

1 c. 9. Un 70.

BEAVER

BRITISH LIBRARY OF POLITICAL & ECONOMIC SCIENCE
N58
18 JUN 1990

NEWSPAPER OF THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS STUDENTS' UNION

No. 95 Fourth of Autumn Term

3d. or 1½ N.P.

If you are lucky this page next term will be full of 'objective' news. Instead of knowing fully the attitude of each reporter the bias will be transmitted by editing, prominence of views, incomplete quotes and bias towards the status quo.

Instead of accepting the way in which one perceives the world and what one regards as relevant as being conditioned by a particular attitude it will be made out that an effort is being made to obtain a 'moderate' view.

Yet a 'moderate' viewpoint, selecting what it perceives as pertinent from both Left and Right, is just as much a political one.

Obviously one strives to attain the 'truth' but what I perceive as the truth—for instance seeing it is essential to know Robbins' investments to understand his attitudes—may not be accepted by somebody else.

If I wanted an opinion different from my own I got it from the person concerned. I did not send someone to interpret and mediate it—I judge readers capable of that. Those in authority have enough space in which to try and justify their actions. Their cries of personal attack, etc., are the cries of those who do not read what has been written. Nobody has been attacked for their personal habits, etc., but for actions carried out in some official capacity, a position of authority.

Let anyone attack me for my politics but not drop to blanket attempts to smear my name and those who wrote for Beaver.

FOOTNOTE—

This edition of Beaver should have been printed and distributed well before the end of the Autumn Term. For reasons best known to himself, the Editor did not send enough copy to the printers for this to be done in time. Accordingly, during the vacation the printers, who had still not received all the copy, asked me to send enough to fill the remaining spaces on pages 6, 8 and 9. This has been done. In accordance with the views often expressed by the Editor I have made no attempt to be objective. ...

C.J.P.
19th. Dec., 1969

THE UNIVERSITIES: RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS OR REVOLUTION

(Northrop Frye on 'Anarchism and the Universities' in 'Higher Education: demand and response' edited by W. R. Niblett and also published by New Society, November 13).

In his article on Anarchism and the Universities, Northrop Frye sets out to unravel a single thread of anarchism and existential despair running through the present radical upsurges in the Universities. To make sense of the philosophy of his term 'the contemporary anarchist', I shall take it that he is talking about the world-views of people involved in specific events — people at Berkeley, students at Columbia, Cornell, Essex, the L.S.E. and Nanterre — events unified over a relatively short time span, and by exchanges of support in their respective struggles. I suspect, however, that he has coalesced into the name everything from the New Left, with its conscious Marxist analysis of society, to the Hippies, or flower children. This alignment of a whole spectrum of political thought and more individual, hedonistic responses to problems are all lumped together as 'radicals'. We must assume that they come together in University protests: otherwise according to him their link is a putative, negative philosophy. Differences in methods, in the amount of political consciousness and the questions raised by the various protests are left entirely on one side. The individual social situations of the people who took part, the structure of the Universities, the neighbourhoods in which they were situated — all trifling factors which he never for a moment considers when putting forward his generalised theory. And yet it is striking that, for instance, people did not use guns at Berkeley, even though they faced guns, whereas the black students at Cornell had no scruples about bringing in rifles; in England too, the L.S.E. provides striking differences in emphasis: it is not a question of the University appropriating property from the outside community (as at Berkeley, Penn and Columbia) but of its connections with racism, and its openly provocative gates which assert a right to deny access to the School even to its own students. Northrop Frye calls these protests 'localised', and completely fails to see how these issues are the theories in action: the events are Capitalism at work. Houses taken for a science research block, without alternative housing for their tenants, symbolise economic over social priorities. They cry out like the boarded-up houses in Drury Lane 'This was a home'. And it was this bid for people over things, and not a chaotic despair, which characterised Berkeley and Columbia. The actual living situation of those who used guns in the midst of the violence of American Society is different, from the living experience of the English students who throw red paint. For Northrop Frye, they are all one and equally the spirit-children of de Sade and subjected to the course of history of unsuccessful anarchism.

He is more than right to link them, of course, but he fails to see — and how can he? — the common social facts which are the real sources of individual frustrations, and that these frustrations are the beginnings, the thousand bitter seeds of protest, only nourished and warmed by their mutual discovery and by the stock of ideas, dormant from time to time, which can transform them into action. The protester experiences the social reality of his own impotence: he opposes the regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa. Since he knows of companies which support them, and can relate this to the running of his own country, and perhaps his own school, he discovers that he has been participating passively in something he is repelled by. Daily, he finds out what he is generating without even knowing about it, what is being decided for him, how he is an accessory to killing, and deprivation of all kinds — that he allows poverty and inequality: the cold in an old woman's room, the six to a basement family in Nottingham, the Working Class student who develops an ulcer or a breakdown in his straining climb away from everything familiar to him, the factories full of human machine-accessories, and the tape-worm of advertising in the belly of the consumer — he begins to suffer from what he cannot control, and like a puppet which suddenly feels the blood and nerves in its disorganised limbs, comes alive and touches his environment for the first time.

If he puts up with what is, he actively perpetuates it. The student sees himself starting on the lonely treadmill of a competitive career, selling his labour like any other employee, being forced to work for a system which leaves no room for motives other than maxi-

Social solidarity is the first human law; freedom is the second law.

Both laws interpenetrate and are inseparable from each other, thus

constituting the very essence of humanity. Thus freedom is not the

negation of solidarity, on the contrary, it represents the development

of, and so to speak, the humanization of the latter.

M. Bakunin.

misation of individual satisfaction, no goals through or for co-operation — the protest is, if nothing else, a rejection of that isolation, that powerlessness which he faces, if he does not join with other people to change it. The mainspring of the movement is not any 'ism', but the individual's suffering, that lack of relationship to the social and physical environment which he experiences, and which he learns to see as the product of the particular forms of institutions in his society. Not all protesters see their alienation, as Marx called it, in an analytical framework, but it is at this deeper level of understanding that the student movement came into being; the analysis, like any philosophy, is not its source, but directs the form of the individual's response to his situation: it helps him to change it, by seeing that acting together (in combined protest) instead of against each other in competition is in itself an attack on the bleak cells of individualism which Capitalism thrusts us into.

Leaving on one side, Northrop Frye's interpretation of protest in the Sixties, which refuses firstly, the too obvious fact that SOMETHING IS WRONG with people's day-to-day lives, he must be condemned even for his descriptions of contemporary Radical movements. They read like notes from overheard conversations. He denounces the Black Panthers, for instance as Racist, even though they have shown their opposition to the racialism of previous black movements, and demonstrate a much broader Marxist-Leninist approach. (This is one of a series of remarks trying to imply that Marx is old hat to the young revolutionary).

He says that contemporary radicals favour 'the kind of spontaneous uprising with no context in past or future, which is without precedence and without direction'. In the context of the Universities, this is patently untrue: often the confrontation exposes how authority within the University is a rigid little pyramid, a miniature of the power structures outside. It has tried to politicize students who still see their own and other people's frustrations in individual terms, and who cannot co-operate in a social solution to what is a social problem.

Again he says: 'The anarchism of today seems almost as indifferent to the future as to the past: one protest will be followed by another, because even if one issue is resolved society will still be "sick", and there appears to be no clear programme of taking control or assuming responsibility in society . . .' Has he totally misunderstood the idea of participation or 'Workers' Control'? If not, why does he ask the intellectual to disregard the opinions of all those people who will be involved in decision-making, and to lay down a fixed programme for them? There are suggestions and programmes, but the movement is not directed towards taking a monopoly of power in the old sense, but to changing the character of power through participation.

