

Bevan at Bay in Saint Pancras

THE SAINTS GO MARCHING IN

happens to most politicians sooner or later. Indeed for the rule rebel it is an absolute must to achieve his ambitions; it is equivalent of a 'blooding' at a hunting meet, and of initiation in equally primitive communities.

happened to Aneurin Bevan Sunday. Five years ago, when the militants were cynically claiming Bevan would go the way of all mortal flesh, the faithful were chiefly maintaining their faith by assuring us how wrong we were. Sunday some of the faithful showed up at a Labour Party delegation meeting and shouted down Bevan's idol.

Five years ago, such a happening was unthinkable. Bevan was leading a militant campaign for a more radical policy for the Labour Party. He had resigned from the last Labour Government and was distancing himself from the 'right wing' leadership over German rearmament and the Health Service—the latter was a great issue of principle for the former Minister of Health—rearmament in general and the whole range and tendency of Labour policy.

For the minority of militants among the rank and file of the Party, the emergence of Nye Bevan came like an angel from heaven, after the purgatory of the six years in office, with its inevitable adjustments to the necessities of running British capitalism. The Party was in the doldrums and was obviously on the way out, it had not introduced a new form of society into war-weary Britain and the strain of giving birth to such reforms as it did introduce was too much for the poor old Party's metabolism. The labour pains were getting it down, and the still-born social revolution which emerged was a great disappointment to the family.

Jumped the Gun

Bevan clearly saw in 1951 that Labour was going to lose the

Don't Look Now—But I think your Defences have Slipped!

WASHINGTON, APRIL 18.

Western scientists have now found a way to defeat enemy radar. It is done by painting aircraft with a special coating which will prevent the aircraft registering on the radar screen. No paint yet developed will completely hide an object from radar, but the better paints are said to reduce greatly the chances of detection.

Work is still going on, but officials of the Department of Defence in Washington say the method should have wide use after it has been perfected. There is only one fly in the ointment—Russia is believed to be working on the same line of research. If that is the case and the Russians develop a good anti-radar paint the protection offered by the Distant Early Warning (Dew) line in Canada and the Texas tower radar warning stations out in the Atlantic will be greatly reduced.

The greatest concern is what these new coatings will mean to the Western programme of developing an anti-missile missile. Radar is still the most advanced and probably the easiest equipment to incorporate in a missile to destroy other missiles. The United States already plans to paint its intercontinental missiles with anti-radar coatings if the Russians develop an anti-missile missile dependent on radar.—British United Press.

next election and got out of office. When he resigned from his position of Minister of Labour, therefore, he was confident that he was making no great sacrifice, but was in fact jumping the gun. Better to resign in a blaze of glory than just to be slung out with the rest of the boys, for then he had the chance of rallying the Party's scattered forces behind his own personality banner.

As the *Tribune*-Bevanite campaign gathered momentum the 'split' in the Party was said to be doing it a great deal of harm, but that was not the view of this paper. The Bevanites were in fact the shrewdest political tacticians of the lot and knew fully well that Labour had not the slightest chance of getting back to power in 1955, and that the best game was to breathe life into the tired old body and build up for the election after that—by which time, it was safe to bet, the electorate would be sick of the Tories and ready to send the pendulum swinging back. It was our contention at this time that Bevan, in spite of superficial evidence to the contrary and the shadow-boxing with the 'Right wing' leadership, was in fact serving the Party well in bringing back the disgruntled militants.

But as far as Bevan himself was concerned, we wrote at the time of his original resignation from office:

'Mr Bevan is a shrewd politician, and an able word-spinner, and an ambitious man. Such characteristics, to our minds,

convince us that Mr. Bevan's "sacrifice" is just a tactical move in the struggle for leadership of the Labour Party. He has no more intention of floundering in the political wilderness preaching revolutionary socialism than the anarchists have of standing for Parliament.'

He Gets the Bird

Seven years later Bevan's shrewdness, the cunning of his tactics and the measure of his sacrifice are now becoming clear to all—even to the suckers who cheered him as their champion five years ago, when their votes, from the constituency Labour Parties, were keeping him in the Party Executive while the Trade Union bosses were afraid of his tac-

tics and the 'right-wing' leaders of his influence.

Last Sunday Bevan got the bird from his former source of strength in the Party. But now he no longer needs them, so it doesn't matter. Now he is lined up himself with the 'right-wing' and in the running for the job of Foreign Secretary should Labour win the next election. And after all Foreign Secretary is Number Two to the Prime Minister, and it is by no means impossible that the Number One job could fall in Nye's lap if he plays his cards correctly. And that would indeed be a great achievement for the ex-pit boy from the Rhondda Valley.

His phraseology on Sunday, in meeting the challenge from his ex-supporters was interesting. During

*FREEDOM 28/4/51—See "Selections from Freedom" (Mankind is One) Vol. I, 1951, p.42.

The 'Law of the Sea' Conference

FISH: FOOD OR FINANCE?

FOR the past two months the representatives of 86 nations have been attending a "law of the sea" conference in Geneva. Only a few incurable romantics might imagine that this could be a gathering of fisherman and sea-dogs from all parts of the world exchanging yarns and experiences. And they would be as hopelessly wrong as they are incurably romantic! We would be

prepared to wager that the Geneva conference was in fact a gathering of lawyers, representing the 86 governments with more lawyers, representing business interests lurking in the background, watching every move, and "advising" their national spokesmen in the name of "the national interest". The Geneva conference was no step towards greater freedom of the sea; on the contrary it was convened, among other reasons, to seek to define the territorial sea. That is to extend the national frontiers beyond the visible land and to erect our economic and political iron curtains on the "continental shelf" which was defined at a plenary session as

the seabed beyond territorial waters to where the sea becomes 100 fathoms deep—and also beyond that limit to where any additional depth of water still allows exploitation of natural resources on the seabed. It also applies to the seabed round islands.

But while the nations were able to agree almost unanimously on baselines, roadsteads, low-tide elevations, closing lines, outermost harbour works, they could not decide on the limits of territorial waters and fishing rights! And it is obvious that they never will, or if they do it will only be as a result of some pretty fishy diplomatic sleight of hand. As it was the American compromise solution of a six mile limit as opposed to Britain's preference for the old three-mile limit and Iceland's interest in increasing it to twelve miles, was violently attacked by the Canadian and Saudi Arabian delegates who accused the Americans of having used "surprise tactics, deplorable manoeuvres and undue pressure behind the scenes". Only Australia's proposal that the matter should be shelved until next winter prevented more dirty linen from being washed in public.

Britain who had reluctantly agreed

A Fishy Theory

PEKING, APRIL 14.

