

Mankind's Arrested Development

A few weeks ago, the quotation at the head of page 1 of FREEDOM was from Dr. Brock Chisholm, Director-General of the World Health Organisation. Dr. Chisholm is a psychiatrist, and extracts from his lectures have been collected in a mimeographed pamphlet by the International Forum in Geneva, with the title *World Health and Survival of the Human Race*. We are indebted to an American magazine, *Manas*, for this note on his ideas.

DR. CHISHOLM is an outspoken man, making it easy for the layman to understand what he is talking about. His thesis is plain: "No well-intended world organisation can possibly succeed in regulating human affairs without an accompanying effort to eliminate or reduce personal, social and religious immaturities at the psychological level. Such education, according to Dr. Chisholm, requires recognition that the familiar reasons for fighting wars are pathological, no essential distinction being allowable between the war-willingness of 'Nazis', Communists', or even 'Democrats'. What is the common denominator? Dr. Chisholm insists that immaturity is most serious in respect to morality, and that when we base our evaluations of persons and of conduct on preoccupation with 'evil' or 'sin', we begin to claim the righteousness of ourselves—and the moral corruption of those who disagree with us."

Dr. Chisholm, in other words, is no friend of sectarian religion. However, he sees that moralistic bias is produced by something far deeper than religious indoctrination over the course of centuries. He feels that there is a primal moral problem which we have so far failed to solve. The first temptation to do evil, as Dr. Chisholm has it, is the temptation to localise badness somewhere outside ourselves, while we attempt to feel secure in some kind of organised agreement as to what the good moral standards are.

"The necessity to fight wars, whether as aggressor or as a defender who could have, but have not, taken steps to prevent war occurring, is as much a pathological psychiatric symptom as is a phobia or the anti-social behaviour of a criminal who has been dominated by a stern and unreasonable father. They are alike irrational behaviour patterns resulting from unsuccessful development and failure to reach emotional maturity. It is evident that this failure is usual in the whole human race, and has been so throughout historical time. . . ."

"To use a medical analogy, the human race is socially, desperately and dangerously ill. The first necessity is a clear diagnosis of the type of illness, with an identification of the causes and then a prescription of treatment. Using all available knowledge of the human being and his functioning, it should be quite possible to do this with some confidence in our ability to reach sound conclusions. The real difficulty will come—as in prevention of diphtheria, tuberculosis, and many other diseases—from the probable unwillingness of the patient, the human

race, to take the medicine or treatment because it tastes bad, or smells awful, or is painful, or involves giving up some of his present certainties, or because he still has faith in one or other of the old medicines which have never been effective. Any change drastic enough extensively to modify perhaps the most consistent behaviour pattern of the whole human race throughout thousands of years, is going to be very painful indeed. Extensive surgery is not pleasant, but a persistent cancer is worse in the end."

Next, Dr. Chisholm turns to an examination of our unquestioned, "last-resort" justification for going to war—"defence":

"Can we identify the reasons why we fight wars, or even enough of them to perceive a pattern? Many of them are easy to list—prejudice, isolationism, the ability emotionally and uncritically to believe unreasonable things, excessive desire for material or power, excessive fear of others, belief in a destiny to control others, vengeance, ability to avoid seeing and facing unpleasant facts and taking appropriate action. These . . . are all well-known and recognised neurotic symptoms. The only normal motive is self-defence to protect ourselves from aggression, but surely we should be able to see the aggression coming long before it breaks out in warfare, and take appropriate action to satisfy or suppress it. Even self-defence may involve a neurotic reaction when it means defending one's own excessive material wealth from others who are in great need."

Dr. Chisholm makes impressive arguments for the complete elimination of the "God versus Evil" method of personal and social evaluation:

"What basic psychological distortion can be found in every civilisation of which we know anything? . . . In the old Hebrew story, God warns the first man and woman to have nothing to do with "good" and "evil". It is interesting to note that as long ago as that, "good" is recognised as just as great a menace as "evil". They are the fruit of the one tree and are different aspects of the same thing."

"We have been very slow to rediscover this truth and to recognise the unnecessary and artificially imposed inferiority, guilt and fear, commonly known as sin, under which we have almost all laboured and which produces so much of the social maladjustment and unhappiness in the world. For many generations we have bowed our necks to the yoke of the conviction of sin. We have swallowed all manners of poisonous certainties fed us by our parents, our Sunday and day school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers, and others with a vested interest in controlling us. "Thou shalt become as gods, knowing good and evil," good and evil with which to keep children under control, with which to prevent free thinking, with which to impose local and familial and national loyalties and with which to blind children to their glorious intellectual heritage. Misguided by authoritarian dogma, bound by exclusive faith, stunted by inculcated loyalty, torn by frantic heresy, bedevilled by insistent schism, drugged by ecstatic experience, confused by conflicting certainty, bewildered by invented mystery, and loaded down by a weight of guilt and fear engendered by its own original premises, the unfortunate human race, deprived by its incubi of its only defences and its only reasons for striving, its reasoning power and its natural capacity to enjoy the satisfaction of its natural urges, struggles along under its ghastly self-imposed burden. The results, the inevitable results, are frustration, inferiority, neurosis and inability to enjoy living, to reason clearly or to make a world fit to live in."

