

Freedom

THE ANARCHIST WEEKLY

"In face of all authority
maintain thyself."

—GOETHE.

Vol. 16, No. 35

August 27th, 1955

Threepence

NEWSPRINT & DOUBLETHINK

AT last, after fifteen years, the moment for which the freedom-loving Press has been waiting has arrived. Control of newsprint is ended and the Government-imposed shackles have been removed; no longer will it be necessary for frustrated editors to slash interesting articles, or cut down important news coverage; opportunities for expansion are now limitless, current issues may be discussed fully, and arguments developed at length—another blow for democratic freedom has been struck.

But no—freedom cannot be won so easily, inherent difficulties have to be overcome . . . Who is going to pay?

Anguished Association

Mr. Peter Thorneycroft's decision to abolish newsprint rationing has been received with groans of anguish by the Newspaper Proprietors Association. With only one exception, the members of the Association have denounced the Government's action. There have been varying degrees of indignation and criticism, a multiplicity of objections have been put forward, but practically all of them omit to mention the real reason for their attitude, which is only too plain to see—they stand to lose money. *The Times*, only supporter of the decision, with noble and high-minded motives, will almost certainly gain financially.

It is difficult to forget that all the newspapers which are now making such plaintive cries, have in the past, vigorously inveighed against the restrictions imposed upon them by shortage of newsprint. Now that their fervent hope has materialised

the comments are somewhat different. All attempt to justify their particular position by pointing out the awkward impracticabilities of the situation. *The News Chronicle* informed its readers of the possibilities of chaos in the distribution of newsprint; the *Daily Mirror* was horrified at the prospect of smaller newspapers being forced out of business; the *Daily Express*, fighting to release its chained crusader, advocated a voluntary scheme of rationing; the *Daily Telegraph* urged Mr. Thorneycroft to reconsider "before, in the name of freedom, he throws half the press, gagged, bound and weighted, into the deep end of the bath."

Economic Principles

The sudden change of heart, as already mentioned, has been brought about on purely economic grounds—for it is one thing to object to controls on high-sounding principles, and quite another when the principles are to be put into practice to the detriment of private interests. The circulation race of the 1930's taught the rival Press giants the unprofitable evils attached to all-out competition. Government control during the war acted as a safety valve against expensive schemes of inducement; the circulation drive continued, but within the safe limits of newsprint rationing. A stable "Press economy" was established and the large national dailies settled down to reap the rewards of thin newspapers with fat circulations.

But with rising labour costs and newsprint at £55 per long ton (against £11 just after the war), the "Press economy" has become distinctly precarious. The addition

of four pages to an eight page newspaper with a circulation of four million might well have disastrous effects upon profits, for the necessary additional advertising might not be forthcoming. This economic factor does not apply to *The Times* however; with its comparatively small circulation, and long waiting list of "class" advertisers, it stands to gain, and can therefore afford to congratulate the Government upon "a wise decision".

Customer Not Consulted

One fact emerges quite clearly as a result of the announcement. It is that the policies of British newspapers are no more idealistic than the policies of any other business enterprise; they are moulded precisely to suit their own profitable purposes, and if avowed ideals are in conflict with economic interests then the ideals have to change. A further fact will certainly emerge in due course, and with equal clarity—the views of the customer will not be consulted, and his needs will not be considered. The problem will be solved in the usual way and with accustomed enterprise—in private.

H.F.W.

THE FAILURE OF DEMOCRATIC INDOCTRINATION

"INDOCTRINATION" is something of a swearword among American politicians, who use it only to mean Communist indoctrination—the training in patriotism given to Soviet servicemen (and future servicemen) by the Soviet State. By a stretch of the imagination it might also be applied by them to the training in patriotism given by a Fascist or other Unamerican State; but they certainly wouldn't use it to mean the training in patriotism given to American children and soldiers, for which they have no single word.

For the sake of simplicity, however, the word "indoctrination" is used here to mean systematic training in patriotism and worship of the local "Way of Life" given by any State to its subjects, particularly fighting men.

Nazi indoctrination seems to have been moderately successful; German soldiers fought in the late war with commendable (or detestable, according to your point of view), courage and ferocity, and in occupied countries behaved with the pride and discipline proper to members of the Master Race among lesser peoples. The same seems to have been true of British troops, whose indoctrination must have been equally efficient. And of Japanese troops.

The same cannot be said of the other principal belligerents. Italy had to retire from the war early because her conscripts, at any rate, were most in-

efficiently indoctrinated, and surrendered with an alacrity which the warlike British found laughable. Soviet troops, after a poor start, fought very fiercely and well, particularly against occupying forces; but as occupying forces themselves, many of them revealed themselves, in spite of all their political commissars (and heavy punishments for behaviour calculated to disgrace their Way of Life), to be very badly indoctrinated indeed, looting and raping without either official sanction or secrecy, until they were repatriated and replaced by better trained regulars.

American troops seemed at that time to be quite well indoctrinated, and conversation with some of the few now stationed in Britain seems to indicate a fanatical faith in the American Way of Life and the right of Uncle Sam to send them to their deaths in defence of Freedom.

According, however, to a report of the Defence Department, "On the Problems and Behaviour of American Military Prisoners," published on August 17, Democratic indoctrination has not been as successful as was hoped.

Of American prisoners in Korea, "only a handful" limited the information they gave their captors to the number, rank, name and date of birth required of them by international law. "In the face of Communist indoctrination the uniformed prisoners of war were up against it. They could not answer arguments in favour of Communism by arguments in favour of Americanism because they knew very little about their America." (This in spite of the ceremony of reverence to the American flag done in schools daily).

The committee suggested that special training be given to American service men in ways of resisting enemy interrogators, and that " . . . the services find an effective means of co-ordinating with civilian educational institutions, churches, and other patriotic organizations (sic) to provide better understanding of American ideals."

It also set out a code of conduct for American military prisoners, consisting of six provisions, the four middle ones setting out the usual accepted behaviour for P.O.W.s—not giving information, obeying orders, etc. For the sake of interest, the first and sixth provisions of the code are set out below:

(1) I am an American fighting man. I serve in the forces which guard by country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defence.

(6) I will never forget that I am an American fighting man, responsible for my actions and dedicated to the principles which made my country free. I will trust in my God and in the United States of America.

(*The Times*, Aug. 18 is acknowledged).

The Goa Demonstrations

THESE days when our minds are petrified with the startling discovery that man has the means of destroying the race—or the possibility of conquering outer space—the struggles of the subject peoples in the forgotten parts of the world against their despotic rulers assume the status of niggling nationalism in our minds unimportant compared to the mighty destinies of the "great powers".

With the recent resumption of the Indian passive resistance movement against the Government of the small Portuguese possession of Goa we are reminded of the totalitarian nature of the Portuguese administration which is no less important to the people under its domination because they are comparatively few in number and have no place in "world affairs". The aim of the movement, to replace one Government by another, cannot excite anarchist sympathy, but the pattern of Colonial rule which is evident in Goa has to be condemned (and in addition should be used to draw attention once more to the peoples of Portuguese East Africa, whose state of slavery was condemned some time ago by an International Committee investigating colonial conditions).