Chinese women have disproved a popular theory that the swallowing of live tadpoles has a contraceptive effect, the *People's Day* reported to-day. Some women swallowed as many as twenty tadpoles a day during a test period, but they still had babies.—Reuter.

his defence of his present pro-H-Bomb policy, he was shouted down, and he replied:

'There you are: there are the moralists. These are the pure saints; you see how these comrades like to polarise the movement.'

There were more loud and long shouts of protest at this, and Mr. Bevan appealed, 'Do not let us destroy this movement by charges of insincerity from one side or the other.'

Which is pretty rich from the man who led the Bevanites in denunciation of the insincerity of the official leadership when he was mounting his crusade. The difference is, however, that Bevan was playing a game; the delegates on Sunday really meant it.

The Workers' Allies

Even more interesting were his later remarks. Following further opposition, he cried:

'Those who desire Great Britain should have no allies and only Russia should

Continued on p. 4

The Case of Driver Trew Responsibility and Social Service

THE driver of the steam train which crashed into an electric train at Lewisham in December, killing a number of people, had a harrowing time in the dock at the Old Bailey last week, when a jury failed to reach a verdict on the charge of manslaughter of the guard of the electric train.

Trew, who has been driving for 25 years (without an accident), throughout the trial, and indeed, since the accident, showed obvious signs of mental strain which is hardly the manifestation of an individual indifferent to the lives of others.

It seems to us unnecessarily cruel and pointless to put a man on trial for an accident which occurred under the most trying conditions. (Not that the legal system is ever very concerned with humane principles).

Descriptions of the conditions were given by two drivers, one travelling as a passenger in the electric train into which the steam train crashed, the other was the driver.

It was stated that after leaving New Cross the track went into a cutting, which was a "trough of darkness". Under normal conditions a signal was a bit difficult to see. It was behind a bridge . . . when the fog was dense a driver would be running "practically blind".

The driver of the electric train was asked by the defence what chance a driver of a steam train had, standing in his ordinary position, of seeing signals if his boiler was 30 ft. long. The reply was that, in his opinion, he could not see them.

The case for the prosecution was that the driver showed "such disregard for the life and safety of others as to amount to a crime against the state and conduct deserving of punishment".

Crime against the state? Does this mean destruction of state property and the fact that the railway authorities will have to compensate the relatives of the people killed?

The assumption is too that drivers involved in these accidents accused of having a disregard for other people's lives also have a total disregard for their own. It was merely chance that Trew was not killed himself.

The responsibility which is placed on public drivers for other people's lives is rarely acknowledged by the majority of people. We take it for granted that when we step in a train or a bus every day we will arrive to and from our destinations in safety. Yet when these men make a demand for higher wages there is usually a "public outcry". If they go on strike to press their claim, fellow-workers and others grumble at the inconvenience.

Accidents will occur in any society, although it is obvious that they can be minimised by improvements on road and rail conditions. Further, if reactions slow down as men get older, thus making it necessary to replace older drivers with younger ones, any economically sane society should arrange for the replacement without loss to the older man who has given years of work to public service.

The (Slow) Emergence of Anti-War Films

PRESUMABLY satisfied that the world is now convinced that Errol Flynn liberated Burma single-handed while Alan Ladd mopped up the rest of the Pacific, or, perhaps, that the sands of Iwojima no longer have the same pulling power at the box office, the film makers are slowly discovering that there are other stories about war that are worth telling.

It may be that they are finding television competition such that they can only hold audiences in the cinema by treating them as adults—which for Hollywood and most British film producers is a pretty drastic solution to their problem. One, in fact, which they are clearly very loth to adopt.

The cinema's first reaction to the theft of its customers by the idiot's lantern was the childish one of "My Daddy's bigger than yours". A film had to be big, as though quantity and quality are synonymous and indeed for one film it was thought sufficient to advertise it as BIG to make sure of pulling the suckers in.

To match the territorial sweep of the epic (usually a dramatic pygmy) screens have swollen so that now one watches a film with the same neck exercise as one would get watching tennis, and the gimmicks have got stereophonier without the moguls apparently realising for a long time that there's no fool like a big fool.

Is the Art Improved?

This is not to say that the wide screen and full colour have nothing to add to the film as spectacle, nor that it cannot be used with good taste. American musicals, with their lavish vigour and their often semi-surrealist choreography and decor, or westerns making full use of America's fabulous scenery—these can clearly benefit tremendously if the equipment is under the control of a director of integrity.

But the art of the cinema; is this improved by magnification? The answer to this was provided last year when a short spate of films all modestly pro-

duced in black-and-white and narrow frame, hit the cinemas without any ballyhoo and in at least one case without any West End showing. And ironically enough, two of the most interesting, *A Man is Ten Feet Tall* and *Twelve Angry Men*, came to the cinema after having been originally written and produced for television.

The rest included *The Great Man and Face in the Crowd*, which might have been regarded as a cinematic smack at television since they both dealt with the corrupt reality behind television personalities, and *The Sweet Smell of Success*, another exposé, incidentally, of the corruption of power, this time in a newspaper man.

None of these films were epics, but they all had one thing in common: they credited their audiences with intelligence. In some ways the most interesting (and the one that didn't get the West End showing), *A Man is Ten Feet Tall* went further than the rest in that it presented a Negro (Sydney Poitier) as the hero and the superior, guide and mentor of a guilt-ridden white man. Such a portrayal had never been seen on the American screen before, where the Negro was usually a figure of fun, the Stepin Fetchit model.

Adult War Films Missing

The films mentioned were all produced by small independent companies, in some cases run by the stars appearing in them, but some films with adult appeal also appeared from the bigger studios, like *Baby Doll*, *The Rainmaker*, *Rose Tattoo*.

The spectacular crap was also turned out, of course, and the least said about that the better. What was conspicuous by its absence was the intelligent war film—which really means the anti-war film, or at least the objective film which does not portray everyone on 'our' side as pure white heroes and all the 'enemy' as sadistic cowards.

What war films were made in the first decade after the war which attempted to portray real people caught up in terrible circumstances and not simply to make propaganda with blood-and-guts violence? The only one that springs to my

mind which had general circulation is *A Walk in the Sun*, although there were others like *A Time Out of War* which went around the 'art' cinemas. But what else?

A year ago it was possible to ask 'Where are the anti-war films?' and get no answer save the above. To-day one can see the gradual emergence of war films which avoid the black-and-white propaganda of war-time and its immediate aftermath.

So far such films do little more than raise a questioning eyebrow at the great evil of war itself; they discuss side issues, or clothe their message in contexts of the past which do not too obviously bear on the present. *Paths of Glory* for example, dealt with the blunders of a French officer in the First World War, but the attitude of Kirk Douglas, star of the film, is not in doubt. When *Time* magazine referred to the film's anti-militarism as an 'old-fashioned passion'. Douglas wrote in to say that if that were so, he was glad to be old-fashioned.

