

BEAVER

BRITISH LIBRARY OF POLITICAL
& ECONOMIC SCIENCE

N58

18 JUN 1990

NEWSPAPER OF THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS STUDENTS' UNION

No. 113 NOVEMBER 25th, 1971

MA THATCHER AND YOU

Attack on Student Unions

THE long-standing concern of the Conservative Government over the status of students has resulted in a consultative paper. Released on November 2nd, it brought immediate condemnation from all sections of the student community.

The D.E.S. document rejected voluntary membership and the establishment of a Registrar of Students' Unions in favour of a new system of financing, which is, in effect, an unashamedly political proposal designed to smash any power which Unions as they now exist might possess.

The D.E.S. sees several major defects in the present system of financing, in which each Union is given a capitation fee by the LEA, which awards a maintenance grant to the individual student.

CONTROL

The present arrangement is said to be deficient in that the level of subscription to each Union is not controlled by the Government, the LEA or the University Grants Committee, and also in that University authorities, as such, are unwilling to exercise much control over Student Union expenditure since it is not their money which is being spent.

The DES has also strongly objected to SU donations to outside political causes, which it feels would be more appropriately made by individual voluntary subscriptions (the argument being the traditional Tory line of opposition to almost all forms of corporate action while retaining the so-called 'freedom' of the individual to act as he sees fit).

UNCONVINCING

These alleged defects of the existing system of financing are not entirely convincing—public control over Unions is already exercised through the university constitution, the UGMs, and the legal system (injunctions can be brought against individual union officers). Public control is also ensured by the requirement that SU accounts should be audited annually by a Chartered Accountant.

Ultra vires payments by SUs last year amounted to less than £100 out of a total annual budget of almost £3 millions. The entire issue is something which has been built up by the press even though the problem is essentially non-existent—most political donations can be given under the guise of paying for a speaker (outright payment

violates the legal status of SUs as educational charities).

VICE-CHANCELLORS

It is important to notice, then, that the proposals are designed not to enforce public control but **political** control over the SUs—even the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals have stated that the present position is entirely satisfactory and that they do not see any reason for change. Even they are suspicious of the obvious intention of the DES to bash Unions in order to make political capital out of a situation widely misunderstood by the public as a whole.

The proposals which establish a new basis of financing are as follows:

PROPOSALS

1.—A clause enabling students to opt out of Union membership on 'conscience' grounds (though they would still be able to make full use of all facilities)—this is clearly an attempt to undermine the obvious representative nature of SUs.

2.—No Union subscription would be included in the fees payable by LEAs and individuals.

3.—All money given to Unions to come from university general fund and to be set against other claims on the University's resources.

4.—Union societies to be financed by a voluntary subscription rather than by Union as a whole (maintenance grants to be raised by "a modest amount"). This would perhaps, inevitably mean that many small societies depending upon a subsidy at present will fold if the proposals are implemented. At present there is a collective fund from which each society is allocated money in accordance with its needs. This clause denies the principle that SUs are corporate bodies, which decide upon the needs of students in a collective manner—it destroys their role as communities.

5.—The Comptroller and the Auditor-General will have to be satisfied that both the Constitution and the expenditure are "proper," i.e. a greater degree of control will be exercised by authorities external to the given college or university.



The proposals seen as a whole are a reasonably obvious attempt to destroy the role of Students' Unions as collective bodies fighting for the needs of their members, i.e. as political centres of student opinion.

LSE

The impact of the proposals upon the LSE Union as constituted at present would be minimal in many respects since the School already controls us in all financial matters as part of their role as official Custodian Trustees.

The School negotiates with the LEAs in order to establish the per capita grant for each student — there is much evidence that this amount is far less than that paid by LEAs to other universities. The School then pays only a fraction of this amount to Union, returning the rest in payment for all facilities used — rent, porters, heating, lighting, etc.

The Union has no real bargaining power in this situation, the amount is allocated per student and is determined by the School. Thus it would seem that no tighter control of Union finance is in any sense possible, as it is all cheques must be counter-signed by the School authorities before they are paid out (thus in fact preventing us making payments to any outside body of which the School does not approve even when such a payment has been authorised by Union).

BARSHAM

This financial control is also translated into a great deal of control over the internal affairs of Union: last year Mr. Barsham (appointed Honorary Treasurer by the School) made a regulation which stipulated, contrary to Union policy, that people working in the Bar and

15,000 Students marched against the Tory proposals on Student Unions last Wednesday. They came from colleges all over London and there were strong contingents from some provincial Universities. The mood was militant, and it looks as if the students are ready for a confrontation.

the Shop should have no say in their running.

Clearly political independence is a meaningless slogan unless complete financial autonomy is also gained.

It is difficult to know what tactics can be used to this end because the problem is essentially a legal one, the battle must be fought on a national level. As well as uniting to defeat the new Tory proposals, the NUS must call on students to fight for the complete financial and political autonomy of all Students' Unions to enable them to function as corporate bodies in a manner determined by their own membership.

ELECTIONS: WHAT DO THEY MEAN?

THE recent elections resulted in a landslide victory for the Socialist Society slate of candidates and, for the first time in LSE history, SocSoc fills the main posts of Union.

The Socialist Union Council stood and were elected on a platform to support and further the new constitution and to resign en bloc in the first week of next term.

EXPECTATION

A radical enough platform, you would say, but some students are still expecting—and even hoping—that Union Council will behave in the time-honoured fashion of all past

OTHER colleges are already preparing action against the Tory proposals.

The N.U.S. have discussed it (at their Margate meeting last Saturday), and copies of the consultative document for your perusal are available from Soc. Soc. or Union Office.

If you want a strong union, a union able to act against the Tory proposals, then you must participate yourself in building that union, contributing to the debates, and letting your feelings be known.

Union Councils—to attempt to control and manipulate Union.

FUTURE

People ask Council members what will happen next week, next month, next year, and expect to be given blueprints. When they are told "It depends on Union," they are either incredulous or impatient.

SocSoc did not fight the elections so that they could control Union, however. They fought them so that you could control Union.

INSIDE

Page 2 Comment, Letters.
Page 3 Food you eat.
Page 4 Armageddon, Review
Page 5 Women's Grants.
Page 6 Passfield Again.
Page 7 Calendar, A.U.
Page 8 News.

COMMENT

UNION COUNCIL

IN the wake of the landslide election of SocSoc candidates, an inevitable anti-climax has set in, particularly among those on the left.