It is about a year since the last non-violent demonstrations against the Portuguese were important enough to merit attention in the British press. The attention paid to them now is related to the forthcoming Indian General Elections and the position of Nehru as a world political figure. The Indian Government, led by Nehru, has favoured and encouraged the passive methods adopted by the *Satyagrahis* against Portuguese rule. An attempt however by opposing political groups, including the Communists, who have little sympathy with passive resistance as a method of struggle, is being made to use the movement as a factor in the elections.

When a few days ago unarmed Indian demonstrators in Goa territory were fired on by the Portuguese police, who were ordered to shoot any Indian refusing orders to halt, thousands of people demonstrated in the streets of Calcutta and Bombay against the shootings. Shops, Banks and Cinemas in New Delhi closed for a one day strike of mourning and Parliament adjourned "for half an hour in memory of the dead".

Many Indians then, encouraged by the opposition are waiting for Nehru to take "strong police action" as well as Western observers who, in the words of the *Observer* editorial:

"given this chance of repaying Mr.

Nehru in his own coin for the attitude of superior detachment he is fond of assuming towards the conflicts of the Great Powers, are naturally tempted to show up the contradictions of a 'non-violent' campaign which whips up mass hysteria until bloodshed becomes inevitable, or to express sympathy with the resistance of 'poor little Portugal' to 'big bullying India'. From there, it is not far to accepting the picture of Goa as a patriarchal paradise, almost all of whose Christian and wine-imbibing inhabitants greatly prefer Portugal's benevolent despotism to incorporation into a prohibitionist Hindu State—a picture that does not stand up to investigation on the spot."

There is no evidence in any statements made by Nehru that he is encouraging the use of violence. He has in fact stated that although Portuguese behaviour towards the demonstrators has been "brutal and uncivilised", the Indian Government would continue with its peaceful approach and not resort to armed force.

The Portuguese authorities claim that the reason for the police firing on the crowd was to resist an attempt made by them to seize police arms, but the following statement by a senior Portuguese police officer makes the intention of the authorities clear however passive the demonstrators are. He said to an *Observer* correspondent:

"If we accept the principle that we can never shoot at them when they come unarmed, then they only have to come in large enough numbers and they will take Goa, which, after all, is ours and not theirs."

On the other hand, if the Communists have any influence on the movement it is likely, should their political interests demand, that they will encourage the use of violence, thus satisfying the anger of the Indian people against the Portuguese and adding strength to the Portuguese authorities in their arguments for the use of violence.

Catholic Rule

Leaving aside the political considerations, there are genuine reasons why the Goan people are sympathetic to the Indian movement. Philip Deane, writing from Bombay (*Observer*, August 20th), in what he describes as a one-man Gallup Poll tells us that:

"All the time, in this small Portuguese possession, people approached me in the streets, in cafés and in shops, and spoke in favour of India. Some of them did so while they wore Portuguese badges. They took risks, because there was no

democracy in Goa, no Habeas Corpus, and the place is full of police informers.

Admittedly a one-man Gallup Poll is subject to error, but I heard no voice of dissent, except from official propagandists and a few very rich people. Besides, there are certain objective factors which, I think, confirm my findings.

Sixty per cent. of all Goans are Hindu by religion. They still remember the persecution they suffered before 1910. Even now they are subject to discrimination, having to maintain their own schools because in Government establishments they cannot learn their own Indian language and are given obligatory religious instruction in Catholicism. Part of the taxes they pay goes to maintain the Roman Catholic Church, while no comparable State aid is given to Hindu religious institutions."

This will be a test of the strength of non-violent methods of struggle if demonstrators continue to march into Goa in spite of violent police action. The latest reports are that demonstrators are still marching across the border. A passive step has been taken by Nehru who it is reported is closing the Consulate in Goa, and has asked Portugal to close its Consulates in Bombay, Madras and Calcutta. Brazil has offered to look after Portuguese interests.

R.M.

Is a Multi-Racial Africa Possible?

HOW just is a multi-racial policy in Britain's African possessions? The idea of giving all races in a territory equal rights and powers in the administration of that territory looks all right at first glance—until one realises that the Europeans there are a small minority, claiming as always, rights and powers out of proportion to their numbers.

British colonial policy is based on developing multi-racial constitutions but has been challenged recently by Mr. Arthur Gaitskell who has devoted his life to development projects in various parts of Africa. He worked for many years in developing Africa's greatest peasant programme—the Gezira cotton project in the Sudan. He was a member of the Royal Commission that recently reported on East Africa, leader of the Government's mission to study the ranching possibilities of the Kalahari, and he is a director of the Colonial Development Corporation.

In the Annual Anniversary Address to the Africa Bureau, which he gave this year, Mr. Gaitskell casts doubts as to whether the multi-racial constitutions that are being developed in Kenya and Tanganyika, and in Central Africa, can succeed. "Do other countries," he asks, "start with a multi-racial constitution when there is a tiny minority of other races?"

In Tanganyika the foreign immigrant population is not much more than one per cent.; in Kenya it is three per cent. When influences from the Gold Coast and the Sudan, from the United States and the rest of the world, and from the British education system in Africa, encourage Africans to expect self-determination, "is a multi-racial set-up really going to get African support? And if it does not, what are we going to do?"

The fact that a multi-racial political objective in Africa is likely to be unsound policy "does not imply that multi-racial co-operation is not desirable, and indeed essential, if self-determination is to mean anything in terms of political

and economic stability," says Mr. Gaitskell.

Anticipating opposition from some settlers, Mr. Gaitskell asks what is the alternative for them. Is it "to seek security for maintaining one's own way of life and to avoid being swamped by a primitive environment by special arrangements which are not usual in the rest of the world? Or to be the first, because they know the language and have the practical experience in the country, to give a hand to the African to set him up in his own country and to help him make it his own country?"

He acknowledges the immense difficulty in deliberately ending an age of mastery, but points out that this is not very different from the way taken by the upper classes in England to adjust themselves to changing social conditions—a way that has led to better security than was obtained in those countries where a ruling class opposed social change and invited revolution.

Here, in his last point, we see that the voice of reason is not unmotivated by concern for British ruling-class interests. The new imperialist technique is to 'adjust' to nationalist aspirations without, if possible, weakening economic interests. This has worked admirably so far for the British in regard to India, Persia and Egypt and will no doubt serve in Africa too.

The Anarchist dilemma arises out of the undoubted fact that at the moment any revolutionary movement that might arise among Africans will be nationalistic and tend to be as racial as its ideas as the white settlers—rather an infertile field for Anarchism!

Nevertheless it is clear that however essentially reformist it is, a more enlightened attitude must be adopted towards the Africans in their own country, and the job for European anarchists remains that of combatting imperialism under every guise so that genuine and non-exploitive co-operation can exist between the peoples of all countries and all colours.