The Stupidity of Militarism

The currently-released epic film of Hemingway's *Farewell to Arms* is also a story of World War I, but its poignancy could not survive the Jennifer Jones/Rock Hudson treatment, and only Vittorio de Sica turned in a performance professionally convincing. Still, it told a tale of a love more important than war or morality, of an out-of-wedlock pregnancy and the stupid cruelty of militarism and the war fever, though its ending seemed suspiciously like a crime-does-not-pay judgment.

Raising moral issues in war itself, *Orders to Kill* has attracted attention—and rightly. It demonstrates how difficult it is to kill directly, individually, but how easy remotely, from a distance, in a story of a bomber pilot who had cheerfully dropped bombs on cities, thinking nothing of the innocent he was slaughtering with the guilty, but how he is eaten up with doubts when ordered to kill one man (whom he gets to know) with his bare hands. This is the first post-second war film to question the basic immorality of war itself, in presenting the

obvious truth of the slaughter of the innocents and of the terrible nature of the act of murder.

Most interesting is the development of the attitude towards Japan. In *A Town Like Alice* the savagery of Japanese officers towards their captives was amply demonstrated—but alongside that was presented a humble guard, a family man with kindly impulses, as much a victim of his circumstances as the prisoners in his charge. Following that, *Sayonara*, not a war-film but a film of the American military in Japan during the Korean war and, again, of the stupid cruelty of the military mind and of how, on the individual level, racial and national differences are overcome.

This film gives an affectionate demonstration of the charm of Japanese customs and of their theatrical art, which contrasts strongly with the 'little yellow savages' line on which we are encouraged to hate the whole Japanese nation.

Highly Civilized

Together with *Don't go Near the Water and Teahouse of the August Moon*, *Sayonara* presents Asiatics in a charming light, showing them as highly civilized people, relaxed, happy, or dedicated to their loyalties in an admirable fashion and, in the first and third, good enough to marry Americans, than which there is no higher praise.

Such sentiments would have been unthinkable ten years ago—or even eight, as the story of *Sayonara* shows, and we who fought the xenophobia of war and hate propaganda might preen ourselves that at last such a powerful establishment as the film industry is coming round to our view.

We might—if it were not for one or two factors that are worth noting. Firstly, that among the nations of Asia which are presented with such understanding, the largest is missing. As far as the film-makers of America and Britain are concerned, China cannot be said to exist as a civilized country, any more than Russia can.

Thinking along these lines, one begins to see the reason for the slow emergence

of anti-war films and for the 'objective' nature of some of those which do raise the questioning eyebrow.

Needs of the Cold War

Can it be that the cold war develops too soon after the end of the shooting war, before the film makers had time to adjust themselves to peace—and then the demands of war-economy war-preparation made necessary the continuance of war-propaganda?

And can it be that what we are now is not meant to criticise war but to untie our knotted hatreds of the Germans and the Japanese—because these enemies are our friends in a common struggle against those who used to be our allies!

Consider *The Enemy Below*, for example. In this film of an American destroyer's battle with a German submarine, the sub commanded is portrayed as anti-war and anti-Hitler and the destroyer's captain is equally unenthusiastic about the war. They fight other to a standstill and find a comradeship in mutual defeat.

All very fine in healing old wounds. But can we imagine such a portrayal of a Russian submarine commander? It would be the measure of the stupidity of a film producer's anti-militarism. We can read between the lines and find a particular instance to a general comment. If the Germans and the Japanese are not so bad after all, might not the Russians and Chinese be likewise?

But unhappily the majority of our fellows do not seem to argue thus. We are told to hate, they hate; when told to be friendly, they are friendly.

That's the way it is. And even *Orders to Kill*, the only film so far to raise a moral question, as distinct from whitewashing the ex-enemy,* ends by practically saying that there's no point in worrying over taking one's life when so many have already been destroyed.

So still the film industry faithfully serves the State. At the moment it apparently subtle stuff that is needed. But be sure that when the blood and guts are demanded again, Hollywood will not be found wanting.

*This seems to be contradicted by the sudden appearance of *Camp on Blood Island*, but I take this to be an aberration against the current trend.

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

OPEN DAILY

(Open 10 a.m.—6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats.)

New Books . . .

Three Plays Thornton Wilder 18/-
Atelier 12 Herbert Read, etc. 12/-
Homosexuality, etc. E. de Savitsch 12/6
An Unfinished Novel
Germany and the Revolution in
Russia 1915-18 Z. A. B. Zeman 25/-
The Question H. Alleg 10/6
Film as Art Rudolf Arnheim 25/-
Endgame Samuel Beckett 10/6
Parables for the Theatre Samuel Beckett 7/6
Berthold Brecht 10/6

Reprints and

Cheap Editions . . .

The Beast in Man Emile Zola 3/6
Nana Emile Zola 3/6
Clochemerle-Babylon
Gabriel Chevallier 3/6
The Honeyed Peace
Martha Gellhorn 2/6
Language in History H. Goad 3/6

Pamphlets . . .

Where Do the Marxists Go
From Here? J. E. M. Arden 2/6

Second-Hand . . .

Conflicts L. B. Namier 3/-
The World's Hunger
Frank A. Pearson & Floyd A. Harper 2/6
Morality Fair
Geoffrey Williamson 4/-
The Whistler's Room
Paul Alverdes 2/6
An Examination of Weismannism
G. J. Romanes 3/6
Psychology of the Moral Self
B. Bosanquet 3/6
The House and the Fort
Charles Humana 3/6
We Did Not Fight
Maxton, Pollitt, Russell, etc. 4/6
The Progress of Man
A. M. Hocart 4/-
The Invaders Lyof N. Tolstoy 4/-
Ivan Ilyitch Lyof N. Tolstoy 4/-
Sevastopol Lyof N. Tolstoy 4/-

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

Postage free on all items

Obtainable from

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

The Readjustment of Winston Smith

The case of Winston Smith, who was rehabilitated to responsible citizenship in 1984, has been misrepresented in a wholly irresponsible manner. Readers will be glad to have the opportunity of seeing extracts from the actual case-notes of this patient who was under psychiatric treatment for some months and was successfully readjusted.

THE patient came to see Dr. O'Brien in the company of his mistress, Julia, in the Spring of 1984. He was in considerable emotional distress and confusion and in need of psychiatric counselling. It was apparent that both he and the girl were suffering from paranoid delusions regarding the political nature of Oceanic society and other matters, and were involved in all sorts of delusions, real and fantasied, and their condition was that of a *folie à deux*. They actually asked Dr. O'Brien to put them in touch with the traitor Goldstein.

As the patient worked in the Ministry of Truth, and was obviously a bad security risk, Dr. O'Brien at once informed the police.

The patient was admitted to a private psychiatric ward after police investigations had shown that no actual harm had resulted from his traitorous derangement, but that the psychopathic tendencies of the couple had led them into sexual and other forms of delinquency. Officials from all three Ministries kindly consented to interview the patient in the hope of reasoning him out of his bizarre delusions about the nature of society in Oceania, but he remained persistently paranoid.