It has never been any part of left politics in L.S.E. to attempt to control Union through the ballot-box. It has always been felt that the offices of Union were bureaucratic and that socialists would become bureaucratic if they occupied them. It is quite difficult to maintain the purity of one's ideals amid the welter of pettifogging details calculated to delight only the aspiring careerist.

Nevertheless, SocSoc won a great election victory on the solemn promise to further the new constitution in office and to resign en bloc in the first week of the spring term. There is no doubt that they will keep their promise, the only doubt is as to whether they can stick it out long enough.

The socialist Council is proving to itself every day the petty and annoying nature of these administrative offices. That they are necessary for the smooth running of Union business is not disputed. But why must administrative functions be filled by politicians and political offices be filled by administrators?

Under the now superseded constitution we, the electorate, are forced to choose between people we can trust to carry out the political decisions of Union and who in all probability are appalling administrators, and those who we know will run an efficient office but who we wouldn't trust as far as we could throw them.

This is the reason why the new constitution incorporates a division between political and administrative functions. We can choose those whose politics we trust to occupy the former and those whose administrative abilities we favour to occupy the latter. This is not an ideal situation, but pending better suggestions it is the one that has been accepted.

But this still leaves us with a political Council faced with administrative duties. There is no doubt that their presence there is necessary to effect the changes desired, and we must bear with them for a few more weeks.

THE FUTURE

Patience is hard to counsel, particularly when so many people are expecting action and seemingly prepared to face it. Many of us feel that action at this stage would be premature and that events should be given time to catch up with us. All too often the left in L.S.E. have gone off half-cocked into an issue and have invited defeat. Only a well-considered and well-constructed

campaign stands any chance of success.

The issue of Student Union independence, however, is not confined to L.S.E. We are fighting to get independence for our Union, but all S.U.s will have to join the fight to maintain theirs.

The D.E.S. proposals attempt to reduce all S.U.s to the servile position we presently occupy, and there is no doubt that the Tory Government are serious about adopting these proposals. So our struggle for independence must be waged not only against the School's administration, but also against the Tory Government.

But we will not be alone in this struggle. Already links are being forged between local trades councils and Student Unions, Workers and students realise that now, more than ever before, they have common enemies and that the only way to defeat them is together.

M.W.

FREEDOM

FREEDOM is a much maligned word these days. The slightest involvement in the most insignificant form of political activity seems to give a person the right to bandy the word left, right and centre, and preferably straight into the well-conditioned ear, heart, brain and soul of the nearest voter.

The more subtle sub-species of the political breed will never refer to freedom directly but make a show of taking it for granted as the obvious Keystone of the nation, the Principle of Principles, the sine qua non, nay, the Be-all and End-all of civilisation. And, incidentally, the foundation of his electoral platform.

"Vote for me, and I'll set you free!" Yet somehow the glaring contradiction expressed in this phrase is so obvious that nobody sees it. Not only does no-one see it but everybody has been so well conditioned by the billion and one half-truths our consciousness has been sculpted with since childhood that the brain can only churn turpidly, choke, and cough up, computer-like, the inevitable equation that inevitably results from the data we have been exclusively fed with since birth.

That old principle of cybernetics, "garbage in, garbage out", holds true for the human brain as well, until for us FREEDOM equals PEOPLE equals VOTE equals REPRESENTATION equals MP equals PARLIAMENT equals GOVERNMENT etc., etc., etc., ad nauseam.

"Freedom": Joseph Stalin, Joseph McCarthy, Mao Tse Tung, Richard Nixon, Ernesto Che Guevara, HRH King Hussein.

The principle sounds valid from any one of these con-men.

But where is your freedom.

Joseph Djougatchvili, and yours. Joe McCarthy? Is it economic or political? Or are you playing God that you can split, with one stroke of a razor-edged ideology a concept that, uncertain and hazy as it is, is also the only guarantee that you or anyone else, as more or less conscious animals, have of safeguarding the dignity this very consciousness gives us.

Take a look back on the foundations you built your "freedom" on, on the revolutions which made them possible, and see what kind of freedom those revolutions sprang from.

Those revolutions were a liberation from an old tyranny, but they were not made possible by an intellectual split-hair, an ideological "freedom-but".

They were made possible by a sum of conscious individuals who looked at the tyranny, saw it for what it was—(economic, political or social tyranny)—and decided to change it.

This was freedom because this was a number of conscious individuals deciding to run their own lives as they wanted. This was freedom because the power did not govern the people but the people governed the power.

Of course, the people were too "dull" and "unconcerned" to want to, or even "be able to", govern themselves once they had shaken off the tyranny.

So tyranny came back through the back door because it had been smart enough to first convince its victims that they were too "dull" and unconcerned to want to, or even "be able" to govern themselves once tyranny had gone.

But people have learned since then, people are still learning no matter what the educational system, and maybe one day people will learn that, just as they themselves are the only source of their own happiness, they themselves are the only possible source of the power which controls their lives.

With a Tory Government in Westminster, with Margaret Thatcher as Minister of Education and Science, with Walter Adams and Lord Robbins at LSE, all doing their best to appropriate what little freedom we, as students, have left, in an institution which exists almost exclusively by and for us, this is a concept well worth remembering.

P.B.

MISSION IMPOSSIBLE

YOUR mission, Mr. X, should you decide to accept it, will be to

write an essay on the retrogressive elasticity of the intra-coronary factors of organic supply and demand, and the first photograph you have is of the totally inaccessible book called "Retrogressive Elasticity" by Irving Williams. This is the main book on the subject. The second was taken by one of our best operatives, who disappeared mysteriously near the East building last April.

It is of a book called "Intra-Coronary Factors in the Modern World," by N. U. Terdson—it has been missing for a year. "Organic Supply and Demand," by Lord Bustroke, has not been seen in the Main or Teaching libraries for a decade. "Elasticity in Organic Supply and Demand," by B. Bottlefly was recorded in the 14th volume of library acquisitions, 1938, as having been acquired by the library, and has not been seen since, if it was even seen then.

The last, and perhaps most interesting, photograph is another posthumous publication by one of our secret agents, of an Unidentified Graduate Student and an Unidentified Faculty Member drinking sherry in the Senior Common Room. Notice the three-foot high stack of books they have put the Bristol Cream Bottle on. Notice the ambitious young undergraduate under the table trying to ease the bottom book out without spilling the Bristol Cream.

We suspect these three men have absconded with the above-mentioned books and are holding them for their own private profit with the connivance of everybody who is in a position to redress an injustice which is seriously inconveniencing the undergraduate majority of this institution.