WHAT IS "FREEDOM" FOR

THE letter from Milward Casey and the editorial reply to it in last week's FREEDOM led to the question of why the paper is like it is, and what it should be like. Having written in it for twelve years on and off, I should like to offer some comments on points arising from last week's correspondence:

(1) LITERARY MAGAZINES

Mr. Casey is optimistic in thinking that if we started a literary magazine it would pay for the deficit on FREEDOM and our books and pamphlets. I should imagine that the only magazines of that kind in this country that are free from their own serious financial anxieties are the *London Magazine* (sponsored by the proprietors of the *Daily Mirror*), *Encounter* (sponsored by the Congress for Cultural Freedom and, indirectly like *Perspectives*, by an American foundation), and the *Twentieth Century* (owned by the Hon. F. D. L. Astor). It would of course be valuable to have a magazine on the level of *Encounter* with an anarchist orientation, but in fact there is no money to subsidise it, and its production would draw off time and labour from FREEDOM.

(2) PERSONAL VIEWS

Mr. Casey says, "An increasing amount of space is being devoted to persons wishing to expound their personal views..." But does he really expect anyone to sit down and express other people's views instead of their personal view? What he means I think is the kind of article which begins with some scrap of personal experience and ends by drawing some anarchical, or just warm-hearted or funny conclusion from it. I should like to defend this kind of writing. Firstly because there are many things that FREEDOM ought to say which are best expressed on the personal level. Secondly because in a paper with a precarious and fluctuating circulation people are more likely to continue to be readers and to regard it as 'our' paper and not just another fried-fish-wrapper when they feel some sort of personal rapport with the writers—even when they dislike them and their silly preoccupations. (A recent correspondent in the *New Statesman* wrote that his particular form of masochism was to pay ninepence a week to read the opinions of Mr. Kingsley Martin). Finally, because the more fre-

quent criticism of FREEDOM is that it is continually carping and nagging about allegedly Big Issues of our day, with little that is constructive or even good-natured and not much to indicate that it's good to be alive.

(3) THE ARTS, BOOKS AND ALL THAT

I don't think that, even if it had the space and the talent, FREEDOM should attempt a general 'coverage' of the arts. Almost all the discussion of books in the paper is because of the relevance of the subject matter, and is not much concerned with appraisal as 'literature'. (If I review a book it is because it contains material which "ought to be in FREEDOM", and the review consists mostly of direct quotation). In the case of films, either we have been invited to review it, or someone feels they have something to say about it, and as to plays, it is appropriate that more space should be devoted to the live theatre than to the so-called mass-media. Anyway, it so happens that we have a good dramatic critic. FREEDOM is not the place for music criticism as such, but related articles like last year's brilliant editorial on *The Conductorless Orchestra* and the recent *Music-Making Anthology* seem to me most valuable. The same thing applies to 'Art'. I still remember with pleasure the feature about the first of the L.C.C.'s sculpture exhibitions in Battersea Park in 1948. The wider aspects of the arts and such subjects as town design and our physical environment generally are, I think, more appropriate than individual criticism and reviewing. FREEDOM is right to exclude poetry and short stories because even if there was room for them in a propagandist paper there would be an inevitable bias towards propagandist poems and stories—painfully sincere, and dreadfully dull and pretentious.

(4) TOPICALITY

FREEDOM is a newspaper as well as a magazine, and ought to be topical. I think that its current commentary on the Geneva conference has been the most honest and best-reasoned to appear in any paper I have seen. But when it comes to less global matters the paper is handicapped, as the note on Mr. Casey's letter points out, by the lack of people with special knowledge on certain subjects to write about them in a better-than-superficial way. There is a temptation, as I found when I used to 'write up' news items, to go through the daily press, pick out the most damaging items on a topic and rehash them into some sort of article. This is a waste of time and a breach of faith with the reader, and I am sure it is better to say nothing than to be topical about things of which one is ignorant. Where there has in fact been access to special knowledge, FREEDOM has contained first-rate reporting, for example the articles from the Middle East in the years just after the war, the eyewitness account of the June 1953 rising in Berlin, and the industrial reporting on transport and the docks.

There is another sort of topicality that is important for FREEDOM. That is in publicising and discussing those activities and movements in the world of to-day which provide, so to speak, experimental verification of the constructive ideas of the 'classical' anarchist thinkers. No

CIVILISATION

RECENTLY unveiled in Times Square, New York, was a huge advertising sign, designed for Pepsi-Cola by Douglas Leigh and built by Artkraft-Strauss to cover a length of 225 feet and tower 100 feet above Broadway.

The giant million-watt sign features two glowing Pepsi-Cola bottles each five storeys high and a crown cork fifty feet in diameter. A waterfall, flowing night and day, occupies the space between the bottles and below the cork. The water, which re-circulates continuously, pouring over the waterfall at 50,000 gallons a minute, is illuminated after dark by lights going through the spectrum, building up to a crescendo of brilliant white.

In the winter, 3,000 gallons of anti-freeze will have to be added to the waterfall, which cannot overflow as it is held in place from behind by a vacuum. Altogether there are 35,000 electric bulbs in the sign. The bottles themselves are fifty feet high and it is said that it would take about one million normal bottles of Pepsi-Cola to fill the two bottles. When the crown cork reaches full illumination, the words "The Light Refreshment" light up in letters running nearly 20 feet in length.

—condensed from
"Advertiser's Weekly"
4/8/55.

other non-specialised daily or weekly paper in this country has carried so much material on the Peckham Experiment, the Spanish Collective, the Jewish communal settlements, the work of educational pioneers like A. S. Neill, the fundamental development projects, and the work on racial tensions of UNESCO, or the Bhoodan movement in India.

(5) "THE WORKERS"

Mr. Casey asks: "Is it a paper propagating anarchist thought and means of action directed to and trying to reach the workers?", and he remarks, as I have often done, that 'workers' in the customary sense of the word are a minority among FREEDOM's readers. Well, as the editorial reply to him suggests, the answer to the first half of his question is yes. But I do think that it is begging the question a little to reply simply "We would like to think that our paper is read by all kinds of people. We do not aim to appeal to a particular 'class' in society, we aim at the abolition of classes". You must forgive me for repeating what I have said before in these columns:

As anarchists, we want to push away the barriers which inhibit our freedom to enjoy life as individuals. But we are, though we reject the idea of the 'social contract', also under an obligation to society, unless we lead Robinson Crusoe lives, independent of the labour of others. When I enjoy 'the arts', I am

indebted to millions of people from the stone age genius who first cultivated wheat or discovered fire or invented the wheel, to the industrial worker who made my gramophone; and when I buy a shirt or a piece of chocolate or a tyre, I do so thanks to some African or Asian who is probably much too 'ignorant' to appreciate what Mr. Casey and I enjoy. My friend P.S. declares what ought to be obvious, that "all wealth is produced, and all social services rendered, by these productive workers, and it is no glorification or flattery to state quite bluntly that they are therefore the most important section of the community". As anarchist propagandists, it is quite true, our approach is to individuals regardless of what layer of our class-divided society they occupy, but by far the most effective resistance to authority would come from the industrial workers who could control and revolutionise the whole economic structure if they exercised their own strength. That is why we must try to bring to their notice our integral conception of freedom; not to patronise them, nor plan for them, but to work with them, in the hope that they too will find it valuable.