Personal History

Home background bad. Lack of paternal discipline in the home, a weak and ineffectual mother, sibling rivalry and juvenile delinquency. The patient proved a bad husband and his marriage broke down. Reputation of poor integration in the neighbourhood community and

solitary gin drinking. Recent history of fornication before psychiatric breakdown.

Psychological Status

Wechsler Bellvue Form I. IQ=130. No abnormal signs on the record except for an exceptionally low score on Social Comprehension, e.g. in answer to "Why are criminals locked up?" the patient replied "They're not—they rule us." With an IQ of 130 the patient must be considered as of superior intellect, but the general pattern of his responses indicates a psychopathic personality.

Rorschach Record. The patient did not co-operate. He persistently stated that the cards reminded him of nothing but Ministry of Truth hand-outs as they were meaningless blots of ink.

Physical Status

Reflexes — normal. Wasserman and Standard Kahn — negative. Physical deformities — nil. A bad varicose ulcer on left leg. Some signs of avitaminosis and debility probably due to alcoholic indulgence and bad eating habits. Multiple abrasions on limbs and trunk: patient would give no rational explanation for these injuries, facetiously ascribing them to "police brutality". Inspector Thugge reports that these abrasions were found on both the patient and his female delinquent partner at the time of their arrest. Probably the result from past sado-masochistic practices together.

Dr. O'Brien's Treatment Notes

12/6/84. Pt. was given non-convulsive electric therapy to relieve depression and make him more amenable to psychotherapy. Pt. hallucinated pain under the electric shock, and appeared to think that the purpose of the therapy was to hurt him.

Pt has little insight into his condition and does not admit that he is mentally ill. He projects his own sadistic and destructive impulses on to me, the clinic, the police, Big Brother and every respectable institution. Like most paranoids he imagines that "they" are persecuting him. He fantasies that I originally enrolled him for a traitorous conspiracy against the State when he first sought my advice, before his arrest.

19/6/84. Continued electric therapy. Little progress in imparting insight to the pt.

28/6/84. Increased electric shock to 1,500 m.v. Some progress. Pt. hallucinated great pain and was amenable to discussion afterwards. He projects an Oedipus hostility on to Big Brother and shows signs of transference to me, together with some masochistic tender feelings of dependence. The hallucinated pain is undoubtedly self-punitive, as is his varicose ulcer which he has maintained for years. He is beginning to show a proper attitude of guilt and revulsion towards his sexual delinquency with Julia but he will not admit or has repressed memory of the nature of the brutal perversities which they must have practised to render them both so bruised and lacerated before they were taken into custody.

4/7/84. More fruitful discussion after electric shock treatment. Pt now admits that he is mentally ill but cannot clearly understand the nature of the benevolence of the Party towards him. He is worried by the purpose of the War Effort and continues to project sadistic fantasies on to the Ministry of Peace. In the course of free association he produced a specific phobia—*rat phobia*. This he admits is essentially neurotic. It can be traced to incestuous fantasies in his early childhood. It may be possible to effect Pavlovian de-conditioning of this phobia, and at the same time remove a whole syndrome of psycho-sexual revolt against recent social morality.

11/7/84. Intensified the shock treatment with same voltage but double sessions. This may make eventual leucotomy unnecessary.

18/7/84. Pt now shows considerable emotional dependence on me, and after shock sessions will admit the truth of anything I say, but still does not understand it. He embarks on futile philosophical speculations on the nature of truth in a typically schizophrenic manner.

I told pt the news that Julia had responded well to psychotherapy, and was now rehabilitated, working for the Ministry of Truth (though no longer in Pornosec considering her recent break-

down). He still imagines that he "loved" her and does not yet understand that they both hated each other violently. Insight into the nature of his sadistic hatred may come to pt through de-conditioning of his rat-phobia in Room 101.

As pt is now very debilitated the shock therapy can be discontinued and a period of rest with largactyl is prescribed.

18/8/84. Pt was taken to Room 101 and confronted with a cage containing two rats from the animal laboratory. Pulse rate, breathing and blenching indicated that considerable autonomic disturbance was produced in pt. I talked to him soothingly and reasonably about the nature of rats and the uses to which they could be put, not understating their savage and aggressive nature. It was necessary to restrain the pt physically when the cage of rats was put against his face as considerable abreaction occurred. Without any prompting however, the pt spontaneously gave expression to the insight that dawned on him, savagely denouncing Julia, his sexual accomplice, and giving overt expression of the violent sadism of his feelings for her which had previously been masked by dishonest sentimentality.

It is now unnecessary to carry the treatment of the rat-phobia further as it has served its purpose. The pt's aggressiveness can be attached where it should properly belong—to Eastasia, the enemies of his country. The Ministry's new slogan "Rally Against the Yellow Rats" will doubtless aid the process of transference.

This pt can soon be rehabilitated, but of course he cannot again be given responsible work in the Ministry of Truth as with his immature schizophrenic personality he will always be a bad security risk. Although he now expresses proper moral sentiments and love for his country and Big Brother, he will need constant supervision and this can best be managed by the police authorities and Inspector Thugge should be again contacted.

P.S.W. please arrange.

FISH: FOOD OR FINANCE?

Continued from p. 1

...ing generation to accept the existing social structure as the norm to which the individual must submit. The obedient, submissive, citizen in existing society is as much a product (victim), of brain-washing as any prisoner-of-war "convert" to the Communist "way of life", and if this fact could be more generally understood, we would be taking the first step in reorganising society to meet the needs and aspirations of the individual, instead of always expecting the individual to submit to the "overriding" demands of society. Only then will society be a true expression of the needs and aspirations of the people.

As at present organised—that is from above—society is the expression of the wishes of a minority which believes in its privileged position as of a right, and in the circumstances it is absurd to assume that this minority will put itself in the position whereby its actions may be controlled by the majority. Equally, is it utopian to imagine that the privileged minority can think in terms of the problems of the majority, when they are themselves largely responsible for these problems! On the contrary, the task of the privileged minority is to consolidate its power, by force in the guise of Law, and by brainwashing through the mediums of Church (or the mummified Leader) Press and Education.

★

PRIVILEGE is the antithesis of co-operation. When the industrialists call on the workers for co-operation, what they mean is that the workers should co-operate in perpetuating the social structure which guarantees them (that is, the industrialists) their privileged status. But co-operation means the working together to the same end. Even the most brain-washed worker will not admit to working for a boss in order to help him get rich. Just as not even the most eccentric boss will declare that he runs his factory as a means of providing employment for so many workers. The worker goes to the factory in order to live; the employer hires labour in the expectation of making more money that way than he could by his own efforts either as a one-man business or as an employee.