Pre-Bolshevik Russian Thinkers

THE legerdemain by which the Communists have managed during the past thirty-five years to pass themselves off as architects of the Russian Revolution has tended very largely to obscure, in the minds of general observers and readers at least, the memory that they in fact represent only a segment of the tradition of Russian opposition to the Tsar. Even Plekhanov, the father of Russian Marxism has been almost written out of the history books because he happened to differ from Lenin. Libertarians keep alive the memory of Bakunin and Kropotkin, but the celebrity of both of these lies far more in their later international activity as exiles than in any part they actually played within Russia. Herzen has a permanent place in European social literature, but this again is largely because he wrote one of the great autobiographies of the nineteenth century and because of his connection with the international revolutionary figures of western Europe, such as Proudhon, Mazzini and Garibaldi. And apart from these, what are we likely to gain from readily available literature about the social movements and thinkers in nineteenth century Russia? Something about the Decembrists, a little about Nechaev as a cloak-and-dagger villain, the more sensational facts about the terrorist exploits of the People's Will, and some rather distorted impressions on the movements of the time which have found their way into the novels of Turgenev and Dostoevsky. And very little more, unless we are prepared to dive into some large library and embark on a major campaign of research.

Yet the period from the Decembrist rising of 1825 up to the Revolution of 1917 is full of interesting thinkers and writers. Most of them have never been translated into English, and the best we can usually gain about them is some brief summary in books like Sir John Maynard's *Russia in Flux*. And it seems as though, as Bolshevism becomes more and more fixed in the general mind as

the stereotype of Russian "revolutionism", there is an increasingly slighter chance of the writings of men like Pisarev, Dobroliubov and Chernyshevsky ever becoming available in any fullness for the English reader. And, indeed, the polemical and topical character of many of these works would give them only a relatively limited interest to-day. Nevertheless, I think that in some happy future when the supplies of paper are once again readily available, some enterprising editor might produce an extremely interesting omnibus volume of extracts from all these lesser Russian social writers which would illustrate their basic theories without dragging in too much of the day-to-day squabbles about political issues which have very little bearing upon our modern problems.

Richard Hare, in his new book *Pioneers of Russian Social Thought* has done the next best thing, by giving sketches, with copious quotations from their works, of the lives and thought of a score of these minor Russian social thinkers. His bag is in some ways disappointing one, since it belongs to the earlier part of the nineteenth century and includes neither the important nihilists, with the doubtful exception of Chernyshevsky, nor the populists and followers of Lavrov in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This criticism is answered by the prospect of a later volume in which these people and tendencies will doubtless be considered.

A good half—and probably more—the thinkers here discussed, Khomiakov, the Aksakov brothers, Kireyevsky, Samarin, etc., are Slavophiles, and Hare does a service to those who have accepted the usual view of the Slavophiles by pointing out that by no means

Continued on

***PIONEERS OF RUSSIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT**, by Richard Hare (Oxford University Press, 25/-)

POSTSCRIPT TO POSTERITY by HERBERT READER

DEAR POSTERITY:

By now you will be getting a little bored with the letters you have been receiving from my contemporaries in this year of grace 1952, but before you return to the more serious business of rebuilding the world we left in ruins, may I beg you to read this postscript? It will not take long, and it may hearten you to find that we were not all humbugs. Of course, I feel a bit of a humbug in making that claim, for how can I, and a few friends who share my indignation, be sure that we have not caught the prevalent infection? But you will have no patience with false modesty, so I hasten to explain that a minority does exist in our time which is not and never will be deceived by the stupidity around us. You will say, your side of all the disasters of a century, why did we not do something about it? If any records have survived you will find that we were not inactive; what you will not realize, perhaps, is the impotent insignificance of reason in a world gone mad. But let me try to explain,