A paper like FREEDOM tends to be read by people who have had the advantage of more formal education than the majority of manual workers (for 'education' the mark of social status, rewards its recipients by taking them out of the ranks of the socially indispensable). The working-class household is not to any extent a book-reading household nor one which subscribes to those books or magazines which are not readily avail-

able from the newsagent. Consequently the anarchist point of view is least accessible to those on whom the hope of a free society depends. But on any level everything worth while is set in motion by the alert and independent-minded minority, and this minority is certainly no smaller, indeed I would say it was larger, amongst the 'workers'. I think it is true that we should especially aim at getting more working-class readers, but it would be contemptuous and insulting to try to do this by writing a lot of one-syllable claptrap, to dress up anarchism as something more attractive, or to hang out a *Daily Mirror* version of FREEDOM like a flypaper to catch them by pretending that our views were other than they are.

Obviously we should aim at straightforward language and the avoidance of private jargon, but if we are to retain regular readers we must have enough non-propagandist material of sufficient variety and sophistication to make the paper a pleasure to read, which a constant reiteration of simple slogans, however valid, would not be.

(6) RECEIVED WITH THANKS

I have used our correspondent's letter as an excuse to argue several points which he didn't dispute, and I apologise. For in fact he should be thanked for being among those readers with enough interest in the paper to write and air his views. The real point is that FREEDOM would be better with more writers and more readers.

London.

C.W.

Notes on a Discussion

Taxes, Wages, The Free Society...

THE article on *Taxation, Wage Claims and the Welfare State* by "G" which appeared in last week's FREEDOM contains one principle argument, namely that the creases in pay are in fact obtained at the expense of the rest of the community (in the form of increased prices); that tax-exation is also effected at the expense of the community; hence "tax-dodgers" are doing no more than voting themselves a wage increase. And G. concludes that "it is farcical to pretend that there is any moral difference between organising to force wage increases and organising to resist taxation; they are simply expressions of the same struggle within capitalism". For someone who makes a principle out of unprincipled behaviour G.'s logic is unanswerable. But since we do not share the values on which his argument is based we find his logic faulty.

★

THE free society will not be produced out of a hat. If it is to come about it will be composed of the millions of human beings who to-day make up the unfree society. It is therefore on the development of human relations and values in the present that hope for the future must depend. In other words two processes will be operating in society simultaneously; the propagation of new social and economic ideas based on freedom and equality contemporaneously with living and working in a society based on compulsion and classes. It is on the effectiveness with which the former is conducted (that is the extent to which it is widely accepted) that the State, government and the present economic system will be undermined, and a point reached at which the open clash between the two ways of life occurs. It seems to us that such a clash will be accompanied by violence, since it is notorious that the weaker the government the greater does it have recourse to force for the maintenance of its power to rule. To the extent that the forces of the free society represent an overwhelming majority of socially active people as well as a representative cross-section of the population, such violence will be limited and not become an end in itself.

★

THE advocate of the free society, especially if he is a propagandist must be objective in his analysis of existing society, and we would

even go so far as to say, modest as well. Anarchists, and we think, rightly, are continually pointing out to the critics of the anarchist society that most of their objections are based on the values of existing society, and that such criticism is unrealistic. But for an anarchist to try to understand the direction in which present society is moving by applying the values of an established free society is equally unrealistic. We realise that this is a sweeping sentence, which may be open to misunderstanding by the watchdogs of anarchist orthodoxy, and, since we have no intention to offend, we will attempt to enlarge on this thought in the course of which, perhaps also explain why we think G.'s logic faulty.

In a society based on capitalism and government, and to which at present the majority of people conceive of no alternative, there can exist a morality within the immorality of that social structure. Thus though we consider representative government immoral there are nevertheless, moral and immoral ways of conducting elections. Though wars are immoral there are moral and immoral ways of treating prisoners of war; though prisons are immoral there are moral and immoral ways of treating prisoners.

Such a relation exists between the wage system and taxation. The wage system is the living symbol of the immorality of capitalism. It is, as Tolstoy once wrote, slavery with the chains transferred from the ankles to the wrists. But let us not forget that it is the basis of society to-day, accepted by the majority of workers as a kind of "natural order of things" (seeking "liberation" for themselves as individuals not through the scramble for more wages, or by dodging taxes—as G. seems to imply—but through the big prize in football pools which will remove them bodily out of their class and their slavery). The immorality of taxation—compulsion—compared with the immorality of wage slavery is so slight as to acquire almost a halo of virtue! Let us examine the facts.

★

IN the Report of the Commissioners of H.M. Inland Revenue for the year ended March 1954 we find that the distribution of the national product was as follows:

Total income of 12,760,000 incomes in the £155-£500 range was £4,245 millions.

Total income of 6,100,000 incomes in the £500-£1,000 range was £3,908 millions.

Total income of 940,000 incomes in the £1,000-£20,000 range was £1,997 millions.

That is to say that 12½ million people earn an average of £332 a year, 6 million an average of £643 and 1 million an average of £2,120 a year.

This represents personal incomes. But when we turn to the income of C companies (excluding Local Authorities and Industrial & Provident Societies which are but chicken feed by comparison) we have that 218,372 Companies in the United Kingdom made a "net true income" (that is taxable profit after allowing £590 millions for depreciation) of £1,860 millions (this figure should be compared with the 19,600,000 employees registered under the P.A.Y.E.—(Pay as you earn)—scheme whose total remuneration in the corresponding period was £8,155 millions).

Perhaps we can comment on these figures by repeating what we wrote a few months ago in this column,* that "it is more than apparent that those who work the longest hours, in the dullest jobs, in the worst conditions, are also those who have the smallest share of the cake".

Now let us examine how taxation affects the situation:

Income Tax on 12,760,000 incomes of £332 p.a. was £18.5. Net income £313.

Income Tax on 6,100,000 incomes of £653 p.a. was £47. Net income £596.

Income Tax on 940,000 incomes of £2,120 p.a. was £780. Net income £1,340.

Tax on Companies' Profits of £1,860 millions was £815.4 millions.

If we add to this, £164 millions in death duties, £56 millions in Stamp Duties we arrive at a figure of £2,340 millions of which amount £546.85 millions were collected under the Pay As You Earn Scheme from 19.6 million employees!

To complete the picture the revenue from Customs and Excise (tobacco, beer, tea, Purchase Tax, etc.), amounted to a further £1,871,686,000 (a tax which no one "evades" except through poverty or by joining G. on a trip to France in order to smuggle back a bottle of brandy!)

*Equality and Uniformity, FREEDOM 14/5/55.

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY

OPEN 10 a.m. to 6.30; 5.0 SATURDAYS

All books sent post free, so please get your books from us. We can supply any book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for.

New Books . . .

Experiment in Depth
P. W. Martin 25/-

Reprints . . .

At the Sign of the Cat and
Racket H. de Balzac 6/-
Crime and Punishment
F. Dostoevsky 6/-

Second-Hand . . .