With such an approach to their jobs, is it surprising that neither the boss nor the worker have what we call "a social conscience". For his part the worker, whose only capital are his two hands and his skill (assuming there is a "demand" for them) may well retort that a working man with family responsibilities cannot afford a social conscience. The boss may argue that he has risked his (or other people's) savings to set up in business and his whole outlook is influenced by what he has at stake. What is important to note is that basically they both think along the same lines and neither thinks of his work in terms of its social value.

Until, and unless, a job is viewed by workers as something which should be more than the instrument that provides a wage packet at the end of the week, there is little to choose between the TUC and the FBI. The FBI is the organisation of the privileged minority for the defence of their privileges. The TUC is the organisation of those whose labour provides the privileges. Now, either that organisation accepts the existing relationship as a kind of natural order of things, and only seeks to get a little larger piece of

BY far the most interesting study recently published on the present Spanish situation is that by Miguel Sánchez-Mazas, which appeared first in the magazine *Cuadernos*, whose editor is Julián Gorkin, and was later reprinted in brochure form to be circulated in Spain. Miguel Sánchez-Mazas is the son of a Phalangist leader; he took part in the student demonstrations of February, 1956, was arrested and later released managed to leave Spain and is now settled in Switzerland, a militant in the Socialist Party. Julián Gorkin, some readers will remember, was a member of the POUM, and right-hand man of Andrés Nin, whom the Communists brutally murdered in 1937.

The following are the salient facts in Sánchez-Mazas' study. The higher classes in Spain, representing 17.2 per cent. of the population, receive 55.4 per cent. of the national income, and the remaining 82.8 per cent. must be satisfied with 44.6 per cent. A still greater inequality exists in the distribution of the land: 12.9 per cent. of the owners hold 90.6 per cent. of mountain and pasture land, 25.4 per cent. own 71.4 per cent. of dry cultivated land, and 19.7 per cent. own 70.3 per cent. of irrigated land. Broken down further, these figures reveal an even greater concentration of wealth in fewer hands. For example 36 per cent. of the national income goes to 7.9 per cent. of the population and 79.8 per cent. of all mountain and pasture land

the industrial cake (the case of the American Unions), in which case our remarks are valid or, if they are not, then it means that the working people are opposed to privilege, and it follows that they must be opposed to the social machinery which favours a minority at the expense of a toiling majority. How many Trade Unionists or members of the Labour Party to-day attack capitalism? How many workers protest that the work they do is socially useless? How many workers have given up their jobs at Aldermaston because of a social conscience? How many workers or Trade Union leaders to-day attack the wage system?

★

AT Geneva the struggles between nations over the limits of territorial waters could only take place because of the contradictions to which we referred earlier. We, the people, want the fish as food to maintain life. The trouble arises only because the trawler owners are more interested in fish than in human beings. When the Hull Fish Merchants' Protection Association says that a twelve mile limit would be an "unmitigated disaster" or the Grimsby Trawler Officers' Guild declare that it would prevent any catch of prime fish they are talking a lot of nonsense. The fish will be there just the same, and caught. But the Grimsby Trawler Officers' Guild "will tie up in port rather than see Icelandic fish landed under this new advantage". And apparently, according to a *Manchester Guardian* report "these towns [Hull, Grimsby and Fleetwood] feel far more bitterness against Iceland than the rest of Britain feels against Russia". The secretary of the Hull Fish Merchants' Protection Association declared that

if Iceland announced a 12-mile limit, the port would go so far as to allow in German ships, banned since 1941. Anti-German feeling is strong in Hull but could almost be forgotten in common dislike for the Icelanders.

If this is a true description of "feeling" in these towns, it is also a measure of the task confronting those who seek a happier and more just world. Xenophobia is one of the greatest obstacles to progress and right thinking. In blaming the "foreigner" we easily overlook our native bosses. Indeed we may even forget, or write-off our own responsibility for the perpetuation of a system which does not hesitate to convert means into ends, and loudly proclaims its faith in strife rather than co-operation as the stimulant to progress.

is owned by only 2.8 per cent. of the country's land-owners. The earnings of landless peasants working on other people's land, averages out at 25 pesetas a day (which is less than four shillings).

The position of the industrial worker by comparison is much better, for whereas he must work 8 hours and 12 minutes to earn enough to buy a kilo of meat the agricultural worker must work two days for the same return. By contrast the English worker obtains his kilo of meat by working 97 minutes.

To buy a kilo of bread the Spanish worker has to work 59 minutes and the British only 12. Other figures on the comparative standard of living between the two countries are: average consumption of cotton goods 2.3 kg. per person per year in Spain, and 7.8 kg. in Great Britain; average meat consumption 12 kg. per person per year in the rural zones, and 17 kg. in the towns in Spain, and 65 kg. in Great Britain.

There are no signs of economic improvement. On the contrary, prices continue to rise, and salaries are either frozen or slightly and only occasionally modified by a token increase. The proletarianization of the *petit bourgeoisie* is gathering momentum, helped by such measures as increase in indirect taxation and corresponding decrease in direct taxation. While the average national income has now reached its pre-civil-war level, the personal income of the middle and lower classes has gone down from 60 to 65 per cent. The number of IOU's and other means of fiduciary circulation is growing apace. Having to eke out a living somehow, the poorer class forego standards of honesty and dignity, and petty thieving and mendicancy are rampant, whilst, attracted by bigger dividends, or taking precautions against the oncoming storm, capitalists invest their money abroad. As a reflection of this rapidly deteriorating situation, and the clearest indictment of Franco's mismanagement, the national deficit has increased from 528.8 million gold pesetas in 1955 to one billion in 1956.

4 Million Illiterates

Hand in hand with poverty goes ignorance. Illiterates over the age of 10 number 4 million. The chief director of primary education, Tena Artigas, declared that 25,000 new primary schools would be necessary to satisfy the needs of the population, while 17,000 of the existing ones were in bad need of repair. When the Minister of National Education, Joaquin Ruiz Cimenez, asked for credits, stating that new school buildings were a question of life or death, Franco and his right-wing ministers refused them on the grounds that it was not good for the people to know too much, and that school buildings in the past had always constituted a concession to the Left. According to the United Nations' Statistical Yearbook, Spain is the European country where people lead least. The *per capita* consumption of printed paper is given for the year 1952 as 0.9 kg. against 14.5 kg. in the United Kingdom for the same year, and 1.2 kg. in the Spain of 1935.