I shall not deal with his historical analysis of the roots of anarchism, nor its tradition in America, nor the roots of Communism, as he sees them. Perhaps the secret of his emphasis on an apostolic succession of anarchists to the present day, and his whisper that Marx is dead, lies in a quotation of James Joll.

. . . 'The anarchists have suffered as much as any minority from the historians' cult of success. They never made a successful revolution . . .' Bracketing the present with the failures of the past, he dismisses them as threats . . . 'Don't worry, it'll all be all right he seems to say reassuringly. The other side of the emphasis on the history of political thought, the contribution of literature (' . . . What happens in literature is very likely to happen in life as a whole a century or so later . . .') and philosophy, is that, of course, it lends a kind of justification, a utility to the academic sinecure, giving the illusion that we must look to the writers if we want to know why it is all happening. Plainly Marx has had a fantastic effect on the formulation of revolutionary methods; Bakunin and Marcuse are cited again and again by people involved in direct action, but this does not mean that the revolutionary dynamic is dependent on them: they are modifiers of the form of events, not of the energy which is generated by people's situations. Whatever attractive analogies can be made between protest movements in different times and places, the history of revolutionary thought is the history of principles to mobilise people under stress from other oppressive groups. It is only one side of the history of protest: the other side is the real history of conditions which hurt and brought people together in a common rejection of passivity.

He talks about a new psychological emphasis in modern radicalism, 'a primary place assigned to emotion and imagination', which draws more on the theories of Freud than of Marx. He neglects the kernel of Marx's thought, that man should develop his individuality, and relate to the world, 'seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling, thinking, willing and loving more intensely and creatively. The 'alienation' which Radicals talk about is no mere psychological concept: it is observable in people's relations with their work — in absenteeism (the aches and pains strains, colds and stomach upsets which in factories and offices are the statistics of non-involvement in work) in go-slows and strikes, in the saving up for the annual holiday as the one high point of the year — and in their relations with each other — the way people look past each other in the tube, the way they will pick a lonely table in a café rather than go up and talk to anyone they may meet there, the way that couples are thrown together for life in a frightening mutual dependence and exclusiveness, which puts tremendous pressure on relationships: we see it in divorces and unstable homes.

This lack of interaction, this alienation from what one is doing and the people one is with, and from the whole world that is glimpsed but out of reach and control, is a psychological and a sociological concept. Radicals look to the institutions as the great dividers: the system under which some shall make the decisions and others do their bidding, some know and others take on trust, under which people are valued hierarchically in terms of money, and accordingly given more or less access to the opportunities, the scarce goods, education, the stimulating milieu, leisure, the global movement and intercourse, security in old age, and comforts offered by the culture as a whole; but by which all are denied full, integrated existences.

There is much more than cries out to be refuted in 'Anarchism and the Universities'. Perhaps his most misleading assessment is to see protests as religious responses to the (imputed) despair of modern philosophy. He talks of the loss of the teleology of history. He says that: ' . . . The anarchism of today seems almost as indifferent to the future as to the past . . .' and that the anarchist ' . . . has inherited all the heroic gloom of

(Continued on page 3)



Continued from page 2

existentialism . . . Having linked it with anarchism, a bad bet in the historians' success stakes, he attempts to castrate the student movement, and turn it into a religious dis-order: ' . . . I feel that contemporary radicalism is deeply, even desperately religious both in its anxieties and in its assertions . . . Yet religion, since Marx and Durkheim, has been seen functionally in society; millennial movements can be seen as organisations functionally developing social cohesion and combined protest within a group — no wonder that movements devoted to developing just this group-consciousness and membership and the liberation of the individual should look similar. To see them as a cry for religion is to fail to see religion in our society as a cry for real understanding and fearless relationships between people. He claims that radicalism comes from a loss of the belief in the

continuity of time, a sense of purposelessness and absurdity, left by the rout of Christianity. But the unmasking of a theory of prior or divine design is only devastating because it puts a man, like a winkle on a pin, in face of his helplessness — the inadequacies of our social relationships and of our social structure, with the purposelessness of work in a divided society without common goals, or real participation by people in the way it and they are run. I have not mentioned the associated divorce from nature, the physical world, which turns everything into a resource, as soon as it's visible, and the sea around us into a vast dustbin.

This is not a religious crisis, but a crisis of knowledge: it is biting on the sour fruit of social reality. No wonder that we, without pedantic recourse to any of the literature or philosophy he mentions, spit it out.

JACQUIE SARSBY



THE PEOPLE

Students of the North Western Polytechnic occupied their Kentish Town building beginning Tuesday night for a 24 hour period. Some 150 people were at the Union meeting that voted for the occupation, and as many as 250 people were present at 1.30 a.m., including students from all four buildings of the polytechnic and visitors from Borough Poly, Enfield, Hornsey and Bedford College.

The issue which sparked off the action was the college principal's refusal to call an emergency meeting of the academic board, or even to discuss the matter with students' union officials, on the currently 7 months old question of student participation. That history began when the College Main Academic Board first considered a Students' Union request for 50% participation in its activities last May. It referred the matter to a joint negotiating committee comprising the Board's Executive Committee and 6 students.

A meeting between the principal and Students' Union officials terminated rather abruptly, when after two minutes the principal ordered the students out of his room. Students saw this action as a slight to the entire Students' Union, necessitating some form of effective action to show their determination to be treated as equals. Much of the support for the occupation seemed to be based on loyalty to the union and backing up its officials.

At the union meeting Tuesday evening, the union executive called for a 'non-violent sit-in of the college main building for twelve hours from the close of this meeting to show its determination to re-open negotiations immediately . . .'. An amendment was put to change 'sit-in' to 'occupation' and 'twelve hours' to twenty-four.

The interesting thing about the amendment is that its proposers did not intend that it should be passed. Rather they hoped that by presenting a 'militant alternative' they would get the moderates to see the '12 hour sit-in' as a moderate alternative. The proposer stressed that 'occupation' meant total control of the building, as opposed to merely staying in the canteen. Later, as support for the amendment seemed to be growing, the head of the Socialist Society spoke for the amendment. Fearing that there were not enough people present to carry out a successful occupation, he deliberately adopted a manner that he hoped would alienate the 'moderates' so that only the 12-hour sit-in would pass.

But the sentiment for direct action proved too strong. The meeting voted about 75-65 for the 'militant alternative', with almost all the opposition coming from a block of students on a one year professional course. The occupation was then approved overwhelmingly, and begun.

Two general assemblies took place during the early morning hours. At the second of these, the occupation committee put forward a plan for barricading the corridors leading to the administrative offices. They felt that such a plan could be successful if there were at least 100 people committed to carrying it through. A count showed only 95 people who would be able to stay the following day. The committee wavered; but again the desire for militancy prevailed. (Just a week earlier, a meeting at the Highbury Grove building changed a 'left' proposal for a one-day canteen boycott into a week long boycott, and several days later, went on to call for dismissing the catering firm and running the canteen under student and staff control).

Tables were piled up in both ends of the two corridors and about 90 students manned each pair. Spirit was very high. Students manning an information table greeted arriving students with an occupation issue of *Stereo* (the college paper) produced that night. Most arriving students agreed with the occupation, and many joined the barricades.

The expected confrontation with the principal, however, did not take place. He and all the other administrative officials carefully stayed away from the college. Although the occupation had decided not to interfere with lectures and classes, these were cancelled by a meeting of heads of department in order to enable as many 'moderate' students as possible to attend the 11.00 general assembly held in the main lobby. The 'moderates', however, voted to continue the occupation for the remainder of the 24 hours.