The Bloody Traffic
Fenner Brockway 2/6
Green Hills of Africa
Ernest Hemingway 3/-
The Cult of Power Rex Warner 3/-
Tell Freedom Peter Abrahams 3/-
Focus One (On Kafka and
Rex Warner) 3/-
A Short History of Women
John Langdon-Davies 4/-
Causes of International War
G. Lowes Dickinson 2/-
A New Life Elmer Rice 2/6
Fair Haven and Foul Strand
August Strindberg 3/6
Intruder in the Dust
William Faulkner 3/-
Why War? Ellen Wilkinson &
Edward Conze 1/-
Death Pays a Dividend
Fenner Brockway &
Frederick Mullally 2/6
To-morrow's Money
Kitson, Saddy, Douglas, etc. 2/6
The Abysmal Brute Jack London, 2/6

Special Offer . . .

All available issues of *Spain and the World*, June 1937 to June 1939. Approx. 84 issues *War Commentary* up to 1944. All issues *War Commentary* and *Freedom* 1944 to 1954 inclusive (one issue only missing) £10

Periodical . . .

Man, Vol. 1, No. 3. 4d.

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

Taxes, Wages, The Free Society . . .

Continued from p. 2

If we are right in saying that the capitalist system penalises those who are the real producers of wealth, then the tax system can be said to tend in the opposite direction (thereby, incidentally, recognising the injustice of the profit system).

Estimated expenditure in 1955-6 includes £1,556.8 millions on "Defence Preparations" (a decrease of £111.2 millions on the previous year) and £2,369.1 on "Services" (an increase of £120 millions) which include education, housing, Family Allowances, National Health Service† as well as Police, prisons and tax collection!

★

THE penultimate paragraph in G.'s article is perhaps the most puzzling of all

Those who talk of tax-dodgers as though they were in a special category who refused to pay for the Welfare Services are under a great misapprehension. They are the victims of the barrage of bluff which politicians like Lord Beveridge pour out to distort reality. If the State decides to build a hospital, a battleship, or to double the old age pension, it does not have to look into the mythical treasury chest to see if there is enough money there to pay for the scheme. The modern State is in fact the creator of all money and credit. If some citizens fail to pay their legal taxes it will not in any way affect State projects—it will simply come out of the pockets (horrid thought!) of all other citizens through a rise in prices—just as if the tax dodgers had voted themselves a wage increase.

Surely the second half of the paragraph contradicts the first, and simply underlines what we wrote in the apparently controversial article *As Ye Sow . . .* (FREEDOM 23/4/55) that

... the process of living in society as it is (which we must do if we wish to influence others) . . . means among other things, making use of those services and facilities which are administered by the Government or the State but which in fact, are provided by our fellow beings. To evade taxes, or to resort to the subterfuges practised by business and professional men to pay less, is not doing the government in the eye (since it will, if necessary, raise the money by other means), as much as it is your neighbour.

How far tax-evasion in this country determines the extent of indirect taxation we cannot tell‡ but it is, as we pointed out in discussing the Poujadiste movement in France, a fact that in countries such as Italy the bulk of taxes were, at least until recently, almost entirely raised by this means. (Is there no connection between this wholesale evasion of Income Tax by the Italian Industrialists, landowners and farmers, and the general backwardness of social services in that country?)

★

NOW G. recognises that, "if anything is immoral" it is not the scramble for wages or the petit bourgeoisie's resistance to taxes

"but the system which makes necessary such a waste of human effort in struggle rather than co-operation. And the system depends for its continuation on the State which demands obedient citizens, obedient taxpayers."

And a few lines later he writes

If we are to wait until people oppose the many demands of the State on the individual out of motives of pure disinterestedness then indeed it is for pie in the sky that we wait. I prefer to place some reliance on elementary self-interest as an anti-totalitarian force.

†Contrary to what a large number of people believe, the National Health Service (£438 millions) is paid for out of Taxation and not from the weekly contributions to the National Insurance Scheme.

‡According to the Commissioners' Report, 18,144 cases of under-assessment of profits were actually found out in 1954 yielding £20½ millions in tax. "Small cases" numbered 133,757 and produced £5 millions in tax.

BOOK REVIEW

On and Off (?) The Band Wagon

FALSE WITNESS, by Harvey Matusow. Cameron & Kahn: Collet's, 10s.

EARLIER this year the news columns of FREEDOM gave quite a lot of space to the affair of the American Harvey Matusow—the man who has tried to go one better than the professional ex-Communists by being the first to qualify for the title of professional ex-professional-ex-Communist. His case is yet another example of the sickness from which the so-called democracies suffer: the malaise caused by that pursuit of power and special interests called politics (a word which is a fine example of pre-Orwellian doublethink in the "Ministry of Truth" class—for what has politics to do with *hoi polloi*, except to exploit them and persuade them to accept the myth which is the opposite of the reality?). The symptom of this sickness is corruption: corruption of the spirit, of individual and of general values. Money and power become the twin desires and other people the stepping stones.

Matusow puts it a little differently. In the language of popular psychology which he uses to explain his motives he says he "wanted identity", something to fill the gap made when he left the Army in 1946. He was no longer one of a group working for a particular end under an accepted leader—so he joined the Communist Party. But he did not find his "identity" there, for "the Communist Party all too frequently regarded its membership as Man—with a capital M—forgetting that man—with a small m—existed . . . The mechanical approach toward me that I found in many party leaders, their absolutist attitude, disillusioned me increasingly in the party. I took on a feeling of hurt and envy toward those who were criticising me. This feeling of hurt grew stronger as I felt that these were attacks upon me. I felt alone again." Resentment and bitterness lead to providing information to the F.B.I. This was in 1950.

It is, to our minds not true to say that the system depends for its continuation on "obedient citizens, obedient taxpayers". There are enough examples throughout the world of countries where neither of these conditions has been satisfied yet the system continues. The million-strong Poujadiste movement clearly was a headache to the Faure Government and might have resulted in its overthrow. But as to shaking the system how could it when in fact the Poujadistes' motives were for a larger stake in the "system". The wage struggle is at present in this country largely a struggle for a reasonable standard of living. But such action will never shake the system if it is not viewed as part of a wider, long-term struggle against the whole wage system. Indeed the recent statement by the leader of the American Federation of Labour indicates the directions such narrow struggles can take: "We do not seek to recast American society. We do seek an ever-rising standard of living—by which we mean not only more money but more leisure and a richer cultural life"‡.

That is the danger of the selfish skirmishes for petty ends which G. seeks to rationalise as effective jabs at the existing social structure. If the system is to receive a shaking (other than those provoked by its own defects and contradictions), it will only be possible when sufficient men and women can show that "pure disinterestedness" which for G. is "pie in the sky"; that is when there are a sufficient number of people whose energies and intelligence and humanity are directed to laying the foundations for the free society of the future, recognising the value of those struggles in the present which help to ease the lot of the victims of the "system", but never deviating from the main objective. For no system which functions (who can deny that capitalism functions on a world-wide scale and embraces some thousands of millions of human beings?) will collapse until the people are ready to take over with new methods, new ideas and a new morality.

‡Quoted in FREEDOM 25/6/55 in the article *No Industrial Peace*.