High fees and an extremely limited number of scholarships are the two

main discouraging features of secondary education. But it is in the Universities that the situation is at its worst, or most keenly felt to be so. 60 per cent. of their professors and lecturers either lost their lives during the civil war, went into exile or were purged. All of Spain's best minds are living out of the country: historians like Americo Castro and Salvador de Madariaga, biologists like Ochoa and Rodríguez Delgado, mathematicians like Rey Pastor, poets like Juan Ramón Jiménez, Pedro Salinas and Alberti, musicians like Pablo Casals, and painters like Picasso. Books and magazines have been publicly burned; important works have disappeared from bookshops and libraries, and whatever is printed must pass through a political and a religious censorship. The students' reaction against all this has now become vocal and organized. Severe measures have been taken against them, particularly in Madrid and Barcelona, but to no avail. Both General Acedo, governor of Barcelona, and Torcuato Fernández Miranda, General Director of University Teaching, had to confess: "We have definitely lost the University".

There are economic causes to the students' discontent, and the tendency among them to go abroad as soon as they have obtained their degree is alarming the government. But it is not with their condition only, or with the general stagnation of culture, that they are most dissatisfied. In a collective document, printed and circulated underground in the Spring of 1957, they protest against a régime that denies the people any participation in public affairs, and offends them in the right to the truth.

Catholic Critics of the Régime

The growing gulf separating rich from poor, the corruption spreading through all branches of national life, and the crying contradictions between theory and practice, between façade and reality, are becoming deeply disturbing to the saner and younger members of the Catholic church, including the clergy. Their criticism of the upper classes is often uncompromising and outspoken; they are greatly preoccupied not to appear privy to the iniquities of the régime. The books of the Professor of Ethics in Madrid University, Jose Luis I. Aranguren, the sermons of the Jesuit Father Diez Alegria, and the twelve who signed the "Report on the Situation of Spanish Catholicism in present-day society" are the best known and most daring representatives of this trend. The Archbishop of Saragoza declared that "Catholicism has become bourgeois", and the Bishop of Malaga, Don Angel Herrera, wrote in his pastoral letter of January 12th, 1956: "Lack of justice and charity favours a system of distribution of the national income which allows a minority to appropriate to themselves the bigger share and to keep the multitude in poverty. The gravity of this evil is worsened by the fact that nobody worries about the means by which he gets rich, and that the powerful, little caring generally to conform to the principles of charity, join together to shun their social obligations".

Even among officers of the Army discontent is rife. There is dissatisfaction with salaries inadequate to maintain appearances and prestige. The conces-

sions granted to the Sultan of Morocco, and the establishment of American bases, have wounded the pride of many a patriot. With a rich tradition of army *coups d'Etat* (pronunciamientos), the possibility is not to be excluded of the army taking the initiative in ridding Spain of Franco.

The arrest of the poet Ridruejo is the most sensational, but by no means the only sign of a growing opposition to Franco in the ranks of the Phalange (the Fascist party that played the leading role in setting him in power). Although divided and disliked, the Phalange is still to be reckoned with, for they control the official workers' syndicates. They feel that Franco has betrayed them by failing to implement the programme for which they fought: agrarian reform, nationalization of banks, suppression of parasitism and graft in national life, etc. More than anything they resent the power which Franco has devolved to the Opus Dei, a sinister Catholic organization, half-secret, dilatory and inquisitorial, which is now intriguing for a return of the monarchy.

The Basis of Franco's Power

Who then is with Franco? What keeps him still in the position he holds? The main reason for Spaniards putting up with him for so long was the fear of a second civil war. Now it is not so much this fear that prevents them from taking decisive steps to pull him down as that each category of the discontented is not quite sure of the others, and might make the greatest sacrifices and reap the least rewards by coming out first into the open. It is also generally felt that it is not the old parties and organizations which will have the last say, and there is no telling in what direction the young will go, once they taste the first fruits of freedom and gain consciousness of their strength.

The latest arrests have revealed pronounced Stalinist leanings among the young engaged in underground activities. It is no wonder, considering how the Western democracies have given recognition and support to Fascist Franco. Yet a patient and careful enquiry made by Professor Jos Luis Pinillo, published in the *New York Times*, shows the young eager to apply democratic methods, and to prefer them to any form of totalitarianism. Democratic Socialism seems to be the ideology most appealing to them as well as to a great number of workers. But, following Franco's fall, the Communists will secure a good following, at least initially, because of the funds and trained organizers they will receive from abroad, and because they will not scruple to enlist the scum from among Franco's present supporters.

The Revolutionary Movement

The anarchists are in a difficult position. They have done very little to make their ideology more convincing and attractive to the socially-minded. On the organizational plane, the movement, as is well-known, is split in two. Both groups recognize that mistakes were made during the Civil War, but disagree entirely about what they were. While one group is of the opinion that the greatest error was for anarchists to share in governmental responsibilities, the other holds that not enough government and power were held by the CNT to prevent them from being out-manoeuvred and crushed by the political organisations. This division will not do the movement any good. Because they were among those who suffered most, anarchists are also likely to show a too violent, and perhaps, indiscriminate vindictiveness against present and past supporters of the régime, which will make them unpopular, if the dispensation succeeding Franco's dictatorship is to be characterised by a general will towards peaceful reconstruction. If, on the other hand, the general bias will be for radical changes and violent means, the anarchist appeal to the anger and dynamism of the masses will find strong and awkward rivals in the Communists and the UGT (the Socialist Trade Union movement). In any event the CNT will not be the only, or the most powerful, workers' force on the Spanish political scene, so that the crucial problem they will have to face will be, as in 1936, what attitude to adopt *vis-a-vis* all organisations and sections of the population that are neither anarchist nor sympathetic to anarchist views.

Intransigence will bring defeat, whilst compromise, it is feared, will so strain the anarchist position as to make it unrecognisable. But surely, if anarchism is not merely a dream, the question of deciding what kind of relationship is to exist is one of the most important both ideologically as well as from a practical point of view. And it is incumbent on the Spanish revolutionaries in exile to tackle this problem objectively and courageously.

GIOVANNI BALDELLI

FREEDOM PRESS

SELECTIONS FROM 'FREEDOM'

Vol. 1, 1951, *Mankind is One*
Vol. 2, 1952, *Postscript to Posterity*
Vol. 3, 1953, *Colonialism on Trial*
Vol. 4, 1954, *Living on a Volcano*
Vol. 5, 1955, *The Immoral Moralists*
Volume 6, 1956, *Oil and Troubled Waters*

each volume paper 7s. 6d.
cloth 10s. 6d.
The paper edition of the Selections is available to readers of *FREEDOM* at 5/- a copy

VOLINE :
Nineteen-Seventeen (The Russian Revolution Betrayed) cloth 12s. 6d.
The Unknown Revolution
(Kronstadt 1921, Ukraine 1918-21) cloth 12s. 6d.

E. A. GUTKIND :
The Expanding Environment 8s. 6d.

V. RICHARDS :
Lessons of the Spanish Revolution 6s.

RUDOLF ROCKER :
Nationalism and Culture cloth 21s.

GEORGE WOODCOCK :
New Life to the Land 6d.
Railways and Society 3d.
What is Anarchism? 1d.
The Basis of Communal Living 1s.