Your Mission, Mr. X, should you decide to accept it, would be to haunt the Main and Teaching libraries between the hours of 9.30 and 18.15, with the sole purpose of finding these books and writing your essay.

When you have finally realised that the books are not there and are unlikely to return this year, go and write your essay with whatever garbage you can fish out of your head. This should be more than enough to fill eight sides and will give you at least as good a result if no matter what you say, it is well structured.

As usual, should you or any other member of your class be caught while trying to obtain one of these books, the Government Dept. will disavow any knowledge of your action.

Good luck, sucker.
This article will self-destruct in 15 seconds.

G.F.

BEAVER POLICY

IT was pointed out by several students that the last issue of "Beaver" contained some contradictory articles. For example, an article on Page Nine called for a more co-operative attitude to Lord Robbins, while an article on the back page urged students to disrupt his public appearances.

It is the policy of the editors of "Beaver" to accept any provocative articles that are contributed, and this necessarily results in the publication of conflicting opinions. We feel that this helps to "balance" the paper and give it wider appeal.

If readers disagree with this aim, or have other ideas about policy, they are urged to attend policy meetings at 1 p.m. every Tuesday in "Beaver" Office (S.116), where they can make their views heard.

A students' newspaper like "Beaver" is very reliant on its contributors, and the Editors have no intention of writing everything themselves. So any contributions you may have, written or otherwise, will be gratefully received.

Beaver meetings are held weekly, Tuesdays at 1 p.m. in the Beaver office (1st floor St. Clements, next to Union offices). Everybody interested in helping out is welcome.

Director speaks

THE recent elections received fairly wide coverage in the Press. The "Sunday Telegraph" even included the following statement from Walter Adams, Bart.:

"I don't mind what democratic systems they adopt. That is up to them. But we are administering public funds and we must be accountable for those funds."

We are very grateful to Sir Walter for not minding our democratic aberrations. However, I would like to point out to him that he is not in fact administering public funds, or any funds, in our direction anyway. No doubt he and the Governors are far more au fait with public opinion than we are, and we completely agree with him that he must be accountable for the funds. So why isn't he?

After having tried several times to elicit some comment from the Director concerning the new constitution, and failing miserably, I was full of admiration for the "Sunday Telegraph" reporter who seemed to have no trouble at all.

Of course, I don't really believe that Sir Walter is more ready to talk to "Telegraph" reporters than he is to talk to "Beaver" reporters, but, just in case, the next time I call, I will say I'm from "The Times."

Peter Bohny.

H.E.

HOW YOU CAN HELP

YOUNG EDNAS

Did you see/read about Edna? Jeremy Sandford wrote the play at the request of Christian Action.

Can you come to 59 Greek Street one evening a week? A new Christian Action Shelter for the Homeless is being launched this month to offer friendship, information, and other help via the medium of a coffee bar. No previous counselling experience is needed for this, but all helpers will be well briefed before we start.

If you are interested, contact me (Simon Edlin) via pigeon-hole or phone Graham Dowell at 637 1975.

S.E.

LETTERS

DEAR EDITORS.—At the end of my account of our meeting with Lord Robbins ("The Lion at Bay") you insert two paragraphs over my signature which were not in the original script. I take this up not to protect a literary masterpiece(!) and not just to assert an important principle—that sub-editors should not add to nor subtract from signed articles without the author's permission.

The real point is: if you are to present anything like full coverage of L.S.E. opinion and activities, your correspondents will need assurance that their contributions are not distorted. I know you do want to present a comprehensive picture, and that it's not your intention to go in for ideological censorship in the guise of "subbing." But I fear that unless the principle is maintained "Beaver" will become duller and more predictable in its ideological stance.

GRAHAM DOWELL.

The job of a sub-editor is not, as we know it, to chop articles to pieces or misrepresent what contributors want to say. In Mr.

Dowell's case, it was a printer's error which led to the mistake, for which the editors duly apologise.

However, allowances should be made, as an enormous effort is required to produce the paper at all. EDS.

DEAR EDITORS.—I was interested to read the short report on Union's censure of the D.P. in your last issue (incidentally, though there was indeed a large vote of abstention, the majority in favour of the motion was much larger).

However, I am rather mystified by your comment that "since Trevor Jones is only acting Deputy President he cannot be expected to resign." The current status of a Union officer surely is irrelevant when his resignation is demanded by Union.

In any case, you may remember that Mr. Jones's primary campaign promise, repeated ad nauseam at hustings, was that he would immediately resign in the face of just such a censure motion. In fact, he made rather a point of insisting on it.

John Stathatos.

DEAR EDITORS.—Why is it that there is no reading room which makes the most important English and foreign newspapers available at the L.S.E. (e.g. "Le Monde," "Pravda," "New York Times," "Paris Match," to name but a few)?

Many students would undoubtedly appreciate the opportunity to read foreign views on a wide number of topics which are covered in these publications.

It seems strange, that in a university where a third of the students are foreigners, there is no such provision—particularly as such a provision is a commonly accepted facility at most universities.

Peter Bohny.

WE WORKED ON THIS ISSUE OF "BEAVER"

Shelley Adams, G. Dowell, P. Duggan, George Foy, M. Ganther, Rosie Hurst, Andy Jackson, Louise Jacob, Rodwell Jones, Keith Jinks, Martin Kersh, Stuart Madden, John Mair, Bob Mellors, Mike Ellis, Ono Osakwe, Imogen Pennell, Soc. Admin. Co-op, J. Sydnor, Maggie Wellings, Robin Widdison, Doris Wilde, Jonathan Wilde. JOIN US!

IT'S A WOMAN'S LIFE IN THE UNIVERSITY

Oh lucky Mrs. Jones,
Your children have no clothes
And your husband is calling for
his dinner,

The taxman's, your door
And you're ing to read for
law

While you purse is getting
thin and thinner.

MARRIED women's grants have, unlike those of other students, not been increased since 1965, because this minority group is considered "privileged."

There is a basic grant for all married women of £275. The majority of married women students are "mature", i.e., over 25 and/or have worked for three years before starting the course. Many have been earning, say, £80 per month, and are reduced to an income of little over £90 per term.

These women have to become almost entirely dependent on their husbands and accept a dramatic drop in standard of living, or have had to use hard-earned savings in order to retain a reasonable standard.

Many mature students have children to support, having to pay perhaps £1 per day for

child care, but receive no contribution towards support of dependants as in the case of a male married students.

ANOMALY

If a woman marries during her course, her grant is immediately reduced to £275. However, if she was previously dependent on her father, he is still expected to pay the same parental contribution as before, and continues to be assessed as before.