He became a regular stool-pigeon for the authorities until he was expelled from the Party. It was then that he found "identity" with a vengeance by becoming a professional ex-Communist. By the careful exploitation of his knowledge of the Party he gradually established himself as an expert on Communism. He testified before committees on un-American activities (where but in America could one find such a ridiculous title for such a humourless subject?), becoming as well known as those other informers (or more politely, witnesses) Paul Crouch, Whittaker Chambers, and Louis Budenz. This position was not achieved without difficulty for there were others in the same field; as a newspaperman said to Matusow "When Lindbergh crossed the Atlantic, it was news. But after the Atlantic had been crossed a number of times who cared?" Matusow's answer to this was to claim expert knowledge of Communism amongst youths and students, an aspect which had not been appropriated by any of the other successful informers.

For three years Matusow flourished in his murky trade, until in 1953 he decided he would no longer testify. He did backslide on this decision for a period but eventually he declared publicly he would no longer give information on Communism and filed affidavits to say that the evidence he had given in two important cases, that of the 13 "second-string" Communists, and of Clinton Jencks, the Texas union leader, was substantially untrue. *False Witness* is his account of his activities from 1946 till 1953.

★

The question one inevitably asks oneself is—Why did he do it? What prompted him to make this strange double somersault? Matusow gives his explanation in these words:

"I doubt that many people who saw my performance on television or who read about it as they scanned their newspapers realised how false and shallow I had begun to feel. But my subsequent break was not easy. Rather than one event, it was a series of experiences which brought me to the point at which

I am now, with a desire to rectify the wrongs I have done and with a feeling which now enables me to live at ease with myself for the first time in many years."

and in a letter to Senator McCarthy he wrote:

"I have gone through life hurting the things I love and believe in. Being dishonest with them for I was afraid that if I were honest I would be hurt by them. I was wrong . . . I don't want to go near politics ever again. And I never want to be part of the Communist question, pro or con. It might be that you look at this as the coward's way out but if I am to go as an honest—honest with myself—human being I have to use salt-petre in my living. I have to tone down my temptations which made me dishonest . . ."

A passage from a Hollywood film scenario? or the genuine feelings of a man who can only express himself in our latter-day purple prose?

Another explanation is provided by, among others, Representative Walter who was chairman of the committee before which Matusow made his debut as a professional witness and also of the committee which first dealt with his recantation. Walter accused him of being a secret Communist, of being "planted" as an informer in order to "discredit Congressional Red-hunts". *False Witness* does tend to confirm this: there is no question that the characters of those Communists against whom he says he gave false testimony are anything but as pure as driven snow. In fact all the evidence he gave which was directly responsible for discrediting (in the case of investigating committees) or convicting (in court cases) a person, he now recants and claims was either misleading or false. A reversal rather too complete to be believable. A further argument (admittedly susceptible to the 'remorse' theory) for this explanation lies in the timing and choice of subject for his public recantation. He filed an affidavit in January of this year concerning the most important trial he had appeared in, that of the 13 Communist leaders—just as they were about to start their prison sentences (*The Times* 31/1/55).

SCIENCE NOTES

Separation Experiences & the Child

THE separation of young children from their parents is generally considered to be an important factor in the development of delinquency and neurosis. As it is often very difficult to avoid such separations parents often worry whether they are causing harm to their children. This anxiety is not alleviated by prominent people who make speeches outlining the dangers of women working and its bad effect on their children.

Many parents have suspected that these harmful effects have been exaggerated and they are supported by an article in the *Lancet*, Aug. 6th, 1955, by J. G. Howells and J. Layng. It is entitled 'Separation Experiences and Mental Health' and gives the results of an investigation to determine the incidence of separation in a random sample of disturbed children attending a psychiatric clinic, but living at home. A group of normally healthy school children were used as a control. The questionnaire method was used, parents being asked to give details of when the mother, father or child had been away from home for a night or more, up to the child's fifth year.

Each group contained thirty-seven children and the two groups were as similar as possible. The sexes in the two groups were nearly equal as was the average age. The results showed that the separation experiences of both groups were very similar. There was very little separation in the first year with very little difference between the groups. Approximately a third of the children (under two years) in both groups had been separated from the mother for more than two days. By the age of five approximately three-quarters of the children had been separated from their mothers and two-thirds had a separation of one week or more. There were no significant differences between the two groups and similar results indicated no significant differences with regard to child-father separation. With regard to the number of separations from their mother of children of all ages similar results were obtained in both groups and the same with regard to the fathers. A considerably greater total duration of separations from both fathers and mothers in the neurotic group was accounted for by a small number of separations of long duration.

Mothers of both groups were also asked to comment on the general effect the separations had on their children on the various occasions that they occurred. Sixty-one per cent. of the total separations were enjoyed or not commented on. Of harmful effects, there was general agreement that they were of a temporary nature and disappeared when normal conditions returned. It appears that when the mothers went away that the parents made the separations as little traumatic as possible, the child either staying with relatives, friends or their fathers and only on rare occasions was institutional care arranged.

The authors considered that these findings support their clinical impressions, that in the great majority of children mental ill-health springs from processes arising from being with their parents rather than away from them. The main difference between the two groups was that in the neurotic group there were a greater number of periods of separation from the mothers lasting over three months which were, in the main, the result of the mother's illness. The position is similar with separations from the fathers; a great proportion of long separations in the neurotic group. But in both instances only a small number of children were affected.

In relating these long separations to their causes they found that the main differences between the disturbed group and the control group reflect on the quality of the parents. In the mother's case the differences can be completely accounted for by the greater amount of illness amongst the mothers of the disturbed group. The mothers of this group rarely visited their children when they were in hospital whereas the control group mothers always did. The neurotic group fathers, when ill, were away twice as long as the fathers of the control group fathers.

From all this we conclude that separation of children from their parents is not necessarily harmful to the children but depends on the emotional stability of their home life. In some cases it may even be beneficial for the child to be separated from its parents.

Bios.

The third, and perhaps the most likely, explanation is that Matusow is a confirmed bandwagon jumper. He says himself that his entry into the ex-Communist underworld was occasioned by his desire "to hit the headlines", to become known, to be somebody. It is not unlikely then that his turnabout was due to the same reasons. It was his most sensational revelation yet, and—a factor which helped him before—he was breaking new ground, for he was the first in the field. He may well have thought that the present more liberal atmosphere in America meant the ditching of the ex-Communist gravy train, and made a jump onto a new (though possibly non-existent) one a worthwhile risk. He had in addition been faulted on some of his evidence; one of his most glaring errors was revealed by the Alsop brothers, the newspaper columnists. "Matusow publicly stated in a speech in Great Falls (Mont.) during the recent Presidential campaign, that 'the Sunday section of the *New York Times* alone has 126 dues-paying Communists'. As it happens the entire staff of the Sunday section of the *New York Times* numbers eighty-seven, including two part-time copy boys." Such comments no doubt helped him to change his mind.