At a general assembly that afternoon, it was decided to unilaterally increase student 'representation' at a departmental academic board meeting scheduled for 2.30. About 40 students waited outside the room for the academics to appear, but the latter decided it was not necessary to meet after all.

Lunch was taken in shifts. When the staff canteen refused to serve students, and then shut down service entirely, the occupying students purchased their meals in the students' canteen and then carried them up to the staff canteen. One practical reason for this gesture was that all the tables and chairs from the downstairs canteen had been taken for use in the barricaded corridors.

At 5.00 the barricaders left for a general assembly in the staff canteen. This time, to the consternation of two well-known outside revolutionaries, very strong support appeared for continuing the occupation for another 24 hours. In fact, a vote produced a 35-35 split (with many abstentions). After several hours of discussion, however, sanity prevailed and it was finally agreed to leave further action to the union meeting scheduled for 9 December, unless disciplinary action should occur.

One of the reasons for the reluctance to terminate the occupation was that for the first time at N.W. Polytechnic, students had experienced a sense of community. The 3,000 students who attend the college are split up among 4 buildings with a minimum travel time of a half hour between some of them. (The coming merger with Northern Poly will add two buildings in an additional location. Many students attend for only two days a week (social work), for two terms each year (teaching studies), or for one year in all (child care). None of the canteens serves an evening meal, and there is very little evening social activity.

For the first time in its history, N.W. Poly became alive. And many students there await the next time.

VIC SCHOENBACH,
Solidarity (Arsenal).

NORTHERN

After the bravery the p

"Members of Peoples Democracy were listening to the radio and for about an hour before the police, before the shooting to the county Inspector of the RUC had disappeared. I think he had been kidnapped or sent away on a fools errand because he had got in touch with and for an hour the B-men ran the town. The police force and they put out the messages and I heard the radio coming over the radio saying "Go out to Cathedral Road, go and tell those people". I went out—I spoke to the people. I said, you should try to warn them what was going to happen and a lot of people tried to turn in the opposite direction, but it was too late. Four cars with their lights out, of B-men in from the country from a place called main, came in and they stopped in the middle of the road.

"They got out, seventeen of them, and they drew their guns and without warning or anything else, they fired into the crowd, they fired in the air and they wounded people both in front of them and behind them and they shot a man dead."

Eye witness account

beat

THE LAW



LAND TRAGEDY

People still search for Freedom

the struggle continues



CONNED BY THIS

BE

TO

Mr. John Taylor, arch reactionary Under Secretary at the Ulster Home Office, made a speech at Ruchill, Co. Armagh, calling for "no alarm." "Every Special who is physically fit" he promised "will be taken on in the new force." The Home Secretary, Mr. Ian Porter, persuaded two platoons of B Specials not to resign with promises of a new, even more powerful Protestant force. More importantly, a letter, which has come into the hands of 'Private Eye', was despatched to all B Specials from the Specials' headquarters, shared with the Royal Ulster Constabulary at Brook Lyn, Knock Road, Belfast. The letter was signed by a senior Specials staff officer, Major Derek Byrne, and it explained that two new forces would be set up, one of them a defence force.

"We can expect" ran the letter, "to be invited to join these forces whilst serving in the Ulster Special Constabulary which is to remain in being and quite unaffected right up to the moment when the new defence force comes into existence. In practise, I assume it will work out this way: up to now date and hour still to be decided, we will continue to be members of the Ulster Special Constabulary. We will then, those of us who apply and are active enough will move across without any delay into the new defence force.

"The fact that in the future for role and training purposes we will be two forces not one should not cause us to oppose change for the sake of it."

The words **without any delay** were underlined by Major Byrne's letter. It had been decided that the new force would consist solely of B Specials, and that if all B Specials applied **without any delay** they could fill the vacancies before any Catholics had the chance to apply. "We" would then become "two forces, not one."

This was the situation to which the British Cabinet had agreed, and it explains Chichester Clark's victory at the Unionist Council on Friday, October 24. It explains, too, William Craig's, and the previous Ulster Premier, Lord Brookeborough's acceptance of the new force, which has been greeted gleefully by the entire Unionist Right Wing. Every attempt is now being made to keep Catholics out of the new force. Half-page advertisements have appeared in local newspapers throughout Northern Ireland, paid for by the Northern Ireland Government, which in theory is not in charge of the new Defence Regiment, giving "the facts" about the two new forces. The advertisement is intended to make the new force as offensive as possible to Roman Catholics, stressing the need for an oath of loyalty to Her Majesty the Queen and Northern Ireland (which no army recruiting poster would ever do.)

From Private Eye

The press no longer report on Northern Ireland. They reiterate press releases by Westminster and Stormont and hope that the six counties will again sink into the obscurity that was before the explosion.

The official view is generally accepted that the whole crisis was the result of religious rivalry and an unresponsive Unionist Party. Thus it is necessary primarily, in the government's view, to remove the most obvious signs of sectarianism and eliminate some of the more glaring anachronisms in the Ulster political system.

The fallacy that this view represents is a major operation in mystification and the main efforts are devoted not to bringing a change in the main faults but in a great psychological offensive. This can be seen in all the well publicised 'improvements'. The Hunt Report for instance is quite open, in its approach expressing first its acknowledgement that police are subject to the socio-economic conditions existing, yet this is used only as a means to excuse the behaviour of the R.U.C. and B-Specials, and requests no change in these conditions. Tacitly accepting their real weakness the reports' authors proceed to do the job they were intended for — to put old wine into new bottles. As we said in our review before (Beaver, 2nd Autumn edition) they have as their object solely the task of changing the "image" of the R.U.C.

Likewise the B-Specials are being re-constituted as the Ulster Defence Regiment. The political pressures of the Unionists and Tories have forced Wilson and Co. to reject even Hunt's proposals on these the Orange Orders private army. The numbers are to be 6,000 (not the 4,000 of Hunt) and are to be controlled by Unionist appointed officials.

The Labour government is in fact a prisoner of those socio-economic conditions Hunt so clearly sees as the arbiter of events. Having pin-pointed religion as the cause they are in fact powerless in many circumstances to ring changes that will satisfy this analysis and the liberal consciences in Westminster. The economy's control is too complete.

Even where changes can be brought the problems remain. One can introduce as many Catholics as are necessary into the R.U.C. but the R.U.C. will still carry out the political role Stormont decides for it. It may require a little more training, particularly psychological, but the end result will be the same. See Catholic police in Spain break up priests in demonstrations or the predominantly working-class police of the CRS used on strikers.

This is why the British troops are merely a veil to give credence to the religious myth. To the Irish they were seen on arrival as the bringers of peace but when they leave the situation, that all important socio-economic situation, will be unchanged. And it was this situation that made people begin to demand better housing, better conditions and better facilities, Civil Rights.

That situation is a result of the workings of British capitalism and the economics that control the whole north-Atlantic community. Thus British troops were there primarily to protect that economic set-up.

The consistent Unionist policy of keeping the predominantly Catholic areas at a slightly lower standard of housing and representation overall than the Protestant dominated areas inevitably leads to conflict when one area starts pushing for its rights. If it is a Catholic area Protestants fear for their tennons almost non-existent advantages and if it is Protestant the Unionist channels through which they have traditionally found some response scare off the Catholics.

The Catholic Church and the opportunistic "green Tories" of Eire add to the confusion, the latter as they are as dependent on the same economic system and the former as the status quo enables them to keep influence over the people. And through this inter-action the working-class Catholics, without yet sensing the strength of their class, turn to both as their hope. Dublin and Stormont happy that their mutual policies and connections keep the poor of all Ireland divided and exploited continue unchanged.