PETER KROPOTKIN :
The State: Its Historic Role 1s.
The Wage System 3d.
Revolutionary Government 3d.
Organised Vengeance Called Justice 2d.

MARIE-LOUISE BERNERI :
Neither East nor West
paper 7s. 6d.; cloth 10s. 6d.

★

ALEX COMFORT :
Delinquency 6d.

F. A. RIDLEY :
The Roman Catholic Church and the Modern Age 2d.

K. J. KENAFICK :
Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx paper 6s.

★

Marie-Louise Berneri Memorial Committee publications :
Marie-Louise Berneri, 1918-1949: A Tribute cloth 5s.
Journey Through Utopia cloth 18s. (U.S.A. \$3)

27, Red Lion Street, London, W.C.1.

What do we think of the Bomb?

DEAR SIR,

It is not my habit to indulge in long newspaper controversies—my experience being that if an editor won't face up to an argument first time, he is far less likely to admit an error subsequently. Further, if the first editorial reply is abusive and personal, then the succeeding answers are more so. However, I will make one more try.

Firstly, a word about some rather unwholesome, as well as antediluvian, features, of the editorial reply.

(1) A serious misprint in paragraph 8 of my letter—by transposing words and italics you had me saying "but we do have to choose between two wars", instead of "but do we have to choose between two wars...?" The misprint made nonsense of what followed, for what followed were remarks suggesting that it was by no means clear, or certain, that we were faced with this choice—that the nuclear campaign might lead to conditions ruling out all wars. A reasonably vigilant sub-editor would have picked this one up.

(2) Gratuitous information is supplied to the effect that half the editorial staff were jailed for opposing the last war* I can only reply that I fought for four years in the last war—that the prospect of England under the Gestapo and my country under the Kempai Tai—gas ovens, concentration camps, the lot, still appals me, and I am very glad we won—as I have no doubt that the Editors are glad. I respect their views, as I hope they do mine—but they must see that my fighting, and their not, has nothing to do with the rightness or wrongness of their or my views, or arguments. What they have done is to come the old soldier—in reverse. Such moves are disreputable. Let us not live in the past!

(3) Reference is twice made to the fact that I did not march every day—(only 2 days). This too must be assumed to connect with the rightness or wrongness of my views. Does it? In between, the Editor states that he also did not march all the way—so his views must be similarly affected—or unaffected. I had very good reasons for not marching all the way—quite likely so has he. But his reasons don't interest me—they are irrelevant to the validity of his arguments and the correctness (or otherwise) of his facts. A very childish and unskilful performance!

As to the rest, the reply bears out the points in my original letter. The editor does think the H-bomb is a deterrent i.e. a force for peace. I will leave readers to decide whether his argument for this view was in any respect adequate or closely argued. He thereby supplies the missing premise needed to support his

*Has nothing interesting happened to them in the last 13 years? Why not put it in as well?

BEVAN AT BAY

Continued from p. 1

have allies are enemies of Great Britain and, not only that, they are enemies of the working-class movement. We are able to have an influence on the rest of the world only if we have friends in the rest of the world.

Now there are socialists who think that the allies of the working class in any one country are the working classes of other countries. Bevan, now that he has long left the ranks of the workers and joined the ranks of the governors, is apparently saying that the ally of the British working class is the American Government.

This is as laughable as the Communist pretence that the Russian Government is the friend of the British working class.

The Labour Party delegates at Sunday's meeting have made the mistake of thinking that a British Government could be the friend of the British working class if it is a Labour Government. How many more lessons do they need? How many more examples of the similarity of governments, communist or capitalist, do they need before they realise that no government can befriend the workers?

They have learned one more lesson about the behaviour of leaders. Can they not go one step further to apply it to all leading or governing bodies?

contention that "you will also be ensuring that there will be another war". Now these are his words—not mine, and it follows that such a march was not only in vain, but actually, if successful, calculated to cause a war, not prevent it. If he can't, or won't, accept the implications, that is his affair. But let him not accuse me, or others, of a "well known but dishonest debating trick". Readers can judge where the dishonesty lies.

The editor then says that FREEDOM tried to get associated with the march, and informs us that individual anarchists marched. This only aggravates the offence—or rather, the confusion. To seek to be associated with a march which one believes will (if successful) ensure that there will be another war, is an offence against reason, not to say morality. And for anarchists to sell copies of FREEDOM denouncing the march in these terms, and then to march—reflects poorly upon their intelligence (assuming they had read the article, and agreed with it).

This all shows the utter confusion in which FREEDOM was in on April 5th† and no amount of abuse, no parade of red herrings, will alter this. Subsequent articles have been more careful; more phrases like "in the writer's opinion". And very welcome too! But, as FREE-

†Had they been taken on the committee, would the April 5th article have been the same?

• Editorial Reply

MR. TEICHMANN gets fiercer and fiercer; so much so that his blind spots are showing and his blood pressure is getting the better of him. It is understandable that he should be annoyed about the misprint to which he refers—such errors are always annoying, but at least in our reply to his letter (19/4/58) we restated his question correctly and dealt with its implications. But this he chooses to ignore.

In point of fact he chooses to ignore our whole argument, to the extent of crediting us with things we did not say, like "The editor then says that FREEDOM tried to get associated with the march". We said no such thing, and we are very happy for our readers to judge between Mr. Teichmann's honesty and ours not only on this point but on his whole attempt to twist our argument.

This he tries to do by claiming (judiciously) that we say that the Aldermaston march will cause a war. We refer serious readers to our long reply

DOM says, "assuming Mr. T. has read all this (the 3 articles on Aldermaston) he is probably thoroughly confused by now as to just what anarchists stand for." Are you kidding? But only Mr. Teichmann?

Which brings me to my last point. Too often, particularly recently, the views of the editors are equated with anarchism—they have the tablets in Red Lion Street—they tell us what the facts are. (Who is the current Pope?) Now anarchism speaks for itself—they speak only for themselves. There are no tablets. The only defensible procedure for an adult is to ask, "what is true—what are the facts?" Then, perhaps, "how does anarchism square with this?" If it doesn't square, then so much the worse for anarchism, or any ism. Instead, we see the question as to whether a fact is a fact, or whether a conclusion follows from a premise—settled by reference to what anarchism teaches. And this in turn by what the editors think. Sheer Stalinism! Now I don't believe for a moment that "anarchists stand for," the view that the H-bomb is a deterrent, or that the march will ensure another war—nor that nuclear war is not different from other forms of war, i.e. anarchism does not entail pacifism. Let there be more "in the writer's opinion," more attention to facts and logical entailments, and more humility.

Oxford, April 22. MAX TEICHMANN.