At the moment of writing—it is the month of February, 1952—we have just experienced a vast conspiracy of humbug which makes those letters you have been receiving hardly worth their postage. A king died—a decent, harmless fellow by all accounts, a perfect prototype of our bourgeois virtues. Though long deprived of any power, a mere symbol of pomp and circumstance, this king's natural decease is swollen, by press and radio, by film and television, into an event of universal, of supernatural significance. The whole life of the nation is disrupted, and uncounted wads of its shrinking pounds are expended in a delirious abandon to wholly fictitious grief. The parades and processions might perhaps be excused—the life we are accustomed to is drab and depressing, and the sight of a scarlet uniform, or the sound of a fanfare, rouses the indifferent heart. But the little man in his millions creeps out of his suburban home, carefully adjusting the black tie he last wore at his grandmother's funeral; looks round fearfully to see that his neighbour is giving his little gesture support; buys his newspaper on which the printer's ink has taken on a blacker hue, presses through the milling crowds of ghouls that always emerge from God knows where on such occasions—myopic spinsters, wispy toothless hags, gawping adolescents—and finally arrives, ten minutes late, at his office, where he proceeds to carry on his little game of deceit.

His little game of deceit—he calls it earning a living, and we all play it in some way or another: punching the machines that now calculate the astronomical figures of finance, pulling the levers that control the machines that make the goods we exchange for food, collecting the taxes that pay for the bombs we shall explode in the Third World War. At the end of the week the little man gets his pay packet—the solution of an equation whose factors are taxes and contributions, leaving a sum with which to pay more taxes and a final surplus for food. He will look at it ruefully, and when he gets home he will face as best he can the anguish of his wife, beset with petty cares, sinking into the restless, sexless indifference of a middle-age without fulfilment, of an old age without hope.

But you will know all this, or you can read it up in the social surveys and the fiction of our time. What you want to know, I imagine, is why we so complacently endured it all. Why, in this year of grace (you must excuse this cliché which I go on repeating: I use it wryly enough) why do we go on with the mad and monstrous comedy? Who knows? We have mass-psychologists, but they cannot give a convincing answer to this question. You must have foreseen (I imagine you saying) the coming of the Third World War; you must have seen the coming of the Great Famine—why did you do nothing about it?

I will try and answer that awkward question presently. Some things, you know, are too big to be seen—and some are too small. By some of us did see, for example, the fantastic folly of our money system—a system which only a college of lunatics could have evolved, and only a gang of criminals could have deliberately operated. Criminals? That is too crude and easy as an explanation. I have a friend who is a trained scientist, a physiologist who seems to have operated on his own eyes, for they see where others are blind, and he has shown that these people who sit in power are simply delinquents—people who in any lower sphere of operations would be recognised as such, and put under control. But the banking world, the stock exchanges, and those mysterious international committees that control the "value of money" are exempt from any kind of control, moral or medical. They sit in some Delphic boardroom, furnished no doubt with statues of bronze (or portraits of past chairmen) and utter their oracles which immediately spread desolation throughout the world. A few of us saw the deception of it all, but for one voice that was raised against these Pythian priests, there were a thousand professors of economics to stifle it with pamphlets and broadcasts. (When one of us, in the second world war, did eventually get behind a microphone, he was promptly denounced as a traitor and a lunatic, and put into a mental hospital.)

I shared the view (it is the view of a tiny minority among us) that the root of all our misery is in this irrational monetary system, and that therefore any direct action against secondary follies, such as war and famine was largely a waste of effort. At the moment of writing, we, who live in an island off the coast of Europe, dependent for half our food on the rest of the world, are engaged in spending £4,700 millions on rearmament. For a quarter of that sum, perhaps for less, we could transform our agricultural system and make ourselves self-supporting (a statement which the professors of economics will controvert after their fashion). The rest of the sum might go to a world fund for the aversion of famine . . . but you see how easy it is even for me to slip into the Pythian jargon. For what are funds, and what are pounds and dollars? The mumbo-jumbo of an obsolete magic. There is no wealth but life, as Ruskin said. We could see—the tiny minority whose voice was unheeded—that the human race was being crushed by machines of its own invention—verbal or ideological machinery rather than machinery of steel. We could see that the way to freedom was wonderfully simple: simply to abandon all that machinery and live as direct producers and distributors of the produce of the earth. Yes: to repudiate all debts, to make usury a mortal crime, to unite all men in a common effort to survive—to survive and celebrate a new-found leisure.

We saw the truth—we proclaimed the truth, and yet we were ineffectual. We left you a legacy of war and famine, and as I write this letter in the year of disgrace 1952 (at last I have found the right phrase) I feel very uncertain that it will ever reach you. I feel very uncertain that any of our efforts, in art, literature, philosophy, will survive the coming catastrophes. But I have to pretend that they will. One lives on an overdraft of hope, and it is a pitiful illusion. Either our ideas must penetrate into the caves where the oracles sit and spin their devastating myths (and can you ever convert people to a surrender of their power?) or must we persuade the deluded millions who listen and obey to turn away and seek the truth. The difficulty is to make our voices carry: the voice from Delphi roars across the cities and fields, and we have no amplifiers—no microphones to command, no forests to convert into newsprint, no delinquents to co-opt on our committees. On our overdraft we might live another century, and on your side of universal catastrophe you might take up the message, and in a world still as death your living voice might be heard.