ROUND THREE OF PARTICIPATION At last honesty

The Union meeting of Friday, 14th November, passed off with another attempt by Pryce and his supporters on Union Council to have accepted proposals on 'participation'. The meeting went along dully until Pryce himself made an impassioned plea.

It was agreed that a motion, roughly reiterating and expanding the one passed by the previous Union meeting (which had been ruled out of order), would be put first and that if it was accepted the Union Council motion would fall. Dr. Desui took the chair.

Pryce made several points in his speech on this third attempt to get students to accept the administrations participation proposals. We reiterated Crouch's plea of over a year ago that never again would Union be offered such terms, a point later countered by another speaker who stated that after a year of direct action the offer had been doubled.

However Pryce's main points were that if we tried to gain anything more the full weight of the administrations and the states repression would be felt and that students should take what they could whilst the going is good and not oppose any such repressive moves.

This view was well countered by a speaker for the abstentions who welcomed this new honesty of the President in at last restating what the left had been saying for several years but that instead of being blackmailed into compliance—with the state's system we should oppose it in the only realistic way—to work for an overthrow of that system.

The movers of the motion stressed that they say their motion is the very minimum which could be demanded in order that students could have a minute voice in affairs but that they accepted the contradictions of the whole educational system came from something much larger—the contradictions within the state.

The motion was carried overwhelmingly and Pryce failed for the third time in his attempts to get student support for the Governor's proposals.

He denied rumours that he would resign as a result of the defeat and when asked if he felt uneasy as the President who had failed to initiate any policy through union he said no.

'Another View'

At the Union meeting on the 21st November, the School's proposals for 'student representation' were rejected by 181 votes to 100, 18 abstaining.

The President in advocating for the second time the acceptance of these proposals made several points. He indicated his disappointment with several aspects of

the offer, in particular the refusal of the Governors to grant students membership of the Standing Committee. He attempted to counter, however, the view that this omission made the rest of the offer meaningless, i.e. in the current jargon 'tokenism'.

Mr. Pryce also expressed his belief that the School's offer was indicative of a

genuine desire to improve the undoubtedly poor staff-student relations which exist at present and that many of the conditions attached to the offer (e.g. the confidentiality conditions) would not prove troublesome in practice because of this goodwill. The President's main point, however, was one which he has frequently made over the last year, both inside L.S.E. and elsewhere (honest or otherwise, it's not new). The Government was faced with the problem of doubling the number of students over the next ten years without feeling able to increase proportionately the resources available to the universities and colleges. This would undoubtedly mean policies which would reduce the quality of the education available to students. Acceptance of places on the relevant School Committees would at least help students to mitigate the worst effect of these policies within L.S.E.

The above argument has been variously misinterpreted, generally by those who explicitly or otherwise advocate the policy of direct action. This, as the President stated, is the only alternative to representation. No-one attempted to counter his charges that direct action has been an abysmal failure in the universities, not least in L.S.E. last year.

C.J.P.

(This wholly one-sided article has been inserted by courtesy of myself. The Editor despite his front page editorial has never "wanted my views" except to distort them.)

Next Term

Florries Coffee Bar will be on the first floor of the St. Clements Extension.

Next to the new snack bar, a new room, S.167, has been placed at the disposal of the officers of Union Societies.

The television will be in room S.100—if we can get insurance.

The old lecture room S.101, will become Union property. A movable partition will divide it into two; the larger half will be a lounge; the smaller half, a committee room.

The G.S.A. will probably exchange their present office for room S.114.

The old basement snack bar will be refurbished and become an extension to the bar. In informed circles, there is intense debate as to the future of Florries present kitchen. Will it be used to store beer or could it become a new darkroom? Tension mounts.

used textbooks bought for the highest prices

Second-hand (marvellous range) and Stationery (everything for the student) Department, The Economists' Bookshop, King's Chambers, Portugal Street, London WC 2.

For a quotation ask
to see Brian Simmons

Welcome to the rat race

We don't know why the rat has become the pejorative symbol of the human condition. Everything struggles for survival; why single one out? Forget the headline—Albright & Wilson say 'Welcome to the human race'. Now you're about to become a fully paid up member—may we tell you why you'd be happy with us.

First we offer interesting work. This is important. No one achieves anything unless they're interested. We offer scope for progress—in responsibility and pay—within our organisation.

We offer financial rewards; the opportunity to work in many parts of Britain, and the world; the chance to become professional in your skill and to keep up with new knowledge and techniques in your field. We are in the expanding field of chemicals, suppliers to hundreds of industries—on a world-wide basis—of essential materials in intermediate or finished form.

We need chemists for Research and Development, and for Marketing and Production, but we need other graduates, too. There are career opportunities for Marketing Men, Chemical Engineers, Computer Programmers, Production Managers, Works Engineers, Accountants and Economists.

Would you find our challenging atmosphere a stimulus?

Please fill in the coupon and send it to:

Mr. F. B. Hunt, Staff Officer,

**ALBRIGHT &
WILSON LTD**

1 Knightsbridge Green, London, S.W.1

I am
interested
in the
following
type of work

Please send me information and
initial application form

NAME

ADDRESS

University/
College

A DIRECTORS DAY

As was my wont I hailed a taxi which took me to the School and after 3 circuits of the Aldwych saw it was safe to enter Connaught House. I raced through the entrance and into the lift. Thank God nobody saw me. On the sixth floor I entered my office after switching off the electric eyes and looked forward to another day of power.

I waved aside the order of closure my secretary proffered and beamed "I don't think we'll need that today". She reminded The Lord was coming at 3 and I had better have everything done by then. I swiftly checked that all students' files were up to date making sure that odd boy Pryce got another star for his attempts to push participation through Union. Funny chap he believes everything we say. He'll probably crack up like all the others.

Brown came in at 12, bowing to the desk with that shifty, lapdog smile of his. "You may speak," I motioned.

"Please sir, I tore down 15 notices yesterday, 15. That's 2 up on Monday".

He looked for congratulations with eager eyes. Instead I said "Be careful. We don't want anything to stir up those bolshies—we've not got that SS PS or whatever it is group to keep the nutters in check you know. Must be calm—I didn't spend time in Intelligence and not learn that. That's where old Logan went wrong. Too open. Should have let us handle that mob. Get 'em all on academic grounds. Spread things out—he learnt, he's handling the inquiry business well, conned all the moderates. Can't say I'm not glad he's got all the trouble."

"Yes sir. You're right, sir. As I said to the Chief Superintendent, that nice one Forrest, only last night we must be calm."

"Good, so don't be seen poster pulling. Order a porter to do it. Make the students distrust them. Clever eh. Ha ha. Eh, What?"

Brown left to be replaced by Percy. He's been a bit of a nuisance lately claiming to have been followed on tubes and things. He even puts a hat on a stick into lectures before he enters. Today he wanted to know if we were going to drop a few more students. He's sure Tomkinson wasn't enough for this year, he also brought the latest copy of Beaver which I believe is a students union publication.

"Look," he said, "Just look, Morris is getting all the coverage. He's hardly done ANYTHING. Jeez, I've chopped more students than he's had anal fixations. It's always the same these theorists get all the glory whilst me and Alan just get ignored. Why last year we were right in the thick of it, raids and disruptions—where was old Morris, couldn't even get his testimony right in court."

I calmed Percy with a few veiled hints that Morris would soon be outflanked on the right by his new lecturer, Bend or somebody. One of the presidents that went round it anyway. He seemed quieted but left muttering about T.V. coverage every night, never had a raid on his office—damned colonials.