So presumably, in the case of a rich father paying the maximum contribution of £380 (£430-50), the student would receive a maintenance grant of £275-£380, i.e., a bill for £105.

No reference whatsoever is made to the husband's income, except that in the case of the husband being a full-time student there is a possibility of receiving £380 or even £420. Do the grant authorities realise that they are encouraging students to live together without getting married, while on the other hand encouraging couples who are married to live apart?

If the wife lives not with her husband but with her parents, she receives £305, and if she

lives "elsewhere" she is even eligible for a full grant.

A small point, but one very relevant to students in London, is that there is no London allowance, which means that the effective value of the grant is cut by a further 6½ per cent.

A concrete example: one student, who has been married for almost two years, receives a maintenance grant of £39 per year, i.e., less than one month's rent. If the grant authorities insist that she is still dependent on her father, why don't they just leave it at that? As it is, they both have their cake and eat it by reducing her grant (because she now has a husband "to look after her") while still expecting contributions from her parents.

A further, and for some the most cutting, indignity, is the fact that a male student can marry during his course or be married when he starts the course, without receiving any cut in his grant.

In fact he can claim more allowance for his dependants. The sooner this petty example of sexual discrimination is done away with, the better.



"Mmm . . . It's delicious."

This is a prime example of women used as sex-objects in capitalism. Of course, the original advertisement was not quite as crude, but the intention was clear. (See back page—Women's Lib.).

WHITE SEXISM IN THE IVORY TOWER

WALTER ADAMS, well-known liberal racist and former principal of University College Rhodesia, has indicated slight approval of the aims of the Gay Liberation Front.

He has suggested that the GLF works quietly; contacting the "right" people — such as broadminded people in the Home Office, or Sir John Waldron, Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police. But what Adams says and what he does are two different things.

FIGHT

Last year LSE was the birthplace of the London Gay Liberation Front. GLF fights the oppression of homosexual women and men in all its forms and hopes to achieve a self-liberation from feelings of guilt and shame.

At the first meeting there were 19 people, then, as word got around, numbers increased to 30, 60, 100, then to 300, when packed meetings were held every Wednesday night in the New Theatre.

Union showed its support with a massive vote in a Union meeting where only three people and a nun voted against.

A lesbian ran for President and got 167 out of 654 votes on the 12th count.

CRUMBLING

This was a fine thing: a liberation movement in a School founded by Fabian Socialism. Many people who are not members of the LSE were drawn into the College.

The Ivory Tower was crumbling a little and establishing ties with homosexual men and women within and without the School.

But all this was too much for Adams who is more concerned with having a quiet docile School than with the oppression of homosexual people. More concerned with sacking socialist lecturers than with encouraging

links between the college and the community.

He struck during the Easter vacation when there were few students around to make a fuss. Within 24 hours' notice the Bursar told the GLF that the bookings they had made for meetings during the vacation were to be cancelled since the Director had not signed their constitution so they were not a recognised society.

A compromise was worked out to overcome the problem of short notice, but within two weeks the sisters and brothers were out on their ears. The Director has absolute control over Union societies and the use of all rooms except the three Union rooms.

We hear that Adams has considered raising the matter of the expulsion at the General Purposes Committee of the School. He did not in the event do this, but had he done so he would very likely have found himself outvoted by homosexual and/or liberal academics.

Not that this would have made any difference since the Director at L.S.E. is vested with almost dictatorial powers and is obliged to take the advice of almost no one.

Having thrown out the harlots and pimps from the temple courtyards, and on the understanding that they wouldn't return, Adams promised to sign the constitution. He agreed that Union societies were allowed to have occasional meetings open to the public.

In May the G.L.F. decide to hold a "think-in" where gay people would get together in small groups and think about the organisation of G.L.F. and its political campaign.

A convenient and comfortable place to hold small discussions would be L.S.E. But the booking was held up. Once again they were told they were not a recognised society. Adams was cornered in the Connaught House lift and agreed that the meeting came within the terms of what he said he would allow. He let it go ahead and again said that he would sign the constitution.

It was not until this September

Justice miscarried

ON Thursday, October 28th, two girls sat on the roof of H.M. Prison, Holloway, as a protest against conditions within the Prison Hospital. The main complaint of one of them, Glaswegian Susan McGowan, aged 20, on remand on a charge of theft, was that the Prison Medical Service had been responsible for her losing a 2½-month pregnancy.

As a price for ending her protest she demanded civilian hospitalisation. A promise to this effect was given by the prison governor, Mrs. D. M. Wing. On Monday, November 1st she was duly hospitalised in a civilian hospital, Henderson Hospital, at Sutton, a MENTAL INSTITUTION.

"Beaver" attempted to find out the reason for mental hospitalisation for a medical complaint. The Home Office said that they would "Look into the matter and ring you back."

They said this at 1 p.m., 1.30 p.m., 2 p.m., 3.30 p.m. and 4 p.m. At the time of writing the Home Office have not even admitted that the girl is in Henderson. Fortunately, the Administration Director at Henderson was a little more forthcoming, and admitted the admission of Susan McGowan to the hospital.

CARTER.

that he said for the third time that he would sign the constitution, but with one amendment. The amendment would make it clear that the the Gay Liberation Front as a Union society would be concerned only with the interests of homosexuals students at L.S.E.

G.L.F. had no choice but to give in. His female lackey noted down the agreement in impeccable shorthand.

This is a salutary lesson in how a sexist, racist, "liberal" protector of academic conservatism plays his game.

It shows the power the Director has over the activities of the Union, and the importance the authorities place on keeping universities isolated from nearly all the people.

Doris & Jonathon Wilde

TOTAL AMORALITY

EVEN in this so-called "permissive" society we still seem to be having the same old boring discussions about morality. Nobody seems to be quite sure what morality is, but from time to time large numbers of people seem to get very excited about it, recent examples are the Festival of Light, charade and the "Oz" trial.

Out of those interminable discussions morality comes out as a rather vague and woolly concept; it is very difficult to give an example of moral behaviour; conversely there are endless examples of immoral behaviour; it is immoral to kill, to steal, to lie, to be selfish, to sleep around. Does this indicate that the notion of morality is basically negative?

But "what would we do without morality?" scream the reactionaries, the Jesus Freaks, and the millions who aspire to attain material and emotional security. Isn't a lack of morality what makes people lazy, destructive, mixed-up and unhappy?

