialism from India. The chapter on Gandhi, conservative or anarchist, is worth the price of this book, for little has been written on this subject in English.

Unlike regular anarchists Gandhi sought by negotiation with politicians to achieve the stateless anarchist ideal, and also unlike most anarchists he was able to develop both personal and mass resistance to the state and to exploitation and to overcome the government. The fact that Nehru did not continue in Gandhi's non-political emphasis is not Gandhi's fault. The author quotes Bob Ludlow in an article in the *Catholic Worker* saying, "It is the political element that will destroy Gandhi's teachings in India for he did not realise that *Satyagraha* must be united with an anti-state philosophy." The author says, "nevertheless with *Satyagraha* as the functioning socio-political technique of action, anarchism could conceivably result."

The famous word *Satyagraha* which describes Gandhi's ideals was coined in 1906 in South Africa when Gandhi ran a contest for the best name for his principles. "Sat" means truth and "graha" means firmness. The difference between *satyagraha* and what Indians call "Duragraha (stubborn persistence) is something difficult for us westerners to understand. "*Satyagraha* excludes the use of violence because man is not capable of knowing the absolute truth and therefore not competent to punish." The dignity of the individual must be preserved no matter if it means a loss of property or life. There is a code which the *satyagraha* must understand: "Do not resist arrest; if taken prisoner, behave in an exemplary manner . . . Do not expect guarantees for maintenance of dependants."

★

"ANARCHISTS urge freedom from politics rather than political freedom." Thus the author shows an under-

standing of anarchism even if it comes from an academic mind. Gandhi told Mahadev Desai when asked about anarchism, "Yes. It is realizable to the extent non-violence is realizable." Before discussing Gandhi and the leading anarchists in detail I wish to give the conclusion of the author upon the subject. I agree with her. "It is indeed clear that Gandhi held essential ideals in common with anarchists but that he was willing, as they are not, to accept a degree of state organization and control . . . Freedom: Gandhi could agree with this essential of anarchism if we add to it the technique of *satyagraha* to utilize man's good and reasonable nature."

Philosophically speaking Miss Bondurant prepares the ground for an understanding of *satyagraha* by saying that the "Gandhian dialectic, as distinct from Hegelian logic on the one hand and Marxian adaptation on the other, describes a process resulting from the application of a technique of action to any situation of human conduct—a process essentially creative and inherently constructive." She shows also that there is between the anarchists Proudhon and Kropotkin, and Gandhi, an appreciation of the Russian mir and the Indian village panchayat. Gandhi's emphasis upon village economy rather than centralized private or state industry is his agreement with one of the main essentials of anarchism.

William Godwin, father-in-law of Shelley, and about the first anarchist philosopher, in his *Political Justice* says that, "if government be founded in the consent of the people, it can have no power over any individual by whom that consent is refused." He emphasized the priority of private judgment and reason and this coincides with Gandhian thought. The author, as she rightly recognizes only that anarchism that is pacifistic, feels that where present day anarchists are at fault is that they do not mention Godwin's belief in "the necessity for gradual and non-violent elimination of political institutions".

Proudhon—"Service to the group without demand for return, without suggestion of a necessary reciprocity, is central to the Gandhian approach. It is a position directly opposed to Proudhon's doctrine of *mutualité* . . . If Proudhon's exchange bank would, in theory, 'absorb' the state, dissolving the government in the organism, *khadi* and the voluntary organization that grew up around it was used by Gandhi for much of the same purpose. Gandhi said that "*Khaddar* has the greater organizing power in it because it has itself to be organized and because it affects all India. If *khaddar* rained from heaven it would be a cala-

mity." (*Khadi* and *Khaddar* mean hand-spun and hand-woven cloth.)

Ruskin, Tolstoy and Thoreau from whom Gandhi gained his enlightenment at the beginning in his change from prosperous lawyer in South Africa, influenced him in different ways. He did not share the aristocratic views of Ruskin against the common man, although he did get the necessity for physical labour from him. He liked the term "bread-labour" used by Tolstoy. From Thoreau he got the idea of civil disobedience.