There is a smug egoism about his book which occasionally reveals itself in such sentences as "The harm I had done with the distortion and lies will probably never be completely erased; during my two weeks in the State of Montana my lies found their way into every home, either through my speeches, the radio or newspapers." This inflated sense of his own importance is a further point in favour of the third explanation; though without considerably more evidence on Matusow's character one can do little except speculate on the causes of his change of front.

★

The ugliest side of the whole affair has been the unscrupulous way in which government departments, and not only sensation-hungry Congressional committees, used Matusow and his evidence for their cases without any sort of check on his accuracy. Matusow alleges that at one trial Roy Cohn, one of McCarthy's young men, when a government attorney, rehearsed him in the evidence he should give. "Cohn worked feverishly hard in getting me to memorize my lines so I would not miss my cue. This was not difficult for me. I loved playing acting." His evidence was used and accepted in innumerable investigations many of which could obviously have not been carried out without the help of the F.B.I.—and yet the F.B.I. recently declared, in an ineffective effort to save their reputation, that they had "dropped" Matusow as being unreliable in 1950, at the very start of his career as informer!

Matusow had, of course, the warm support of Senator McCarthy among others of the more reactionary politicians. He reproduces in *False Witness* the title-page of McCarthy's book, *McCarthyism, the Fight for America* which is inscribed "to Harvey Matusow, a great American, thanks, good luck and best wishes—Joe McCarthy."

Matusow and McCarthy, both unscrupulous in their methods and both relying on the gullibility of the people. And no doubt others will continue to flourish in the same manner until the people realise what is being done in their name. M.G.W.

Who's Going to Sweep the Streets?

ONE of the hoariest chestnuts from the Hyde Park heckler is still heard from time to time to the effect that in a free society somebody has to sweep the streets, or—with the more filthy-minded heckler—clean out the sewers.

In Whalley, Lancashire, on the route to Blackpool, the coaches pause a while and deposit the hallmarks of civilization, discarded newspapers, sandwich wrappings, cigarette packets, empty bottles, toffee paper, orange peel, etc., departing for more glorious rubbish dumps. It seems that the Clithero Rural District Council from its lofty height had forgotten Whalley's visitations and had no power to spend money on street-cleaning. Consequently every Sunday this pleasant little village was littered with rubbish left by trippers and no one was employed to clean it up.

Consequently a resident was so appalled by this that he challenged the chairman of the Parish Council to clean the streets himself and promised to help. So at 6.30 to 8.30 a.m. on Sunday the volunteer road-sweepers cleaned up the village.

It seems that when the need for sweeping the streets arises, the volunteers arise too, for next Sunday's volunteer rota is already worked out. A question that arises is what authority decided that Clithero had no power to pay Whalley for street cleaning? J.R.

How to be a Communist Hero

THE more secure a régime is, the more freedom it can allow its people. In view of the general lack of liberty throughout the world, the British can count themselves lucky in the number of civil liberties that are still left to them. But they are left precisely because the State is so secure.

The same British Government which allows us to publish and distribute FREEDOM in this country, bans it in Kenya the State is not as secure as at publication or association. Because in Kenya the State is not as secure as at home. If the British people started resisting their masters as fiercely as Mau Mau or the Malayan resistance forces, our civil liberties would be 'suspended' here too.

It is always an indication of opposition within a country when the State maintains massive 'security' forces. The Communists, of course, always claim that the opposition to their régimes comes from capitalist governments outside and their agents within, or, at most, from the bourgeois hangover from the old régime who practice sabotage against the people's State.

It is, however, an observable fact that the vast majority of the victims of the security forces of Communist States consists either of ideological enemies from the Left or of ordinary workers and peasants who have objected to being shoved around.

So Much Support?

The workers and peasants are always, according to Communist propaganda, the classes who benefit most from their régime, and it is always a little puzzling to simple souls like us Anarchists as to why a régime which enjoys the unanimous support of the people—as the 98 per cent. election figures show!—needs to maintain such large and powerful forces of secret police, with all their part-time marks.

In Russia the secret police has been a most powerful and efficient organisation ever since the Bolsheviks converted the Czar's Okhrana into the Cheka and proceeded to terrorise the Russian people into submission. An odd thing about this organisation has been the way in which, although its very existence is in order to protect the people from traitors and saboteurs, the men who rise to the position of chief of the organisation, invariably turn out to be traitors and saboteurs themselves—e.g. Yeshov, Yagoda and Beria.

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

Role of the Revolutionary

S.F. is probably right in supposing that the rôle of the revolutionary to-day is the most difficult question facing Anarchists. It seems to me that his own approach is typified by these two extracts from his article:

"Is a revolutionary one who actively works towards a change in social conditions and personal relationships . . . or is it the man who here and now withdraws his support from existent irrational institutions . . . ?"

"The total revolutionary . . . must either swell the ranks of revolutionary dependents or become an evangelist and make the propagation of his ideas the end in itself."

S.F. is thus presenting us with an either-or situation. I think he would agree that neither alternative by itself is satisfactory. But do the two exhaust all the possibilities in each case? Can we not find a third way that preserves what is worthwhile in each of the choices offered? From this point of view, let us consider the issues raised by S.F.

The possible definitions of 'revolutionary' range from the narrow advocacy of the complete overthrow of the existing order to the wide seeking of a better society. I think we can accept the wider definition without giving up any valuable element of the former. But a more important reason for breadth of vision here is that we cannot be effective revolutionaries without it: we cannot satisfy S.F.'s first requirement of working towards change in social conditions and personal relationships.

His second requirement of withdrawal from irrational institutions is given much attention in anarchist circles. Yet withdrawal is obviously only one aspect of the process—we are also concerned with what new institutions are inserted. This point is not adequately met by the revolutionary who "creates new and better ones for himself." It is merely dodged by the social simpleton who says "there won't be any institutions in the new society."

Take war as an example. It goes without saying that revolutionaries withdraw support from 'capitalist' wars. But is this always done for the right reason?

This would appear to make the secret police a very dangerous organisation for the Russian State as well as for the Russian people, for the amount of damage a traitor and saboteur can do in the position of supreme head of the 'security' forces is surely far beyond that of any recalcitrant worker.

Why There for so Long?

One may ask, though, why such an organisation has had to exist for so long? One can perhaps understand, if not agree, with the arguments for its existence during the period of revolutionary war and intervention and during a time of cold war and open hostility from the capitalist states. But there was a long time between the wars when, although the Western powers were hostile to the Russian régime, they were far too occupied with their own internal problems to make trouble in Russia, and as an organisation for dealing with enemies from outside the secret police could have been disbanded, or at least considerably reduced.

But it was not. Which indicates that the real reason for its existence is to deal with the State's enemy within—the people. For we must never forget that in dealing with the Czar and making their revolution against him, the Russian people had their ideas about the kind of revolutionary society they wanted. Those ideas may have been vague among the masses and thought out only by a handful of intellectuals; they may not have been quite sure of what they wanted or how to get it. But they certainly knew what they did not want. They didn't want a dictatorial despotism like the Czar's, but that is precisely what they got at the hands of the Bolsheviks. In order, therefore, to maintain this unpopular régime over the people, the Czar's repressive institutions had to be carried on—under different names and professedly for different purposes.