Don't we need to control the desires of the individual by giving him an infallible "conscience," which can place a religious or moral restriction on his actions, because his natural inclinations lead only to the destruction of himself and others?

And what about all those young people who work hard, pass their exams and settle down into secure jobs and quiet domesticity, aren't they happier when they are adjusted to conventional society and morality than those who refuse to conform, and are either punished or pitied by the majority?

ATTACK

This point of view can be attacked from two different directions. One is that in practice, it is very difficult to persuade a large number of people to accept a given moral code for

any length of time, under a system deviants will arise, who threaten the established order, and whom we designate criminals, heretics, lunatics, or revolutionaries, requiring rehabilitation.

Another objection to educating people in some system or code of morality is that it tends to destroy genuine creativity and initiative; it blocks natural curiosity because it says it is wrong to do or even think about certain things; when faced with this block the mind can either revolt against the moral system which constrains it, sink into apathy, or blame and destroy itself.

ALTERNATIVE

The fact that we are slowly gaining more and more knowledge about the world and about ourselves also makes us question the need for moral restrictions — should we do what we like and what makes us happy, and take the consequences of our actions, or should we be constrained by some precept based on God or some vague metaphysical entity which, conveniently, it is impossible to understand or prove the existence of?

Is it better to rely on blind faith or past experience; have we really any basis to believe that people's natural desires and needs are so destructive that they must be rigidly controlled, and has anyone or anything the right to impose restrictions on man's behaviour for his own good?

Perhaps there is no solution to the problem of insecurity in seeking some infallible set of principles which can tell us what to do, to pass judgement on us and reassure us, the only way to cope with life is to assume that what we are and what we want is good unless proved otherwise by our experience.

Carr-Saunders Hall of Residence Fitzroy Street London W1 Telephone 01-580-6338/9

THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE

Your reference:

Our reference:

Date: 22 September 1967

The Housing Officer,
The London School of Economics,
Students' Union,
Houghton Street,
Aldwych,
London W.C.2.

Dear Miller,

When we met towards the end of last term I promised to let you know should any vacancies occur in the Hall shortly before the beginning of the Michaelmas Term. It turns out that we now have two vacancies in double rooms and I would be grateful if you would refer to me students in need of accommodation. I would prefer First-Year students.

There is one further proviso: as you may know, the anonymous donor stipulated a quota for non-British students, and this quota is now full. I therefore have no alternative but to ask you to refer to only British students. I am sorry to have to write in these terms but you will understand that I have no option in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Kurt Klappholz
K. Klappholz
Warden.

This was unearthed from Union office files when the newly-elected got to work. They are sure that they will turn up other "specimens" for your delight.

PRIME MINISTER FACING BOTH WAYS

(Continued from Page Four)

sufficient detail, i.e. the South African arms deal question.

The boy who made good from Huddersfield is "right" on nearly everything except on a few trivial incidents. His ability to hedge on nearly everything remains unequalled.

If Harold Wilson backs horses, I bet it is each way.

As a politician Wilson is best at

handling details, and one suspects that it was things like the "Torrey Canyon" affair that he most enjoyed, with its melodrama and lack of doctrinal overtones.

As a Prime Minister, Wilson was too lenient; deadwood and incompetence remained far too long. How did Arthur Bottomley and George Brown ever remain so long in the Cabinet? Perhaps the reason that the Labour Party lost in 1970 was the popular feeling that if they wanted a conservative government, the Conservatives would do it marginally better.

JOHN KIRKALDY

SOFTLY, SOFTLY

(Continued from Page Four)

banging through me and he's still smiling and my foot's in his mouth and there's red over his nice white teeth. . . ."

Despite the froth about sex, drugs, and the generation gap, the important themes of the book are class jealousy (not hatred), the dominance of the male, and self-release through violence.

Richard does not want to modernise because he wants to help a lot of people because his own vacant life bothers him.

ANDREW ADAMS

Classified Ads

RENT

Would anyone like to rent my attic bedroom during the Xmas vacation? £4 p.w. all inclusive. House is shared by four other girls. 20 minutes from L.S.E.—Contact S. Bruley—U.G. pigeon-holes.

MINI

MINI COOPER 1275cc., 1966. Brown smoked windows, radio, airhorns, fat wheels, lowered suspension, oil cooler, rebuilt gearbox; £410 or try offer, but limited sense of humour in these matters.—Ring 722 1795—Chris Keen. Also flatmate's MINI COUNTRYMAN, 1964, 1½ owners, undersealed from new, £200.

ROCK

TREEBEARD, L.S.E.'s very own jazz-rock band, are looking for bookings. We would like to hear from anybody (via S.118) with any contacts for work—and if you would like to hear from us, we play at University College Bar on Fridays (free).

TAPE

FOR SALE—PHILLIPS CASSETTE TAPE RECORDER, plus sensitive microphone. ALMOST NEW: THOROUGHLY SERVICED IN OCTOBER. Brand new £24.50, price £14.50 o.n.o.—Taff—

PASSFIELD:

FOLLOWING Thursday's meeting, which passed the motion to make the house assembly of workers, staff and students the sole decision-making body, the whole issue passed upstairs to the ((unreformed) Hall Committee.

The school is worried to the point that Wally himself and Pike (Financial secretary) made it their business to attend (Wally departed after the lunch party for senior staff and selected house-trained students).

DEMOCRACY

The committee's task was to simultaneously reassure moderate students that liberal democracy really works, whilst defusing the immediate situation by passing off the main demands on to the bureaucratic grinding machine, known as the school authorities.

Further reaction on the main demands cannot, therefore be expected until at least December 16th, when the standing committee of the court of governors next meets. This means that returning students are unlikely to be informed of the position until the first House Meeting.

If all students withhold their hall fees, at least until the situa-

La Lutte continue

tion becomes clear, it might prove useful. Ultimately students have the economic power. Whether or not they have the will to use it is something else.

A minor demand, the abolition of staff's high table privilege, was neatly skipped. Tacitly acknowledging the success of the spontaneous direct action by students occupying the table at meal times, the committee conceded its use at peak times. They still regard the privilege as existing, and therefore justified, but it won't be as blatant.

Not to be outdone by the committee, on which the warden repeatedly had to shut him up, the sub-warden, Bridge, did a neat somersault and denied his intention of expelling some students. It was, of course, a filthy rumour and not even within his power to do. But then has that fact often stopped him before?

Finally, a comment from Miss Baron, devoted housekeeper, and famed for her ready good humour:

"I'll not eat with those pigs," she wisecracked after Friday's hall meeting.

*Predictably, the only objection to including workers came from a member of the National Labour Party.