★

THE criticism which the author makes of an anarchist is that he has, "no constructive technique whereby he can struggle toward anarchist goals." And she adds that, the *satyagraha* need not wait until the state is abolished before he acts upon his principles of voluntary association and opposition to authority . . . We of the *Catholic Worker* have not sought to find *satyagrahis en masse* among Catholics or among radicals and pacifists. We have done well to establish our own integrity. We feel that we have creatively used the Gandhian dialectic in taking the thesis of the Counsels of Perfection of the early Christians as contrasted to the antithesis of the acceptance of the industrial-capitalist system by most of the clergy today; and we have emerged with the synthesis of living poor, in the vanguard of civil disobedience to air raid drills, payment of income taxes for war, and in the absolutist stand of refusal to register for the draft, creating as the I.W.W. and Peter Maurin have said the new society "within the shell of the old."

The author quotes Gandhi to the effect that if all the Hindus in India believed in untouchability that would not make it right for him, and even if they sought to prove it by holy scriptures he would still believe and act on his own interpretation. In this I feel the same on the subject of exploitation and war. I disagree with Gandhi's sanction of Prohibition for I believe it creates more problems than it solves, and I do not believe in coercing others to be good, or sober. Miss Bondurant summarizes her thought about Gandhi and anarchism: "Gandhi would have had no patience with attempts to classify him as conservative, liberal, socialist or anarchist. He was all of these and none of them for he never lost his profoundly revolutionary character. If the technique of *satyagraha* is resolutely pitted against injustice, then conservatism, liberalism, socialism, or anarchism might serve as matrix from which human indignation, guided by reason, might carve out an ever-approaching nearness to the ideal."

AMMON HENNACY.

What comes first in Education?

Continued from p. 1

teaching. Everyone who has been in contact with schools knows however, what little importance these paper qualifications really have. Many people with neither degrees nor teaching certificates have more to give children, and are better able to give it, than the conventional products of the closed circle school-university-education department-school.

The plain fact is that the members of the teaching world have hitched their wagon to the star of authority, and the State has got them where it wants them. It is doubtful whether many teachers ever question the values implied by their watchful discipline and rigidly dictated syllabuses. Several progressive people who have been in State schools say that the most unbearable part of the experience is the attitude of their colleagues in the staff room. The predominating feeling among them is that they are passing on something which is coming from above; they are working for 'society', and therefore doing something to children, rather than working for children and perhaps doing something to 'society' in the process.

There is, fortunately, a very healthy distrust of formal education, particularly among working class people, and while it is not particularly rational or positive, it keeps alive the conviction that the most important things in life are learnt independently of, if not in spite of, the schools provided by the State, and pre-

vents the mystique which the teaching profession would dearly love to create, from gaining too firm a grip.

Returning to the conference speeches, they have one prevalent motive, that the one crisis in British education is the shortage of teachers. Whether or not that is the important crisis, there is a chronic complaint affecting education, and that is the way in which the lives of children are used for carrying on the values of authoritarian society. The most important movements against this are the small groups who show that schools can be run without the recognition or financial support of the State, and those parents who provide their children with a better education at home than they would get at school. If and when the N.U.T. were to set its own priorities in order, and if its members were to try to get rid of their own mental shackles instead of fastening them on others, they might find a readier ear for the annual salary moan. P.H.

DON'T FORGET THAT
SUBSCRIPTION
RENEWAL

Thanks!

Keeping the Peace?

THE above inept title was given to a Home Service broadcast (Thursday, 2nd April) on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of NATO. The programme consisted mainly of a review of the military strength of NATO—considered by the contributors to the programme adequately equipped to meet the defensive needs of Western Europe—and a survey of naval forces which, it seems, at present strength, could not be called upon in the event of war to meet the menace of 500 Russian submarines. We were informed by first hand observers that the implication being that since morale among the forces was high, NATO's stated function is primarily a deterrent force against aggression, the moral justification for its existence is felt by those serving under its command.

It was argued that the existence of NATO had prevented the Russians penetrating into Western Europe over the past ten years. This may or may not be true. What seems

to us more important from a long term point of view, and it is the weakness in all military 'defensive' arguments, is the silence on the subject of a potential aggressor who may eventually reach a stage of military development which will exceed or equal the power of the 'other side'.