The People Might Try Again

And these repressive institutions are especially necessary for a State faced with a people who have had a revolutionary experience—for having recognised and used their own power, the people would not necessarily be loth to try the same again if the new government did not come up to scratch. This, of course, happened in Russia in 1921, when the sailors and workers of Kronstadt rose up against the already despotic government of the Bolsheviks, only to be

slaughtered into submission by the 'people's' Red Army under the instructions of Lenin and Trotsky.

And whenever a Communist régime has been established, so a secret police force has been created—or taken over. In all the 'Iron Curtain' countries, the political police are features of the 'People's Democracy', whilst in Yugoslavia, Tito has boasted of the socialist institution which he modelled on that of Stalin in Russia. (This was pre-1948).

A way in which People's China has distinguished itself from the other Communist countries has been the grotesque mass trials which were taking place up till a year ago. They seemed to have been moderately successful from the government's point of view, but now comes news again of another series of purges in the party and the Army and

COAL-4

(Continued from last week)

WE may as well reconcile ourselves to a constant condition of crisis as far as coal production is concerned. There will never again be a surplus, never again be a situation in which coal can be exported from this country as it was prior to 1914. The most that could possibly be achieved would be production sufficient to render import unnecessary, and even that is unlikely.

Competitive capitalism demands ever-increasing expansion of productivity, which naturally demands the supply of more and more power. Britain's unbalanced economy is particularly dependent upon this continued expansion and competition, in that, having delegated agriculture to a very secondary position, she is tied to overseas sources of food as well as other raw materials. The slogan 'Export or Die' is quite literally true for a capitalist Britain. Of course, if we were to develop agriculture here to its fullest possible extent, the words 'balance of payments' would not have the sinister ring they have for us to-day, and it is worth remembering that the other great competing industrial powers of the world—America, Russia, Germany, Japan, even France—are either self-supporting as far as food is concerned or else much more nearly so than Britain.

The British economy is therefore a very delicately balanced one to-day—as we have seen in all the post-war crises, the Crippian austerity and devaluation, R. A. Butler's juggling with bank rates, restraint, attempts at wage-freeze, and all the rest of it. It is a continuous fiddle, and back of it all the serious reality that the nation's first real source of energy is giving out.

The Price of Imperialism

All the crises, however, are crises of capitalism and of imperialism. There would be no shortage of coal in this country if Britain were not a 'first-rate power'—with all that entails to-day. In the 19th century, expanding British imperialism had no real competitor either in the military, naval or economic fields. Britannia ruled the waves and a fifth of the land masses of the world as well, and the disorganised working class at home had no power to wrest from their rulers more than the pittance thrown back at them to keep them alive.

It was not until 1914 that any challenge was made to Britain's supremacy, when the Kaiser demanded 'a place in the sun' for rising German industrialism. That threat was beaten back, with the help, no doubt, of God and the millions of the Allied nations, only to be repeated twenty-five years later, and again defeated—but at what cost to the British economy it is impossible to estimate.

To-day, the cost of maintaining Britain's imperialist power is straining the economy to breaking point—for the £1,000 million a year spent of armaments and 'defence' in general is 'necessary' only for a country with the commitments that go with being a 'first-class power' in the capitalist sense.

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT! WEEK 33

Deficit on Freedom £495
Contributions received £432
DEFICIT £63

August 12 to August 18

Pontardawe: Anon. 6/6; Falmouth: R.W. 4/-;
Sheffield: G.P.* 5/-; London: D.M. 3/-;
London: R.S. £6/5/0; London: P.H. 10/-;
Glasgow: S.M. 5/-; Preston: J.L.M. 1/6;
Patricroft: A.G. 3/-; Westcott: M.G.W. 1/8;
Donaghadee: J.T. £1; London: Anon. 10/-;
Maidenhead: L.S. 2/-; London: N.B.T.* 5/-;
Los Angeles: Italian Group per A.S. £8/15/0.
Total 18 16 8
Previously acknowledged 413 5 3

1955 TOTAL TO DATE £432 1 11

GIFT OF BOOKS: Frankfurt: Z.

of disciplinary measures throughout the whole country.

For Intimidation

A report from *The Observer's* correspondent in Hong Kong tells us that a new campaign of 'discipline' is being launched which threatens to be the most thorough of its kind yet. Robert Franklin writes:

'After months of the usual propaganda preparation this latest campaign was officially launched on July 27 by Lo Jui-ching, Minister of Public Security, in a lengthy, fire-eating speech to the National People's Congress. It has been gaining momentum ever since and one million copies of Lo's speech are now being put into book form to serve as a campaign manual.'

'The ostensible purpose of the campaign is the eradication of hidden "counter-revolutionaries"; but it is really part of a continuing process of intimidation designed to exact unquestioning

obedience to the party at every level of society.'

Franklin then maintains that the campaign should be taken as an indication of the Party's strength rather than as evidence of threatening disaffection. It is hard to believe however that such a costly campaign would be undertaken if there were no signs evident to the Party bosses of growing dissatisfaction. In fact *The Observer's* correspondent writes that 'in the country the campaign will serve to check growing peasant dissatisfaction with the Government's stringent grain collection policy.'

It Depends on the Nark

It is a sign of strength in that the Party has the power to launch and carry through its purges, but surely the necessity for such measures indicates a weakness in the ability of the régime to remain stable other than by repression from above. Franklin says the campaign will provide the rationale for ridding the party, the Army and the Government of deadwood or politically unreliable personnel, and of bringing under still tighter control teachers, businessmen, and others who, though suspect by party standards, are still needed for their skills.

The nature of the régime that is created by such methods can perhaps be gauged by the correspondent's final paragraph, which, we feel, needs no further comment from us.

Robert Franklin tells us that:

'The slightest misdemeanour is likely to be labelled an act of sabotage to suit the campaign's purpose. Already the campaign has produced one rather unsavoury by-product. Successful informers now become eligible for an ominous new State award, that of "Security Hero." This week a 21-year-old Peking artisan who had turned over 281 suspects to the police was made "Security Hero, Class A".'

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

LECTURE-DISCUSSIONS

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB
155 High Holborn, W.C.1.

(Nearly opposite Holborn Town Hall)

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

Every Thursday at 8.15.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS

Weather Permitting
HYDE PARK
Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

MANETTE STREET
(Charing X Road)
Saturdays at 5.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OUTDOORS

At Maxwell Street
Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

The Malatesta Club

155 HIGH HOLBORN,
LONDON, W.C.1.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP
Informal Discussions Every Thursday,
at 8.15 p.m.

Lecture-Discussions Every Sunday
at 7.45 p.m.

ALL WELCOME

DISCUSSIONS

A Trilogy

By BONAR THOMPSON

DICKENS, WILDE & SHAW

Alternate Thursdays at 8.30

September 1st: Wilde

September 15th: Shaw

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 17/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)

6 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)

3 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies

12 months 27/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)

6 months 13/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers

FREEDOM PRESS

27 Red Lion Street

London, W.C.1. England

Tel.: Chancery 8364

Freedom needs more Readers
Are You Helping?