DEPARTMENT NEWS

Social Admin. Dept.

THE Soc. Admin. Department seems quiet again this year. The selection procedure appears to have done its job well and saved the friendly Fabians of the east building from any confrontation with radical thought.

Or has it?

Down in the social work courses something stirred; Bert, a champion of the oppressed, arrived, and was very quickly forced to leave again. The staff, steeped in Freudian casework theory, believe social work should help poor people become content with the shitty system they live in—Bert thought they should control the system, but as the social work lecturers controlled the system Bert lived in, he just had to go . . .

Social work is basically a societal control mechanism; but social work is a sub-system in itself with its own admission regulatory procedures to ensure conformity.

The Soc. Admin. Dept. perpetuates this conformity, firstly by employing as staff only those social workers whose ideas have shown no detectable change since the day Freud died and, secondly, by seeing people as "clients" and "cases" (i.e. objects) rather than fellow products of the capitalist system. Note: social work is the fastest growing profession—whatever happened to the trade union movement?

The size of the Soc. Admin. Department is a function to capitalism's growing need for

social controllers. Controllers have to be pressed; the Social Work diploma and M.Sc. courses supply the appropriate social workers (those of like Bert), the Branch III Sociology degree supplies the administrators and the self-perpetuating academics, while the two a year Soc. Admin. diploma ("No formal entry qualifications required") provides the liberal facade. Most of the staff are employed directly in research to make the state machine operate more smoothly, for instance—Professor Abel Smith, one time social service adviser to the Labour Government, is now a member of the Tory-appointed Fisher committee to investigate the use of social security . . . Dr. Tessa Black, recently employed on Weekend Television, had a reaction to "Sesame Street" sub-titled "The child's guide to competition, achievement-orientation and door-opening."

Professor of social administration and founding father of the Welfare State, Richard Titmuss started life as a bus conductor in Worthing—Bert was a bus conductor, too, when do you think he will be appointed professor?

The Soc. Admin. Co-op

Geography Department

A RECENT survey undertaken by the British Board of Boredom Research, showed a marked concentration on the fourth and fifth floors of the St. Clement's Building, reaching a maximum in the vicinity of the Rodwell Jones Room.

Any signs of early-term dedication have now been dispersed following a series of lectures on topics of unparalleled mediocrity.

The Research Board dis-

covered in the course of its analysis the following causes:

1. Unnecessary duplication of topics within courses.
2. The insistence that a regional topic must be endured.
3. The inclusion in lectures of trivial details.

A method to eliminate the above would be to institute more problems—orientated courses, with more time devoted to discussion . . .

... we are open to ideas!
Rodwell Jones.



Passfield administrators: out of what century?

THE ATHLETIC UNION PAGE

FEELING THE PINCH

THE Athletic Union grant has now been increased to £4,750. We hope that this will be available some time next term after the Director has seen the accounts for last session.

In an executive meeting on November 11th, a motion calling for decreased subsidisation by the Athletic Union for membership fees, entrance fees, and insurance was rejected.

If this had been passed it would have meant that clubs with high initial costs for insurance etc., would have had to make some contribution themselves, leading to a saving of about £200 to the Union.

The implication of the rejection is that all clubs which now contribute something, namely the Gliding Club, must in future have a 100 per cent subsidy from the Union. This increases our deficit by £100 and as a result we must reduce all club budgets by about 10 per cent.

Necrophilia and bestiality at Oxford

SATURDAY, November 6th will live long in the annals of the Soccer Club. A motley crew of 11 hardy lads and one lass took on the might of Oxford's soccer best. We won by seven magnificent thunderbolted goals to one blatantly offside goal.

Gzech political escapee Pete Chobididous broke the net twice, and our Norwegian goalkeeper, Marius Hange, kept goal so bravely that he must have assured himself of a place in Valhala.

VICTORS

The poor lads of Ruskin College hardly knew what hit them but had sufficiently recovered to provide the victors with the spoils of the conquest, a gallon of beer. Despite the lack of support for the trip, the few who went consumed enough beer for a party twice its size.

Like last year the "boys of the L.S.E." treated the patrons of a rural pub to a fine display of beer sipping, obscene ditties and balancing. The star performer was again the undaunted Norseman, Marius Hange,

who astounded the locals (and us) with a chair balancing act. Mention must also be made of Phil Vale, who sang continuously from a prone position some of the vilest songs ever heard.

On the domestic scene most of the team have had mixed fortunes. The first XI still fail to play to potential, while the seconds played badly against Imperial College. They still remain unbeaten in League games. The thirds have picked up their momentum again, while the fourths continue to do quite well. The fifth team, now captained by Dave Millar, lost heavily to Camberwell Art College, but seem to be enjoying themselves.

OLIGARCHIC

However, the Dynamos continue to do pretty well on the field but the principles upon which it was born seem to have been discarded (i.e. drinking, playing for fun) and some of its oligarchic leaders seem bent upon a vitriolic campaign against the venerable and representative leaders of the Soccer Club.

The real problems of the Soccer Club still remain. The first and second teams badly need training. One can still ask sensibly—Is John Aspinall a cardboard replica? Is John Kopij entering for the "On the Ball" penalty prize?

The necrophilia and bestiality? Well, everyone was so pissed at Oxford that the missing four hours in everyone's consciousness must have some explanation—this was the most likely one we could think of.

Ski Club

WITHIN the last few weeks a ski club has been formed, which has at the moment a membership of about 40. However, at the beginning of term approximately 80 people showed interest in forming this club, and we hope that these people will be able to come along to the A.U. to become members.

The programme for the coming year includes social activities, films and a trip to Europe (probably Austria) this Easter. Realising the importance of fitness, we have also planned an extensive training programme.

As a group we will benefit by price reductions, whilst amongst our members we have a number of experienced ski-ers, some of them being qualified ski instructors.

The grant that we have been allocated by the Athletic Union, we hope will be supplemented as our membership and activities grow. Part of our budget will be used for the purchase of training equipment and also to subsidise training at the Crystal and Alexandria Palace dry ski slopes.

Could any person who is interested in our activities or who has any useful information please contact the club secretary, Naomi Lester, either through the Undergraduate or Athletic Union pigeon holes.

Paul Cooper.

of the soccer club establishment clique, the Dynamos have blossomed into a team of infinite talent.

SAVAGERY

Their player-manager, a suave sophisticated Midlander and their captain cum leading goalscorer, an irrepressible Geordie, have instilled in the team a spirit envied by most brandy

drinkers. With a subtle blend of footballing skill and pure, unashamed savagery the team has contemptuously dismissed all opposition.