It is generally accepted that the Soviet Union will soon equal the West in overall military strength, therefore the question remains—what is the peaceful answer to a potential aggressor no longer deterred by superior forces? NATO's answer is to convince, by its strength, any would be aggressor that there are no benefits to be gained from attack. If it is true that Russia is gaining in military strength, and her naval force seems to already exceed the West, it may be that when she becomes even more powerful her leaders will consider that there are a number of 'benefits' to be had from a victorious war. It is possible too that Russia does not quite accept the avowed intentions of NATO, namely that no aggressive act will be committed unless attacked; not a new claim in military history preceding an act of aggression! But we are asked to accept that the NATO forces in Europe are sitting there, machinery at the ready, waiting only for an attack by Russia. With fear abounding on both sides and nuclear

weapons being aggressively piled up the situation is explosive to say the least, at the press of a button the whole of Europe could be devastated, and under these conditions who is going to enquire too closely which side pressed the button first?

We can gauge Russia's own strength in nuclear weapons by the extent of Western nuclear power. It was pointed out in this broadcast that there are magnificently efficient long range weapons stationed in Western Europe capable of 'striking back' at the enemy with 'devastating results'. American guided missiles, manned night and day, which could be fired at the touch of a button are capable of taking off in 6½ minutes from the word go.

It was admitted by one speaker that civilization could be 'set-back' indefinitely by a nuclear war, but in spite of this we would use our nuclear weapons rather than 'give in' to the Russians. The question people should be asking themselves now since they may be faced with just this situation before very long is, whether any one group of individuals has the right to make such devastating decisions affecting the whole of mankind? If it comes to a choice between 'giving in to the Russians' and a fight to the death' it might be wiser to ponder the words of Bertrand Russell to the effect that if

we are occupied by the Russians and since they are only men subject to change and persuasion as other men, we could try to convert them to another way of life, maybe more desirable than being dead or maimed for life?

In considering the two choices above we are not advocating surrender to military occupation! Obviously the anarchist solution is different and radical. We hold that the only answer to war or the threat of war is for people in all countries to refuse by positive action to support the policies of their governments. By refusing to build and man military weapons, by organised intelligent resistance to all government edicts which can be used to further the causes of war.

In this country now there is a growing movement against the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons. From an anarchist standpoint it expects too much from government and as has been stated in FREEDOM for the last two weeks, 'democratic' methods will get them nowhere. But the movement may spread to other countries and as experience in government reaction begins to take effect it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that people will see the connection between war and government—the defender of the national state—and act accordingly.

We have said little about the actual form of NATO, because we feel that this is not the question

which should occupy us. Whether there are 30 divisions or whether it is called *defensive* or *offensive* does not alter the fact that it is a military alliance with weapons at its disposal which could devastate the whole of Europe; if one takes the view that a powerful military force can prevent war, then obviously the existence of NATO is of supreme importance.

By the same token the Russian military machine is also necessary. Invaded by the Germans once, it has reason to fear a rearmament (many supported by the United States and Britain; few people will be convinced by the words of the Inspector General of the German Air Forces that supreme command is vested in the Federal Chancellor whose democratic attitude is reflected in the army!

The point is that we do not accept the view that the purpose of a military organisation is to prevent war, and we doubt very much whether the Generals accept it either. The formation of a military force in itself an act of aggression and the stated intention of NATO to 'keep the peace' can only be taken seriously if its armies are disbanded and nuclear weapons rendered harmless. The same goes for the Russian military machine, but we cannot expect this to be done by General politicians—it can only be effected from below.

Sacco - Vanzetti Pardon Sought

(From a correspondent)

BOSTON, U.S.A., APRIL 4th.

NICOLA SACCO and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, Italian immigrant anarchists, were executed in 1927 in Boston after seven years of trials and retrials in a case which echoed throughout the world. Mr. Alexander Cella has launched a resolution in the Massachusetts State Legislature seeking a posthumous pardon, contending that Sacco and Vanzetti were convicted of murder during a wave of anti-radical and anti-foreign hysteria.

On April 4th a committee of the Legislature held a 13-hour hearing, ending just before midnight, in which only one opponent appeared, Mr. Paul J. Burns, a lawyer acting as administrator of the estate of John F. Dever, a member of the jury. He told the committee that Mr. Dever had written an unpublished book on the case in which he declared that both men had received a "fair and impartial trial".

