

Secret Deportations in Australia

PROGRESSIVE opinion has gained a significant victory this week with the announcement that 3 Portuguese sailors and 2 Malaysians ordered to be deported some months ago are now to remain in Australia. All 5 men would have been forcibly returned to their country of origin had they not evaded arrest and sought the protection of a sympathetic public.

This does not mean that the Government has abandoned its racialism or plans to change the White Australia Policy: a few days before the announcement the Court ruled that the deportation of the 3 Portuguese sailors was legally valid.

The Government has merely acknowledged the pressure of public opinion for these particular men. In reality they have now resorted to *secret* deportations.

Only a few weeks ago the public learned that a Chinese deserter from Communism, Mr. W. Wong, had been seized at his place of employment, and handed back to Communist guards as an illegal immigrant, at the Hong Kong-China border in April.

This Eichmann-like operation was revealed when 2 Right-Wing Parliamentarians attempted to use the incident for political ends.

One of them, Sir Wilfred Kent-Hughes had known about the deportation but planned to prevent it at the eleventh hour when the man reached Hong Kong. This was no humanitarian gesture. He does not oppose the White Australia Policy. Sir Wilfred merely insisted that Wong should be sent to Formosa as the Australian Government does not recognise the Peking régime!!

The Minister for Immigration, Mr. A. Downer, was thus forced to send a cable—which arrived too late—requesting that Wong be held at Hong Kong. The two "rebels" then informed the public regarding the affair and stated that they believed that at least 8 or 9 other unknown Chinese deserters had been returned in this way. Their fate is not known. The Government refused to reveal their names.

Events have shown that a considerable proportion of the population are now prepared to defy the Government and break the racist laws imposed by both the Labour and Liberal politicians.

They have now seen racialism in action. A.A.G.

ANARCHY 16 (OUT NEXT WEEK)

WILL BE ON
AFRICA

ANARCHY 15 discusses THE WORK OF DAVID WILLS

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 1/6 on the last Saturday of every month.
ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

IF we wanted to we could fill this issue of FREEDOM with reports of unrest in every part of the world. In this country strike action was threatened (officially!) by the dock workers, engineering workers, airline maintenance workers and among the nurses, not to mention the unrest in almost every other industry or service. But in all countries "affluent" or "underdeveloped" this pattern of unrest and dissatisfaction with their lot is growing among the working masses. Add to the economic unrest the political agitation: the States of South America always in ferment, now it is Venezuela and Argentina. Cuba and the Caribbean live on a political volcano. The United States has its problems of overproduction and of employment and racialism; France has Algeria and de Gaulle, Italy "prosperity" and Sicily; Franco after more than 20 years in power and American dollars to bolster him, is faced with widespread strikes in his industrial areas (is this an indication of the falangists challenging

Unrest Everywhere

his rule as well as a growing unrest of workers who can no longer live on starvation wages in a country where the cost of living rises faster than their wages, and where the rich grow richer?); in nearby Portugal, police fired on anti-Government demonstrators last week; in Algeria more Moslems are being killed each day since the cease fire than when France was at war with them; Africa is seething and starving; Yugoslavia is in economic troubles and Tito has personally waved the big stick of new measures to control trade, prices and wages; in the Saar, 45,000 miners were on strike last week for pay increases—there has been no major strike in this area since 1923—in spite of West German "prosperity". And when the crisis is not economic it's something else. In Ceylon there's trouble about the

Press, in Ghana about detentions without trial, in South Africa there's a case of heresy; and the International Labour Organisation in Geneva points to "forced labour" in seven of France's former West African colonies.

We are not suggesting that the unrest is of a revolutionary nature. What we are pointing out is that unrest is not a phenomenon of the "backward", hungry countries. It is general. There are more working days lost through strikes in the affluent countries than in the backward ones. They can afford to, someone will say. That is probably true, but it also confirms our view that the affluent society if anything increases the demands workers make on the employers and does not, as some maintain make them into subservient yes-men. We believe, fur-

ther, that thinking workers will not only demand a larger share of the cake, they will demand to enjoy, or control *all* the cake of production as well as having equal rights with all their fellow citizens. Thinking workers, however much their boss pays them, want something more than money in return for their labour, they want the time to live a full and free life. We have no fear that workers in the affluent society will become less revolutionary than when they were faced with unemployment and low wages. As a matter of fact we hadn't noticed that they *were* revolutionary in the bad old days! What we have noticed, however, is that there are many potential revolutionaries among the "middle class", etc. . . . supporters of the Committee of 100. It makes you think, doesn't it?

Myths and Reality

ONE of the really serious problems, from our point of view, of mass communications is not so much that it conditions people to prefer Omo to Daz, or *vice versa*, and to desire gadgets and useless things to which they would otherwise not have given a moment's thought, but that all kinds of myths, lies and unfounded statements, by continuous repetition become accepted as absolute truths without the majority of people ever bothering to question the bases of these "truths". For mass communications, by creating the myth that everything in the modern world is so complex that it is beyond the grasp of we ordinary mortals, has paved the way for a privileged class of "experts" whose word is gospel, whose opinions are presented as facts, and whose facts no one, who does not want to look a fool in public, would dare to question! Indeed only the experts themselves have a chance of questioning in public the facts of their fellow-experts. Incidentally we find it strange that very few people seem to learn a lesson from the disagreements between "experts". Think of two outstanding "experts" of our time, on the Origins of Man: The Pope and Prof. Julian Huxley. For millions the Pope is without question right in all he says, otherwise he would not occupy the exalted place in God's church that he does; similarly for other millions, who believe in the infallibility of Science, Dr. Huxley's scientific approach, and his eminence in the world of science stamp his utterances with the seal of truth. We believe both the attitudes we have described are equally "dogmatic". After all, the school of thought of which the pope is an eminence includes other eminences, and there is still no unanimity among them as to the facts, let alone the interpretations of the facts! Similarly among the men of science. Perhaps through no fault of their own, though we think publicists-scientists must accept their share of the responsibility, mass communications serves up what are in reality

hypotheses as facts, and scientific facts as truths.