At 3 The Lord arrived.

"Hey ho Wally, how's things. Herd still quiet? Good, good. We need to get the Governors to pass a few new regulations you know—government think we've got too many loopholes. Goodman looked them over last night—no not the bandleader you fathead. I'll get you posted back to the colonies if you're not careful—fancy your chances in Anguilla? Now to work."

Joined by the trusty academic governors we quickly worked out our strategy and apart from The Lord nearly having apoplexy when Freedman said the word Bateson all went smoothly.

Ben brought up the actions of Desai but the lord wiped these aside with a searing "What do you expect from one of them. Give them a good job, a home, friendship—what do they do? Turn on you."

After Freedman stopped clapping Ben added "Just like that lawyer fellow meddling in everything. Damn nuisance."

We finished writing the passes people would get at next years exams then, after a break for a scrumptious tuck feast, returned to the problems. His Lordship expressed concern that a wishy-washy approach to troublemakers was emerging and was concerned some people had opposed his idea of supplying tear gas to staff members of proven loyalty. Pearson and Co. shares had fallen $\frac{3}{4}$ d. in the last month and when you hold 7 million that means something.

Becoming more expansive, he stood up, beaming at the Committee, and launched into one of his long polemics whilst Percy and Freed took bets on its probable length.

"Gentlemen, I have watched LSE grow, nay mature under my predecessor's great guidance. We have served several governments faithfully and well—a tradition we aim to continue, eh Freedman? Nevertheless the students do not seem to understand the niches we have reserved for them if they follow our experienced lead."

He continued thus for several hours until indeed it was safe to leave.

Continued next week.

MY LAI NOT PINKVILLE

The utter completeness, omnipotence, of the oppressive culture is so effective that we often accept its dictates, so enmeshed are we in its sticky web. The very vocabulary and terms we use are the tools of that culture and help to divide us from the class in which lies our salvation. Moreover the use of truly socialist concepts stand out like Centre Points in the bourgeois vocabulary and their novelty jars on the senses often causing irrational rejection of the reasoning behind them with the words themselves. Some are absorbed and subtly changed, devalued by general use—the 'Times' carries reviews of the Middle Class and imperialism—sociology having given them some measure of respectability.

At its most sickening it can be revealed in a horrific incident, a horror repeated daily in scattered incidents, that of the massacre at My Lai. Why this event out of many has been so extensively and intensively discussed is interesting but our culture ensures it will go down in history on its terms—not those of the poor people who died there. It will be remembered as Pinkville—not My Lai.



This massacre of the people yet again was only fully revealed to me by a German friend—who perhaps is more conscious of the irregularities of our vocabulary. That the sickness of the American attitude will be perpetuated over the reality of that tragic village is a crime also—that because it was "Pink" it could not exist only pure white is allowed, any shade of red demanding extermination.

Our philosophers etc. will say this does perpetuate the crime but in fact merely perpetuates the existing cultures view. It will sink into obscurity purely as a name and few will examine it further, it will superficially give a story, and the notion of history as a series of isolated events, a patchwork quilt, will continue. No person will be required to look deeper. It will become as Auschwitz and Hiroshima cannot an aberration, a temporary lapse, a horror of humanity—not of an authority structure, of a system of government.

The rotting bodies will be forever presented on the terms of their invaders and murderers without even their true identities as an actual community the three hamlets that made up My Lai. Even in their death they are to be victims of the force that dared to cause it. Not people. Symbols.

War is a horrible part of struggle and its primary justification must be sought in the origins and causes of each particular outbreak. For Vietnam this has been done extensively and here we will leave this question.

The tenacity and heroism of the Vietnamese in nearly thirty years of continuous fighting and oppression has been an incredible example to all who struggle for the same results. Most incredible of all has been their retention of the important emotions which one could easily understand as becoming bludgeoned to death.

The small nation of North Vietnam 63,000 square miles and about 30,000,000 people has had rained on it more explosives than were dropped on Germany in the whole Second World War.

The South Vietnamese have lost over half a million dead. They must not be forgotten. They must be remembered for what they are.

The Youth Council of L.S.E. are beginning a survey in the N. Paddington area of the inhabitants knowledge of the social services available to them. More volunteers are required to carry out the survey. Those doing the Survey Methods Course would find such experience invaluable. Please contact Youth Council if you would like to help.

Also, there are positions available for anyone who would like to assist in a playgroup. Only the patient need apply.

Wednesday saw the play off for the Lenin Cup semi-final. Monty Johnson trained by the CP met Tony Cliff, soothsayer of International Socialists. The audience was made up of those come to drink from the oracle and damned cynics plus one Monday Club member (whether of the CP and IS we don't know). Cliff's more fluid style dominated the early play and he pushed home entertaining if weak moves. Johnson began with an injury, his Stalinist past, which hampered his moves and led to his adopting crucified poses whilst Cliff got in with blows to head and body whilst his own footwork kept him out of trouble.

Result:

Cliff (IS Athletic) 10 pts.
Johnson (CP Town) ... 8 pts.

SATISFACTION IS . . .

trousers made to fit. Find satisfaction at

Dean Rogers, 6 Thayer St., London W.1.

Your Local Bookshop

**SIMMONDS
UNIVERSITY
BOOKSELLERS**

16 FLEET STREET, LONDON, E.C.4

JAZZ SCENE by Robert Kidson

The third concert which L.S.E. Jazz Society is putting on in conjunction with the London Jazz Centre Society and the Arts Council is on Thursday, 4th December, and is in memory of Mike Taylor, the brilliant British Jazz pianist and composer who died recently. Very few people seem to know much about Taylor. Like a great many other modern Jazz pianists such as Thelonius Monk, Bill Evans, Phineas Newborn and Lennie Tristano, Taylor was a very introspective and thoughtful musician, a reflection perhaps of his own personality. Much of his material is used by the Cream, Pete Brown, Jack Bruce and other "progressive" pop artists. Anyone waiting to hear his music should listen to his L.P.s "Pendulum" and "Trio" both on English Columbia. Not long before his death, Taylor was awarded an Arts Council grant so that he could spend more time playing and composing in his own highly original way. It is to be regretted that his untimely death robbed British Jazz of the full fruits of that award.

Playing in the concert will be the Dove Gelly Group.

Incidentally, the response by L.S.E. students to the two concerts held so far — the first featuring the Stan Tracey Band and the second, the Mike Pyne Octet and Alan Skidmore Quintet—has been very disappointing. The prices of the tickets are very reasonable—6/- for members of LSEJS and 8/- for other students. These concerts feature the best in British Jazz so please try to make it on 4th December for what promises to be a very memorable occasion.

The death occurred recently of Ted Heath one of the father figures of British Jazz, though many would question his validity as a Jazz musician. However, he should be remembered since it was he who first focused American interest in British Jazz playing concerts at such places as New York's Carnegie Hall. He also started off the careers of many Jazz musicians, notably Don Rendell and Stan Tracey.

One of the more interesting developments on the British Jazz scene is the fusion of Jazz and pop elements. One of the best exponents of this is Jon Hiseman's group, Colosseum, which has just released a fantastic new L.P.—Valentyne Suite. Also Georgie Fame has just recorded a new album which is to be released shortly featuring some of the best British Jazz musicians, including Frank Ricotti, Alan Skidmore, Harry Beckett and Chris Pyre. Skidmore has joined Fame's band.

WHAT REKAYI TANGWENA SAYS:

"My children, I am very glad that you are advancing with your education. It is good to have children because one may die at any time. I may even pass away tomorrow.