CONVIVIALITY

The international flavour of the first team squad has given rise to a convivial atmosphere, which is the envy of Didcot United Fourth Team Reserves. When asked to explain their undaunted record of victories a first team player was heard to comment: "Well, Brian, I hit it first time and there it was in the back of the net."

MOTTO

However, after an unaccountable minor setback of a five-goal deficit in their allegiance to the team motto "We're only here for the beer".

EDDIE WARING.

Dynamos

WITH their recent run of success the LSE Dynamos have firmly established themselves as a major force in the London soccer world. Despite immense jealousy, vicious backbiting and virulent character assassination from the lackeys

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, W.C.2.

For a quotation ask to see Brian Simmons

SIMMONDS

UNIVERSITY BOOKSELLERS

Our shop is not the biggest in London, but it is among the best. And it's a place where you will obtain individual attention.

16 FLEET STREET LONDON, E.C.4

(opp. Chancery Lane) 353 3907

Beaver

Needs help for production, reporting, taking copy to station, distribution, getting paid ads., etc.

Come to Beaver Office, Room S116, St. Clement's Building.

COMING EVENTS

UCH Hockey Club challenge LSE Rugby Club to a booze-up in the Tuns — date to be arranged. This is a direct result of the Exec's forage into their territory on Tuesday.

H E C (Paris) Soccer Club will be coming over at the end of term.

The Bar—BEWARE.

Mountaineering Club are going to Scotland over Christmas.

Another coming event — Iwan Morgan.

Bryan Smith continues to baffle everybody as treasurer.

Come home LSE Sam — Your chopos are still in the drawer.

Cricket

THIS term we are having a series of NET PRACTICES, and if there is anyone who wants to get in training for this season then he can come with us.

We go to Alf Gover's Cricket School in Clapham on Monday nights and meet in the Concourse Area of St. Clement's at about 5 p.m. Please check the noticeboard of the Cricket Club for details.

You only pay your fare there and back, and 5p to join the GOVER CRICKET SCHOOL. For this 5p you get 10 per cent or more reductions on cricket gear you buy there.

KEVIN CARROLL.

CALENDAR

Thursday, Nov. 25—
Blood Donors, 9.15-5.30, gym.
Ents. Meeting, 1.0-2.0, S.118.

Friday, Nov. 26—
Politics of Psychology Conf.
Debate Soc., "Rhodesia", 7.0-9.0, S.401.

Saturday, Nov. 27—
Stone the Crows. Freedom.
D.J.: Andy Dunkley. Bar and Disco, 7.45.
Politics of Psychology Conf.

Monday, Nov. 29—
Soc. Soc., Ian Clegg, 1-2, S.421.

Tuesday, Nov. 30—
Beaver Meeting, 1-2, S.116.
Con. Soc., Mrs. L. Townsend (GLC), 1-2, OT.
WONDERWALL, Film Soc.

Wednesday, Dec. 1—
Council, 1-2, S.101a.

Thursday, Dec. 2—
Ents. Meeting, 1.2, S.118.
Extra film: "Women in Love" plus cartoons. 7 p.m. O.T.

Friday, Dec. 3—
Watch notice-boards.

Monday, Dec. 6—
Gay Lib., 1-2, S.067.

Tuesday, Dec. 7—
ALL QUIET ON THE WESTERN FRONT, Film Soc.

Wednesday, Dec. 8—
Watch noticeboards.

Saturday, Dec. 11—
London Wainright III, Eggs Over Easy, Bar and Disco, 7.45.

JEWELLERY AND WATCHES

20% - 25% DISCOUNT to all NUS members and University staff
DIAMOND ENGAGEMENT RINGS. Gold—Wedding and Signet Rings. Gold and Silver—Cigarette Cases, Powder Boxes, Bracelets, Necklaces, Charms, Brooches, Earclips, Links. Silver and E.P.N.S. Tea-sets, etc.
10% - 20% DISCOUNT to all NUS members and University staff on all Branded Goods—All Swiss Watches, Clocks, Cutlery, Pens, Lighters, etc., and on all Second-hand Jewellery.

Remodelling and repairs to all Jewellery and repairs to watches
GEORGES & CO. of Hatton Garden
(Entrance in Greville Street only) 88/90 HATTON GARDEN, E.C.1.
Showroom Open Weekdays 9-6, Saturday 9-12
Special attention to orders by post or phone: 01-405 0700/6431

REMEMBER RHODESIA

SIR ALEC DOUGLAS-HOME, Foreign Secretary, has been spending time in Rhodesia, in the company of men who, for the large part, make Governor Wallace of Alabama look like a liberal.

There have been so many protestations about Sir Alec's "Honour" during the last weeks in Britain, so many affirmations that a man of his integrity will not sell out to Mr. Smith and his friends, that it is difficult not to feel a little uneasy.

Whatever the words any settlement may be cloaked in, it will nevertheless be a disaster for the majority of Rhodesians.

So far the British negotiating teams that have visited Salisbury have not included any Africans in their talks, apart from the occasional individual.

And even if the negotiators had been available, Africans would have been too frightened to go and see them. You don't have to live in Rhodesia to be aware that the Smith regime is based on the use of police and army and that the actions of the police are based on the constant flow of reports from police informers.

But it is perhaps necessary to have lived in Rhodesia to appreciate how afraid people are—afraid that their own relatives or friends may be taking note of what they are saying or doing: afraid of a summons by the local chief, of the sound of a police jeep chugging up your road.

The five principles on which any settlement is meant to be based are masterpieces of ambiguity. It is quite possible to interpret the first principle—that there must be unimpeded progress to majority rule—in terms of centuries.

This is what the ruling white Rhodesian Front will be doing in their hearts if not with their tongues. The second principle lays down guarantees against retrogressive amendments to any new constitution. But since the 1965 unilateral declaration of independence destroyed the Rhodesian constitution of 1961 Mr. Smith has had two new constitutions, each of them progressively retrogressive.

And it is common knowledge in Rhodesia (and in British Government circles) that any settlement is likely to be torn up as soon as sanctions are lifted and the whites are legally granted their independence.

Neither the Labour Party nor the Conservative Party has been able, while in office, to protect even one Rhodesian or in any way to exert its legal responsibility for Rhodesia. So it is quite ludicrous for the Government to believe that the second principle is of value whatsoever.

The third principle stated that there must be immediate improvement in the political status of the African population. But in the eyes of the Rhodesian Front the African population has no political status of any relevance.