We think the anarchist approach to these questions was clearly and succinctly expressed by Malatesta when he wrote:

I do not believe in the infallibility of Science, neither in its ability to explain everything nor in its mission of regulating the conduct of Man, just as I do not believe in the infallibility of the Pope, in revealed Morality and the divine origins of the Holy Scriptures.

I only believe those things which can be proved; but I know full-well that *proofs* are relative and can, and are in fact, continually being superseded and cancelled out by other proved facts; and therefore I believe that doubt should be the mental approach of all who aspire

to getting always closer to the truth, or at least to that much of truth that it is possible to establish. . . .

To the *will to believe*, which cannot be other than the desire to invalidate one's own reason, I oppose the *will to know*, which leaves the immense field of research and discovery open to us. As I have already stated, I admit only that which can be proved in a way that satisfies my reason—and I admit it only *provisionally, relatively*, always in the expectation of new truths which are more true than those so far discovered. No *faith* then, in the religious sense of the word.*

★

THERE is, to our mind, the danger that the development of the social sciences and the knowledge

that Man is acquiring of himself not only is being used for the wrong ends, but will be retailed to the lay public in a way which will convince people that though they are what they are through no fault of theirs nevertheless there is nothing they can do to change the pattern of society. And this picture of mankind biologically and socially determined will be presented by "experts" using all the scientific clichés at their command and with the same dogmatism and belief in the infallibility of science, as the believers in Man's fall from grace, in his inherent wickedness, and his need for salvation who seek to oblige him to come to terms with a world in which most people are socially and economically condemned to live as underdogs. All the "scientific" dogma does which the religious doesn't, is to try to take away the sense of

Continued on page 3

IF ever anarchists were tempted to vote it might have been last Friday at the municipal elections. It has been claimed by some that local politics are 'real politics'. That local politics deal in local issues on which one can be expected to have a voice and some control. Reading (for example) in the *West London Observer* that "re-covering the floor of Notting Hill library may cost the Kensington ratepayers £345 10s. Kensington Council are being asked to accept a tender for that amount". This is something tangible and real, floors, linoleum, books, one may see the new lino, or indeed, trip over the old on the way in.

One may, in theory, vote for the forward-looking lino-laying cultural 'goodie' or what is more often done, abstain from voting for the reactionary culture-hating, lino-denying 'baddie'; or alternatively, vote for the forthright independent economic conservator of municipal funds and abstain from voting for the squandering, grafting, pleasure-loving, power-seeking municipalizer. The issue is, on the face of it, real. The people concerned are real. You may live next door to them, you may have gone to school with them.

In the face of all this reality it would seem amazing that the abstention rate is higher in local elections than in national elections. It may be that living next door to candidates, or going to school with them tends one to take a rather cynical view of their lino-laying activi-

CONFOUND THEIR POLITICS

ties or abilities.

The decline of independence in local elections, or indeed in local councils, has led to a realization that this illusion of real issues, of real decision-making is hard to keep up. Indeed the phoney adoption of the label 'independent' by right-wing candidates is a cynical admission of the deception.

The centralization of power in government and the financial pressures put upon local authorities to toe the (party) line is evidence of the decline of local autonomy. The recent decision to liquidate the L.C.C. was a purely party-measure to break the Tammany-like hold of County Hall. The decision upon education in London was only rescinded when it was proved, by a series of rowdy Parent-Teacher meetings, to have touched too delicate a nerve for a by-election-apprehensive Tory party.

One will remember too the pressure

put upon St. Pancras council to instal Civil Defence against their wishes. (St. Pancras has again swung to the left) and George Lansbury and the Poplar councillors' imprisonment testify to the pressure that central Government can bring. An attempt to gerrymander London in order that it may be amenable to central government's wishes is the obvious tactic of a power-hungry group seeking to bypass any checks and balances and disguising their move as 'decentralisation'.

The local elections have been further complicated by the dock-strike, increased Liberal candidature and the CND, all tending to make confusion worse confounded. The dock-strike threat was supposed to show how the Socialists were proposing to throw us all into chaos. Perhaps the electorate thought, not unnaturally, that Mr. Gaitskell was no Socialist, nevertheless it didn't scare them, unless it turned them over to the Liberals. Now, with a miraculous eleventh hour rescue the Government and the employers can take the credit for being the peacemakers—or for *not* pushing us over the brink.

The Liberals, the new generation of political virgins, can 'tut-tut' at the whoring going on around them and point to their own unsullied record—since 1918, which was oddly enough the last time they had power. By a curiously ambiguous attitude to the vital questions of the day, the Common Market

Continued on page 4