Now I will give you a short account of what has been happening to me here. I know not why I am being troubled, but I am struggling for you, my children. My own days are numbered and I am well on my way to my grave. I am much pleased with your progress in education, but you should realize why we are educating you. It is you our children whom we brought up and educated with the little we get from the land who are arresting us for no reason.

My home has been destroyed by a bulldozer and I am living in the forest like an impala. Tomorrow, however, I am going back to rebuild my houses at the same spot. The end of my people will only come if I am given a life sentence. If they put me in prison for one year, or two years or more, on the day I am released I will go back and build other houses at the same place, because that hilly and eroded land is the land that I have inherited. I am not interested in anything else. This is what I want to let you know and you will help me. I am not a politician but claim only my rightful inheritance.

There are two people here (G. Clutton-Brock and D. Mutasa) who are advising me: some say they have been instructing me—but you don't have to teach a grown man how to eat. I have only been seeking advice on the right way to conduct my affairs. They are doing what I have asked them to do, and that is all that they should be accused of.

That is all I want to say my children, and I want to ask that whatever you do, do not suppress your parents, because they have given life to you. I have nothing else to say. Thank you, my children."

After receiving a gift of money collected for him on the campus:

"As I have said, it is good to be among you. If you were all my children, I would have done a very good job. I am pleased for what you have done for me. I don't mind living together with Europeans: I want to live with anybody, but they don't want to live with me. That is all my children. Thank you very much."

A MATTER THAT CONCERNS YOU

Among the suggestions proposed by the D.E.S. to facilitate the necessary expansion of British Higher Education are the following

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a reduction or removal of student grant-aid, coupled with a system of loans; (ii) a similar policy at the postgraduate level only; (iii) a more restrictive policy as regards the admission of overseas students; (iv) the requirement that grant-aided students should enter specified kinds of employment for a period after graduation, which might have the effect of reducing applications; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (v) the greater use of part-time and correspondence courses as alternatives to full-time courses; (vi) the possibility that the most able should have the opportunity to complete a degree course in two years; (vii) the possibility of some students not proceeding to the customary three-year course, but to a different course lasting only two years and leading to a different qualification; (viii) the possible insertion of a period between school and university, which would give school-leavers a better opportunity to formulate their views as to whether or not they | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wished to proceed to some form of higher education; (ix) the more intensive use of buildings and equipment, including the possibility of reorganisation of the academic year; (x) more sharing of facilities between adjacent institutions; (xi) more home-based students; (xii) the development of student housing associations, and other forms of loan-financed provision for student residence; (xiii) some further increase in student/staff ratios. |
|---|--|--|

The full text of a letter sent to the Universities outlining these proposals can be seen at the Union Office.

REKAYI TANGWENA

Rekayi Tangwena and about 260 families, consisting perhaps of 3,000 people, live on remote, rough, hilly land in the Inyanga district beyond the Gaeresi (or 'Samba') river, adjoining the Mocambique border. Tangwena forbears have clearly lived there for many generations, since long before the white man came. The history of the tribe extends back probably over 400 years through the Rozdi and Mutapa empires to the 16th century. These WaBarwe people apparently inhabited an area extending from the Zambezi to the Macheke River.

In 1890 the Pioneer Column entered Rhodesia which was gradually conquered and occupied by the B.S.A. Company. The European immigrants spread eastward, agreeing with or over-running the tribal units. In 1905 a vast area at Inyanga, designated 'Crown Land' on which the remaining nucleus of the Tangwena tribal unit lived, was alienated to a European Company. In 1930 the Land Apportionment Act was passed, declaring it to be 'European Area'. It was thereafter sub-divided into estates and ranches but the remote hills where the Tangwena lived, although bought as part of a large estate by a private owner, were almost inaccessible and remained virtually unused.

From 1930 the process of removing Africans from the 'European Area' went steadily on throughout the country but not until 1964 did it begin to touch the Tangwena. Government then began to face the landowner with the alternative of either evicting the Tangwena or being prosecuted himself for allowing them to live on his land. He issued notices to many to quit but the majority remained. Meanwhile Rekayi was elected Chief by his people but was refused recognition by Government, seemingly because he would not sign a 'labour agreement', although he had no legal or moral obligation to do so.

In 1966 Rekayi received a letter from the landowner giving him one month's notice to leave his home and the land which his forefathers had occupied for many generations. He disregarded the notice and in 1967 he was prosecuted by the Crown in Inyanga Court on the charge that he "being an African did wrongfully and unlawfully occupy land in a European Area". He was found guilty and fined but did not move. Again he was charged, convicted and fined. On each of his eight appearances in court, he, and up to a hundred of his people walked 40 miles across hills and valleys to defend their rights which were under attack. Against his conviction he appealed to the High Court. The judges allowed his appeal, quashed his conviction and set aside his sentence. He was occupying the land lawfully. Section 93 of the Act gave protection to Africans who had been occupying land in the European area before it was alienated by the Crown to a European owner.

The matter could have ended peacefully there, Government, landowner and Tangwena knowing, from the judgement of the High Court, that those who had occupied this land since before 1905, when it was first alienated, had a legal right to do so. Clearly those who designed and passed the Land Apportionment Act were concerned for justice in such cases and made provision for them. Section 93 provided for a reasonable compromise with the traditional land rights of indigenous people.

However, for reasons unknown but which seem to be purely ideological, perhaps because Africans have been living with rights in the 'European Area', the present Government was not prepared to let the Tangwena people remain with their rights. They took the course left open to them under Section 86 of the Land Apportionment Act, which provides that the Governor may make a Proclamation for the removal of Africans from the European Area including those protected under Section 93. This final sanction can be brought to bear only with the signature of the highest authority in the land. The citizen, therefore, has a right to assume that this sanction was intended by the law-makers to be used only in cases of absolute necessity, with the greatest sense of responsibility and after the deepest consideration of all the circumstances. No such absolute necessity is apparent in the Tangwena case.

In February 1969 a "Proclamation by His Excellency, Clifford Walter Dupont, Esquire, Officer Administering the Government . . ." was published in the Gazette. This directed that 36 men of Tsatsi's kraal, including Rekayi, together with their families and property, shall permanently depart from their lands and move to other land, at 'Machena', a small rocky area in the Holdenby Tribal Trust Land.

After this Proclamation, strong pressures were progressively brought to bear on the Tangwena, including the offer to Rekayi that, if he moved, he would be recognised as Chief and provided with a salary and buildings. Rekayi approached his Member of Parliament for an interview with the Minister of Internal Affairs but the Minister refused. Meanwhile his people continued to build their houses and plough their lands for the coming rainy season. By 31st August, the final date named in the Proclamation, none had moved. After a fortnight, the area was declared a 'Protected Area'. Thereafter, no members of the Press nor outside observers were allowed across the Gaeresi river into the area. A picture of what is happening now has to be pieced together from reports of reliable tribesmen who have experienced or witnessed the events. After several days of rumours, officers of the Ministry of Internal Affairs moved in to the area on trucks along the new dirt road just completed for the purpose. The Police stood by to maintain 'law and order'. The District Commissioner and Messengers arrested Rekayi and carried him bodily to a truck and thence fifteen miles away to 'Machena', the rocky place appointed. The women tried to defend the Chief, some stripping their clothing. The majority of people then scattered, but about 160 marched the 20 miles to the District Commissioner's office at Inyanga, where they sat in protest.