Witch-Hunts

'Totalitarianism Gone Berserk'

THE lengths to which the United States Government is prepared to go in its fear of politically harmless individuals is exemplified in the case of William Heikkila, son of naturalized American citizens who brought their son from Finland at the age of 2½ months—he is now 52.

It seems that at the time of the depression William Heikkila joined the Communist Party, and for his sins he was obviously subject to a routine check-up of ex-C.P. members which started in a big way at the time of McCarthy's purges.

No other proof of a man's "guilt" is necessary if he has had the misfortune to be born in Finland and a member of the Communist Party in the 'twenties.

The absurdity from any point of view of this man's deportation may have passed unnoticed except for the unfortunate individual involved, but for the fact that some newspapers, notably *The Washington Post*, which described the action as "totalitarianism gone berserk", have given it a lot of publicity.

No Progress!

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!
WEEK 17
Deficit on Freedom £340
Contributions received £269
DEFICIT £71

April 18 to April 24

Sheffield: C.A.R. 5/-; London: J.S.* 3/-;
London: P.F.* £2; London: Anon. 1/6,
B.F.P.O.: A.F. 11/6; San Francisco: "No!"
Group per A.R. £8/15/0; Reading: M.B.
11/-; London: D.R.* £1; London: J.P. 6/-;
London: Anon. 5/8; London: J.F. 2/6.
Total ... 14 1 2
Previously acknowledged ... 254 11 8

1958 TOTAL TO DATE ... £268 12 10

*Indicates regular contributor.

... and more
New Readers
for Freedom please!

Needs versus Financial Interests

ABOUT three years ago, when a fall in the prices of foods such as butter occurred, it was acclaimed as being the result of a housewives' strike, and people were urged to continue to refuse to buy at high prices, in order to gain further reductions. There was never any conscious expression of such a boycott, and it seems far more likely that the fall in prices was due to external economic affairs, than to direct action.

Now the price of butter has fallen again. This time however, the news was not greeted with such unmixed enthusiasm; for at the same time a New Zealand trade delegation was in London discussing the effects of English prices on the dairy farming industry in New Zealand. Whereas some years ago the *Daily Express* had been foremost in telling its readers to buy at the lowest price they could find, last week's *Sunday Express* was urging them that the remedy lay in their own hands, to not mind paying the extra few pennies for Commonwealth products, rather than buying those dumped on us by Sweden, Finland and Argentina.

The "Cheap Food League", which works backwards in a slightly different direction, issued a statement welcoming the low prices and exalting the right to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest.

The main reason that butter is being dumped in England, is that the dumping countries have a great need for sterling. The fact that irks the apostles of competitive economics, and of course the Commonwealth dairy farmers, is that since the governments of these countries subsidise, and hence control their farming economics, they are able to put their products on the British market at prices which are not only less than those on their own home markets, but are in fact less than production costs.

An international conference in Geneva has been discussing The Law of the Sea for several weeks, and one of the problems on which very little agreement has been reached has been that of fishing rights, and territorial waters. The tradition has been that a belt of water extending three miles from the coast has been considered as under the sovereignty of the State concerned, and foreign ships have of course been barred from fishing there. The coastal waters are usually very rich in certain kinds of fish, and this has continually provided a source of dispute, for example the question of whether the three mile limit off Norway should follow the indentations of the fiords, or be measured out from a mounding line. Now several States want to extend the limit to twelve miles. This would in particular exclude the Hull and Grimsby trawlers from the very rich fields off the Icelandic coast, which have for many years been a source of wealth to them. They are threatening that if Iceland unilaterally imposes a twelve mile limit, they will retaliate by banning Icelandic trawlers from British ports.

But why does Iceland want a monopoly of the fishing grounds off its coast? Not because of any shortage of fish for its own people but because, for reasons of financial balances, it needs to be able to export everything it can to England.

Both these cases illustrate the way in which financial policy and government control bring chaos into the matter of producing and distributing food.

Farmers all over the world are producing milk and butter, and people all over the world need it. Yet the Swedes are paying high prices for it, and at the same time paying high taxes so that their government can dump it in England,

thereby knocking the New Zealander out of the market and causing confusion among their farmers. The English consumers seem to be doing well out of it on the surface, but if New Zealand becomes short of sterling it will reduce its demand for goods manufactured in England and increase unemployment here. And of course while the 'civilised' nations are engaged in these economic struggles, most of the world's people are underfed.

There is yet no shortage of fish in the sea, and it makes no difference to its food value whether it has been caught by Englishmen or Icelanders, but between Icelandic gunboats and English bans, we may end up by not getting the fish at all.

Advocates of government argue that the chief reason for finance is to make the exchange of goods easier and fairer, and that laws, and the coercive machinery behind them are to ensure this happening, and to prevent the strong and powerful from exploiting the weak. What it has done in these two cases, as current examples, is to distort a very simple situation where food is being produced by some people, and is needed by others, and it would be the easiest thing in the world for the producers to make it freely available to those who needed it. Because power resides in the hands of small groups they are able to use the production and distribution of food as a weapon, to regularise the situation by the passing of laws, and back them up with threats of economic and physical violence.

The people who suffer under this system would probably be among the first to assent that the abolition of government—would produce chaos. It rests with them however, to feel the need for, and determine to institute a more rational way of organising things.

The State Department has now issued instructions to the U.S. Embassy in Helsinki to give the papers which will allow his immediate return to the U.S.A.

This may have been a mistake of routine bureaucracy, but the action cannot be explained away as easily as that. The appalling thing is that the machinery which deported the man is part of the government set up which can deprive a man of freedom and livelihood because one time in his life he supported a political party now out of favour with the authorities.

The frustrating situation for us that people are being asked to choose between two forms of totalitarianism in the struggle for political dominance. Anarchists refuse to make such a choice.

MEETINGS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at
THE MALATESTA CLUB.
32 Percy Street,
Tottenham Court Road, W.1.

LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS

MAY 4.—Gene Sharp on
NON-VIOLENT RESISTANCE

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

HAMPSTEAD LIBERTARIAN GROUP

Fortnightly public discussions are held on alternate Mondays at 7.45 p.m. in the basement of 12, Oak Hill Park (off Frognal) N.W.3. Nearest tube station: Hampstead (Northern Line).

★ Malatesta Club ★

SWARAJ HOUSE,
32 PERCY STREET,
TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1.

ACTIVITIES

Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.
London Anarchist Group Meetings
(see Announcements Column)

Trad Jazz at the Malatesta

Every Saturday from 7.30

THE MALATESTA JAZZ BAND

Admission 2s. includes coffee
MALATESTA CLUB
32 Percy Street
Tottenham Court Road W1

Open to Public
Jazz Men welcome
Organised by IAC

Every Wednesday at 7.30 (prompt)
BONAR THOMPSON speaks

FREEDOM

The Anarchist Weekly

Postal Subscription Rates:

12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00)
6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50)
3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75)

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50)
6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25)

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

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