Any grudging concessions Sir Alec may be able to extract from the Rhodesian Front will be minimal and will last just as long as the whites are agreeable to their existence. So we may all rest assured that any movement towards majority rule will be effectively and violently halted by Rhodesia's white rulers.

The fourth principle asks for progress towards ending racial discrimination. Racial discrimination is the foundation stone of the Rhodesian Front and will remain so whatever facades are erected.

And now the last and final principle: "The British Government must be satisfied that any basis proposed for independence was acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole."

The British Government have made it perfectly clear that they do not have to be satisfied. They have already, undoubtedly in collusion with Smith, ruled out any hope of a democratic referendum of Rhodesian adults. They show a complete lack of concern for the absence of organised political activity amongst Rhodesian Africans since 1964.

Instead they will set up some kind of Commission to estimate what the people feel—and, in the words of one of those concerned in the negotiations, **the Commission will see what is best for the African.**

It will not insist on free and informed discussion throughout the country, it will allow only six weeks for an assessment of public opinion. So it will be quite impossible for the hundreds of Africans who have left Rhodesia to return to their country in time to participate. And even if the African leaders were let out of detention and imprisonment, it would be quite impossible for them to re-form political structures through which to reach and advise their intimidated followers. So the African people will have no political alternatives to choose from.

The forthcoming "honourable settlement with Rhodesia" will be one of the most dishonourable events in British colonial history. It will be a declaration of peace between Her Majesty's Government and the Rhodesian Front—nothing more, and nothing less.

JUDITH TODD.

Judith Todd is the daughter of Garfield Todd, former Prime Minister of S. Rhodesia. She has been a consistent critic of Ian Smith's moves toward an Apartheid system.—(NUS Press Service).



THEY'RE MAKING MONEY OUT OF OUR BODIES

OUTSIDE the Miss World show last Wednesday about six hundred women and men were shouting short slogans such as "Mecca pimps out" and "End Sexploitation", while others tried to talk to the people as they went in and out.

We didn't get in, due to the incredible concentration camp-style security inside and the band of cops outside.

But nobody left the Albert Hall without some idea of how women's lib. felt about the farce.

SYMBOL

We protested, because this annual contest symbolises the judging of women by men—which occurs every day—our main reference points being face, tits, buttocks, and legs; the narrow physical definition of beauty manufactured by the cosmetics industry and fashion business.

Teenagers spend over £175,000,000 annually on fashion and cosmetics. They are socialised into feeling ugly, inadequate and unfeminine if they don't attempt to imitate the women in the adverts.

Women look at themselves through the eyes of men and see

the social success of the fashionably dressed body with the correctly made-up face, and participate in the "get your man" race.

QUANT-ITTY

We play the capitalists' game and hand over the money.

Why should the definition of femininity focus on costly clothing, cosmetics and other accessories such as maternalism and cooking?

We must become conscious and strong enough to say no to

**Eyes by Yardley,
Complexions by Quant,
Lips by Revlon,
Boobs by Playtex,
Legs by Immac.**

Why should others become rich by this emotional "sell" which directly exploits all but the self-confident by physical appearance treatment?

The effect of the hairdresser's appointment makes some women feel "young and desirable" again—to men!

The divide and rule law splits workers, black and white and also men and women, and turns women into rivals in their attempt to grab their man.

Women want their own identity. They don't want to be re-

ferred to as "Mick's girl", or "my bird", or any other terms used to describe men/women relationships.

Women's Lib. is trying to fight and help people to understand the social, economic, political and cultural oppressions of women, all of which transcend the class struggle.

The expensively dressed and perfumed female audience added respectability and sophistication to what was really nothing but a strip show. Women in the audience saw each other as rivals or objects, and not first and foremost as people.

Twenty-eight million watched Miss World on T.V. reaching top place in the ratings, while Max Joseph (worth £20-million), and friends, foreign businessmen and ambassadors, proved the success of international business relations extending to politics, by watching **Miss Black and White S. Africa** grinning on the same stage as though **Apartheid** didn't exist.

Mecca's managing director—Morley, has boosted profits up to £20-million by socially exploiting women's bodies in the name of international politics and monopoly capitalism.

LORD PORN AT L.S.E.

LORD LONGFORD received something like a cheer when he entered the Union on the invitation of Cath. Soc. last week. Not entirely ironical, either.

It was clear that however widely people differed from his views—and his methods—they respected his courage and his obvious concern, documented down the years, for social reform and the welfare of individuals. It was as if they were saying "We like you, but we distrust your friends and we feel a lot of undesirables are hanging on your shirt-tails."

His own concern with pornography and obscenity, he said, arose out of a long association with the victims of society and its penal code. He was concerned that people should not be exploited for financial gain. And he thought he had considerable support from Women's Lib and other groups who rightly objected to women being treated as sex-objects, their bodies

draped over cars or washing-powders. This could only have a dehumanising and degrading effect. (He hadn't made his mind up about the "Miss World" cattle-market).

He rejected criticisms that his committee was loaded with **yes-men** who only agreed with him or Mrs. W. It was far more widely-based than was generally supposed, he asserted. And he felt that he had a majority of public opinion on his side (though clearly not a majority of students—but he thought they didn't form a very large body of porn-consumers!)

He referred to David Holbrook, a humanist poet and teacher, who had submitted some weighty evidence. Holbrook argued that pornography served only for the destruction of the erotic in human life: not to "pervert children," but to destroy childhood: it was, in fact, not just "anti-sex" (like Bunny Hugh H. etc.), but also **anti-human**. It diminished,

instead of enhancing and giving full value to human personality.

The weakness of Longford's case lay in his failure to define pornography.

This, he said, would have to wait for the full report of his committee. Though he cheerfully assumed that Christians were "against it"! The strength lay in his voicing genuine public unease with the exploitation of people by commercial, capitalist, interests. Especially of women, children and lonely psychopaths who could put up inadequate defences against its diminishing effects.

He showed considerable sympathy for the **Gay**. But when it came to gay marriage and full sexual expression he could only say that this presented hitherto insoluble problems.

He also seemed worried about the censorship issue, but noted that the Arts Council working party (of which Mr. Mortimer, Q.C., was a member and to which he had assented) had agreed that some legislation was essential to protect children. And even the Danes have that!

G.D.

NOW REMEMBER, LAD, NO TORTURE YOU UNDERSTAND, A LITTLE HARSH TREATMENT OR PERHAPS A BIT OF BODILY DISCOMFORT SHOULD DO THE TRICK...