Meanwhile at Gaeresi many huts were being bulldozed, and some were burned. Property and foods were removed to 'Machena' and cash savings, hidden in the roofs of huts or under floors, were lost in the debris or the fire. Homes were destroyed or property removed of some whose legal right to live there had not been challenged and who had not been named on the Proclamation. It seems that the authorities could hardly identify the innocent from the 'guilty' so some of both were dealt with alike.

On the following day the 'demonstrators' and others returned to their homes. So also did Rekayi, by foot from 'Machena'. Some complained to the Police of the loss of their property. They were detained at the Police Camp and then taken back to join the others in the area. Many started to rebuild the homes destroyed, including that of the Chief. A fortnight went by. Again the officers of the Ministry and the Police moved in. Again the people scattered through the hills. Rekayi walked across the hills and quietly took the bus to Salisbury, to appeal to Bishops and church leaders to stand by their suffering fellow Christians in the name of Justice and Love, to ask them not to pass by on the other side.

Meanwhile, after Rekayi had left, the people of Tsatsi's kraal, some 120 families, began to be hunted through the hills and valleys by helicopters and police dogs. When caught, the men were photographed, finger-printed, taken by lorry and dumped at 'Machena'. There they were short of food because of damage to their stocks but all helped each other with what they had. The people believe that Government intends them to stay at 'Machena' for 5 months; then be removed to Bende, the Nyagui Forest Area, for 2 years; then be moved to Gokwe, the lowland some hundreds of miles away.

WE ARE ALL

Foreign



SCUM

26th November, 1969.

Editor,
'Beaver',

Dear Sir,

Your article in the last edition of 'Beaver' entitled "The Right & Pryce" contained a number of inaccuracies, as well as certain allegations which I would like to refute.

Your first paragraph describes supposed machinations, the object of which was to undemocratically persuade Union to adopt a certain policy on the new Regulations. The amendment in question was not a Conservative amendment but one proposed by the Secretary of the Drama Society who has no connection with

the Conservatives. I did not in fact support the amendment as it read, because it contained 'recall' provisions which I regard as undemocratic devices. Further, you imply I chaired the meeting in an unfair way. It is true that I was criticised by some left-wingers which might support your proposition. You omit to mention that my handling of that meeting was also criticised by the Right and more important that on the two occasions on which it was proposed that I 'leave the Chair' the majority of students present supported me. Apparently they saw no evidence of bias.

You also mention 'constant caucuses' in my office. Could you tell me who is involved? I'd love to meet them.

Your third paragraph is a masterpiece. It contains

four sentences and nine lies. The facts are quite simple:

On Friday afternoon, November 7th, I found 'Beaver' office open, went in, discovered a complete mess (you can confirm this with the porters and cleaning staff), and asked the Deputy President and Senior Treasurer to help sort out the 'Beavers' into separate editions, and count them, which we did. I had previously asked you to supply me with the necessary information for which we have a right to ask at any time but which, as it happened, we needed in order to answer a question at a Union meeting.

The lies are:

1. The Editor had 3 weeks in which to pay in the

cash from the sales of the first edition. From this edition alone, one could reasonably expect £20-£25. At this time less than £4 had been accounted for and this included sales cash from the second edition handed in by the porters and others.

2. 'Len Harris' and 'Chris Pryce' did not confer.

3. I did not search for 'misappropriated funds' and did not pretend so.

4. I did not break into your office the door was open.

5. Your office was not ransacked; papers etc. were not strewn over the floor.

6. Files were not searched (the filing cupboards are in fact locked—you should know that). We did open a few large drawers to see if there were stores of undistributed 'Beavers'.

7. Your allegation that 'only one Council clique' knew of these events contradicts your further allegation that the Deputy President (who knew) suspected that I was in some way trying to taint him. (Interestingly enough, the D.P. maintains that the first person to suggest this was—surprise, surprise,—yourself). Congratulations, it's good to see an editor who believes in making news. It shows initiative.

8. There was no plot.

9. There were no 'furtive discussions' and no other attempts either to obscure these events.

The next paragraph is complete nonsense. When I finally tracked you down (no mean feat), I asked you questions to discover the information for which we had been asked. There was no interrogation, no offensive

language, and no insinuations. This brings us perhaps to the most objectionable feature of your approach. You are fond of comparing 'Beaver' and its honesty, etc. to the unsavoury practice, of the 'bourgeois press'. In fact, you exhibit some of the most nauseous characteristics of that genre. One good example is the 'ambiguous allegation' technique. Twice in this article you imply that my colleagues or I stole your money, accounts, etc., but in such a way that when challenged (as you were) you could deny that such a charge had been made (as you did). Apparently Horatio Bottomley is alive and well and living in England under the name of Roger Sutton.

It hardly seems worthwhile pursuing further a detailed refutation of your article. May I just say that I can stand being called a liar, an intruder, a coward and a thief without flinching, but the implication that I drink is an insult for which there can be no forgiveness.

Finally, I would like to put on record a few general comments. You have been Editor of 'Beaver' for two terms. During this time 'Beaver' has become the most perfect example of the gutter press with which I am acquainted. Your methods are those of Geobels—the lie, or at best the half truth, infused with an essentially puritanical self-validating morality, incessantly repeated in the hope that strident repetition alone, unqualified by doubt, fairness or fact, can convince others as surely and as irredeemably as it has convinced yourself. No-one cares that you choose to live in a world of fantasy; that you should inflict this fantasy on others is intolerable. It is an insult to the intelligence of your readers.

You indulge in campaigns of spite that know no mitigation. An enemy once conceived, a slur once imagined, is never forgotten. (More than a year after he left office, you refer to an ex-President as 'execrable'—a word most of us reserve for very few of our fellows). Your demands are absolute, and your definition of sin, Draconian. Anyone with the temerity to disagree with you is immediately subject to vicious attack. You even sank so low in one issue to smear, with your usual lack of restraint, the Porters of the School. You claim to have the interests of the working men at heart, but dare let them develop a mind of their own!

In sum, you take £1,200 a year from your fellow students and proceed to use it to promote your own interests to the exclusion of all else, while desperately rigging the true circulation figures to disguise the fact that most of us are wholly alienated and above all bored. Even your feverish attempts to gain the accolade of martyrdom will fail. Your term of office has run its full course. No-one has attempted to interfere with what you laughably term your editorial freedom—it could hardly have been more extensive.

Yours sincerely,

C. J. PRYCE.

President.

Footnote.—This is the full text of the letter to which the Editor appears to refer on the last page. Despite the bewildering display of assertion and counter assertion, the reader can at least judge how fairly the Editor "interpreted" the original letter, if not the matters of substance at issue.

THE POSTER WORKSHOP

61 CAMDEN RD NW 1

- BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE
- NEEDS THE PEOPLE
- FIGHTS FOR THE PEOPLE

YOU'RE THE PEOPLE. USE IT

4'OFF

OFF
ALL
FULL
PRICED
L.P.'S

Brand New, Guaranteed unplayed, and
POST FREE
Latest releases available now!
Send No Money, write for full details:
PLUS ONE RECORD SERVICE (Dept. BVR)
40 Ives Street, Chelsea, London S.W.3.

I SWEAR BY ALMIGHTY GOD

As the mass of students leave the college to turn their thoughts towards turkeys and booze give a little thought for the victims of the Senate House conspiracy. Gillespie, Brayshaw and Hoch face the possibility, the strong possibility of spending Christmas behind bars plus a few more months.

The possibility of conviction has increased with every new police lie. Unfortunately police and university are contradicting themselves in their anxiety to pursue their own varied stubborn aims. Thus the university deny what was stated in open court by Chief Superintendent Forrest about the university informing him that these people would disrupt if released. This was a modification of Forrest's previous statement, denied by all the accused, that they themselves stated their intention of disruption. On that occasion, after seeing how well visa difficulties had weighed against Gillespie, made up that Hoch's visa was out of date and thus he was an illegal alien. Hoch's visa runs for another year.