A famous New York lawyer, Mr. Morris Ernst, in his testimony declared that in his opinion the man who actually committed the murder was still alive, or "was alive in 1949". He named Joe Morelli of Providence Island, a convicted murderer. He said he had questioned Morelli in prison and Morelli had given him information which could only have been known by someone who had been at the scene of the murder.

The committee is expected to make its report to the Legislature on Wednesday, and it is believed that a commission will be appointed to make a thorough investigation of all aspects of the trial.

NOW READY Freedom Reprints Volume 8, 1958 'SOCIALISM IN A WHEELCHAIR'

300 pages 7/6*

Also Still Available

- 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*

*All these volumes are offered to FREEDOM readers ordering direct at 5/- per volume Order Now!

A More Effective Participation

Continued from p. 2

courses in Government and Political Science—acquired a new and a better life in its relevance to the formation of a political society."

And here, in my final extract from Professor Shils' long report we come to what he himself calls the Paradox of Rhodes:

"At present *Government* is the chief agency of which men think for achieving any public end, particularly in the new states. How then can the 'infra-structure'—that unlovely term which most of the members despised and nearly all used—be developed? It must be developed by state aid. How can the populace be aroused from its torpor? It must be aroused by education financed by the State. How can individuality be liberated and formed? It must be freed from its bondage to tradition by legislation. How can independent intellectuals, with high standards, be selected and trained? They must be trained in universities supported by the State. How can agricultural co-operatives be encouraged? They must receive financial aid from the State and their officials must be given a rudimentary training in book-keeping by the State. And so it goes.

"This dependence on Government to create a society which will be able to act independently of government naturally creates misgivings . . ."

IT certainly does. But what creates misgivings about the meeting at Rhodes is surely this: Here were gathered some of the most distinguished intelligences, speaking not as representatives, but as individuals, able if they wished, to drop the usual lip-service to the democratic formulae and the shibboleths of public life. Yet they began by assuming that the typical political institutions of the West were the prime necessities for the newly emerging countries of the East. But then they revealed their personal scepticism about the workings of these institutions in their own countries. They then grasped at the idea of the non-governmental social institutions, both negatively as a check on the institutions of government, which as Shils put it, "no one loves and no one would displace", and positively as a more effective means for people to control their own destiny. Finally as the ultimate paradox, they relied on the state to create these social institutions.

This dreadful political conformism and paucity of creative social imagination among the big thinkers is perhaps the real *trahison des clercs*, the real betrayal by the intelligentsia of its social function. Was there no-one willing to assert that the 'infra-structure' is society, that the social and political principles are in an inverse relationship, that in Martin Buber's words, "Administration in the

sphere of the social principle is equivalent to government in that of the political principle" and that in governmental society, "The political principle is always stronger in relation to the social principle than the given conditions require. The result is a continuous diminution in social spontaneity." Was no one willing to declare, and to draw from the ample evidence available in the 'under-developed' countries, that the task there is to strengthen *society* at the expense of the *state*, rather than to expect the state to strengthen *society*?

The report of the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Indian Community Development Programme comments that,

"the distinction between *popular* and *official* is clear, and it is easy to see that anything which the people have not willed, have not planned, have not directed and have not voluntarily carried out is not popular. The bureaucratic and semi-bureaucratic schemes of rural development had no elements of vitality, dynamism and creativeness in them for the basic reason that they were not popular in these respects."

At the very time when the discussions were taking place in Rhodes, Jayaprakash Narayan was saying in India, "I am not aware of any instance in history in which a country was developed only by the State . . . I should like to put every possible emphasis on this statement, because it is to my mind the crux of the present situation in this country".

It's Never Surplus!