For Brayshaw the courts found some difficulty but requested to hold his passport. Brayshaw is English.

It must be reassuring to note that when you get a Chief Superintendent to lie, you must be quite important. Usually they leave it to ordinary bobbies and the new phenomenon TDC's or Temporary Detective Constables. And we haven't even got to the trial yet!

EVENIN' ALL

Following the article Pryce and the Right the president has been very perturbed. So much so that he has cross-examined me and several other people trying to deny what we printed. This evidently did not satisfy him as he wrote me a letter enclosing his objections.

This document starts quite intelligibly but towards the end merges into incoherent and illogical attacks on Beaver, or myself, as he seems to see our various contributors as a homogenous unit. As the letter is very long and I am sure most people are little interested in the whole affair I will answer purely his allegations and will round off with some of his more entertaining quotes.

Firstly he states that the amendment we mentioned was not a Conservative one. We stated it was a conservative one, the president seemingly not grasping the subtleties of the English language. He denies he chaired the meeting in an unfair way, supporting this with the fact he was attacked by both Left and Right students and that the majority supported him when so challenged. Could this be because they did not know of the deal with Con-soc?

He denies caucuses in his office and asks me to name those present despite the fact I did so when he interrogated me. I personally can name only those mentioned in the article but various members of council can name others.

Pryce claims that he found Beaver office open (only he knows the truth of that) and discovered it in a complete mess and asked the D.P. and Sen. Treasurer to help sort out back Beavers. We are indeed grateful for this sudden touching concern for the office but wonder why the office was in a greater mess after the assistance than before. Moreover all Beavers were in edition piles. This tidying up is justified by a claim to have asked me previously for information in order to answer a question in Union. It's here everything gets very interesting. First the president had not asked me for such information until after the search. Secondly how did he know a question was going to be asked by the Right as one had not been submitted to him at that stage and that a written question was only produced a week later. Thirdly he asked me to be prepared to answer questions from Harris on the night of the search. How did the president know of Tory policy on his admission three weeks before the relevant union meeting, or as we claim two weeks before.

Pryce then claims we printed nine lies, unfortunately for him we have nine lives.

1. Claims we were tardy in paying in money when he knows full well our Sales Manager was languishing in Brixton Jail and the editor was ill.
2. Says he did not confer with Harris. Apart from one of my staff there are three other witnesses to this.
3. Says he did not search for misappropriated funds whereas this is what he told two members of council, myself and one other non-LSE person.
4. States he did not break into the office but I would claim that whatever the method used to gain entry metaphorically he broke in.
5. States the office was not ransacked but I, plus many others, saw that it was and if the object was to tidy up why were Beavers left all over the floor?
6. Claim files were not searched saying 'filing cupboards are in fact locked — you should know that' exactly but how does he? In addition only five out of 32 are but Pryce calls these drawers which he admits he searched. It's nice to have him telling me what are files and what aren't.
7. Says "your allegation that 'only one council clique' knew of these events contradicts your further allegation that the D.P. (who knew) suspected that I was in some way trying to taint him" adding that I was the first person to suggest this to the D.P. This is simple to answer the D.P. was unaware of the previous caucuses and their plans but was introduced to the scheme at a late date with incorrect information. He regrets having been so involved by Pryce and apologised to me, and I fully understand that the D.P. and Sen. Treasurer were duped into the plot. The D.P. further was the person who informed me of this "tainting".
8. Says there was no plot. You judge.
9. Says there was no furtive discussion. The Social V.P. would beg to differ.

Then Chris, as he is known to his friends, goes on to deny he interrogated me, that there was no offensive language and no insinuations. Apart from the second of these which we never claimed or stated, I as the object of that questioning, and two other witnesses will

ORATION DAY MASSACRE

Our one real chance to confront our Governors en masse the annual Oration became the usual non-communication due to Robbins' refusal to answer questions.

Those who wished to see our much criticised rulers entered the Old Theatre despite some vigorous attempts to prevent them. In evidence were the familiar faces of academic spies busily writing down people's names. This was due to the administrations move of classing the Oration as an academic lecture at a meeting beforehand. Thus having defined their own hazy legality they prepared to deal with these "Red nazis".

Added to Adam's usual cares the speaker was head of the Civil Service and had to be accorded due deference.

Robbins refused point blank to answer a single question about his manifest mal-administration of the School and the whole issue became diverted by the occupation of the stage (necessarily by two non-LSE persons) and Robbins called off the whole farce. His unbending sternness just proved most people's notions of how he looks on the students. However he did put his arm reassuringly around Pryce's shoulder.

Pryce had done his utmost to make the General Assembly that arranged the protest invalid and bullied Union Council into accepting his condemnation of the whole incident. With the right-wingers on Council calling the whole thing "Fascism" and Pryce putting the blame on "outside agitators" the way has been paved for the stringent reaction forecast by many who should know.

Those who organised the event claim that it is absurd to yell about free speech when it is obvious that some people's free speech is maintained by a whole system of education and government whereas even lecturer's can be disciplined for exercising their right of free speech.

With union officers accepting the rules and decisions of the persecutors of the student body the time is coming when we must look closely at who are our friends.

continue to state "Pryce then attempted to cross examine the editor in very offensive tones maintaining various insinuations."

Here Pryce begins to ramble and it is charitable to merely answer the points raised. He accuses us of "ambiguous allegation" stating that the article implied he and "my colleagues" stole money, accounts, etc. How he twists persecution mania to this point I fail to understand. In a paragraph about Beaver staff tidying up we state the bald fact "A key to a money box disappeared" which I regard the President as responsible for. In the last paragraph we stated that these incidents could explain the motives (i.e. political motives) behind a theft last year of a book containing accounts and subscription lists. The important word here is motives.

After all this Pryce says it is not worthwhile pursuing a detailed refutation of your article. He denies he drinks.

Then he just raves about 'gutter press' (which he told me was proven as we called Crouch a more able Pryce) quite nicely calls me puritanical and continues with the jibe made famous by Trevor-Roper comparing me to Goebbels (I wonder how much Goebbels he has read?)

Apparently we indulge in campaigns of spite that "know no mitigation, a slur once imagined is never forgotten" (like searching our office). At points he appears complimentary "Your demands are absolute and your definition of sin, Draconian" it's a pity I don't believe in the concept of sin.

In the end, alongside some raving accusations, he, thank goodness, assures me I will not gain the accolade of martyrdom of which it is helpful to know he sees himself as the arbiter. For those who wish to spend a few happy moments the full oration will be on show for one week only in the Beaver office.

But as the walrus said most interesting of all is not what he denies but that which he doesn't.

Editor.

LETTERS TO ME

"Dear editor,

The Friday before last (21st) in the bar, a few minutes after his last ditch stand in Union, I was joined by an irate President, grasping a copy of Beaver.

"Have you seen these lies?" he blurted.

"We read the article your pointing at," said I.

Pryce proceeded, teeth bared, to go through the article published on your back page that week, denying all of your allegations.

"It's nothing to do with me," said I, "but why don't you reply?"

"I can't be bothered," he said.

"That'll look like an admission of guilt," said I.

He then proceeded to go around the bar claiming that I had said your article was untrue.

I would like, therefore, to take this opportunity to deny I ever agreed with Pryce's counter accusations, and to inform you that I have further evidence of his co-operation with Con-Soc should you deem it necessary to pursue this creep.

Yours,

R. BEBB.