WEEK 14 Deficit on Freedom £280 Contributions received £332 SURPLUS £52

March 27 to April 2

London: R.S. 3/4; Tadworth: W.G.G. 2/6; Cleveland: T. & D.H. £1/7/6; Columbus: R.A.B. 7/4; Edinburgh: W.M.C. 1/4; Edinburgh: C.M. £1/1/0; Perthshire: H.J.C. 1/4; Kidderminster: J.W.H. 1/4; Newton Abbot: E.D. 1/4; Danham: C.B. 1/4; Middlesbrough: P.E. 4/6; Billingham-on-Tees: J.G. 6/4; Woldingham: F.R.B. £2/0/0; Kingston: J.C. 6d.; Dundrum: Anon. 6/4; Cambridge: J.P.H. £1/2/0; Aldermaston & Trefalgar Square: Sympathisers £1/4/6; Brighton: S.B. 6/4; Chicago: R.C. £1/0/0; London: Anon. 2/3; Wolverhampton: J.G.L.* 2/6; Huddersfield: A.L. 10/-; Oxford: Anon.* 5/-

Total ... 17 15 3
Previously acknowledged ... 314 14 1
1959 TOTAL TO DATE ... £332 9 4

GIFT OF BOOKS: London: Anon.
*Indicates regular contributor.

and he went on, "Now, even the most power-drunk ruler of the country has come to realise that in the absence of what is termed 'public co-operation' all official effort turns out to be rather a damp squib . . . The most important question before the country therefore is not how to strengthen the government or who should succeed the Prime Minister but how to awaken to action the sleeping Leviathan, the 370 million people of this country" (*Bhooadan*, Poona 19/11/58).

And who is to awaken the sleeping giant? *The Government*, replies the Rhodes Seminar, for as Shils says, "At present Government is the chief agency of which men think, for achieving any public end". In the new state he writes,

"qualified and devoted persons are scarce. The government draws most of the best into its service. This leaves on the outside only a handful to carry the responsibilities of forming a critical public opinion and to help in the formation of the 'infra-structure'."

And why does the government draw most of the best? Not for the delights of an Indian Civil Servant's pay, but because, like the participants in the discussion at Rhodes, government is the chief agency of which they think for achieving any public end. Where can we break this closed circle of thinking and find people of their quality, willing to put their efforts into those institutions, "through which a participation more effective than that afforded by the usual institutions of representative government could be achieved"?

This is not an academic question. It lies at the root of the deadlock which so many valuable social initiatives of our day have encountered. Why does Danilo Dolci's movement in Sicily not spread to the whole of southern Italy? Because the people who might be helping him are wedded to governmental methods. Why is social advance in Latin America bogged down in *proyectismo*, grandiose official plans coming to nothing? Because they work from the top down and not from the bottom up. Why is Vinoba Bhave's Land Gifts Mission in India slowing down with a bottleneck in the distribution and development of the new land? Because there are too few capable people to follow up the campaign at the village level, teaching for instance, the *Japanny* method of rice-growing and other techniques.

Why, for that matter, is the energy released by the Nuclear Disarmament Campaign in this country, going to be dissipated in the vain pursuit of "political action"? Because we are so wedded to governmental and political ways of thinking—even though experience shows that they cannot deliver the goods, that, like the conference at Rhodes, we decline, in the interests of a fallacious 'realism', even to begin to explore the alternatives. C.W.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENT

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Regular Sunday meetings now held at "Marquis of Granby" Public House, Rathbone Street (corner of Percy Street, Rathbone Place and Charlotte Square) 7.30 p.m.

APRIL 12.—H. B. Gibson on THE PSYCHOLOGY OF COMMUNAL LIVING

NEW YORK

APR. 17.—SYMPOSIUM—THE RECENT EVOLUTION OF STALINISM

Speakers: David Atkins—"News and Letters" Group. M. Reese—Revolutionary Workers' League. Sam Weiner—Libertarian League.

APR. 24.—William Rose on IS INDUSTRIALISM COMPATIBLE WITH FREEDOM?

MAY 1.—SPECIAL MAY DAY MEETING

MAY 8.—Sam Weiner on THE GROWTH OF THE MILITARY CASTE IN THE U.S.

MAY 15.—Vince Hickey on YOUTH AND SOCIAL CHANGE

MAY 22.—David Atkins of the "News and Letters" Group on ART AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

All Meetings will be held at THE LIBERTARIAN CENTER, 86 East 10th Street, New York City, U.S.A.

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
London, W.C.1. England
27 Red Lion Street
Tel.: Chancery 8364