I had no power, therefore had patience.

Correction

In the third paragraph of the note in our last issue on the late Agnes Inglis and the Labadie Library, for "persecutors" read "precursors".

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

Geography of Hunger
 Nineteenth Century Opinion
 Pioneers of Russian Social Thought

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

FREEDOM FROM NUMBERS

VIEWED from a Continental angle, the abolition of identity cards in Britain will, no doubt, seem a remarkable act. Identity cards, often with photographs, papers to prove this or entitle a man to that, are among the normal documents of a (for example) every Frenchman. There is a long tradition of resistance to such docketing in England, and it took considerable persuasion and promises to make Identity Cards acceptable in September 1939—twelve a half years ago. FREEDOM has often pointed out that the promises included a clause that Identity cards would be cancelled when the war ended—that this promise was not kept. The traditional hostility to such cards was never fully lulled was by the law case of a year or so ago which resulted in the police being instructed not to use Identity Cards.

There are obvious objections to such papers. A man should not be required to prove his identity, and his inability or unwillingness to do so should not be taken to be *ipso facto* evidence for the police to require investigation of. The whole atmosphere of suspicion which surrounds them is unpleasant and restrictive to normal people, and not confined to minority political sections.

The development of the welfare state, of rationing, of nationalisation, and planned economy generally has given new force to the impulse to docket individuals. Identity Cards are to go, but the National Number is to stay, and arrangements are to be made to merge the newborn with such numbers.

They are to be known as National Insurance numbers, and the name sufficiently indicates the tie-up between the docketing of individuals and the development of the Welfare State. Many will think that with the abolition of the card and of the duty of policemen or Post Offices to other nosy parkers to demand the objections to such National Registration also disappears. But there are other objections which still remain, though they are more theoretical.

In the past, some anarchists (and also some others not connected with anarchists) have objected to censuses, and even to the registration of births. They have done so not out of mere crankiness, but as a protest against the trends which these things exemplify. Registration of birth is chiefly for the purpose of determining legal issues of property and succession. To-day, it also serves to fix an individual's age. It is not unreasonable to object to the conception of property and inheritance, and a man's (or woman's) age can be regarded as the individual's business and no one else's.

Censuses illustrate another trend to which reasonable exception can be taken—increasing centralisation. The retreat from communal life to metropolitan centralisation has been a slow but relentless process with many evil consequences for human and social life. The top-heavy administrative machinery of the Welfare State shows the present position of this progression.

It will be seen that the abolition of Identity Cards makes no difference to this aspect of National Registration. A contributor to FREEDOM made this point some months ago when he recommended just this abolition to the Tories as a concession which would cost nothing. Later on FREEDOM remarked that they would not be

abolished till their function had been absorbed elsewhere.

When all this has been said, however, the freedom of individuals from a particular kind of police and administrative snooping is an important position regained for the citizens of this country. The traditional hostility towards such things and the determination of a few individuals are to be thanked for it.

THE RIGHT OF ASYLUM

INTERNATIONAL treaties and laws agreed upon by states have always remained a dead-letter, quite valueless but always invoked when circumstances and "reasons of state" make it desirable. The rights of men and citizens written in blood in the turbulent days of the French Revolution and which since then have only served to decorate the façades of the so-called democracies—have no longer the moral consistency of

the past, nor the romantic aura attributed to them in the past by multitudes of slaves. The right of asylum has been a nice theory. In practice it has been in unceasing and steady decay; a farce and sometimes a monstrosity.

Man has always sought to defend himself against tricksters, against the hatred and vengeance of his fellow creatures. Self-defence is instinctive even among inferior animals. When man's strength and forces show themselves impotent to resist the prepared and accumulated onslaught of his enemies, it is natural for him to try to escape to a place or country far from the vengeance and wrath of his adversaries.

The ancient Hebrews instituted the right of asylum in designating six cities where the persecuted could take refuge. The Egyptians knew and practised the right of asylum as a protection for debtors and maltreated slaves. Perhaps even in that time governmental powers started to abuse these rights, for this struggle has been kept alive throughout the centuries, sometimes manifesting itself in violations of the right of asylum, and at other times in attempts to obtain the extradition or capture of the refugees.

In Mexico, a political exile has been consigned in an underhand and secret way back to the United States. Gus Hall, one of the ex-Stalinist general secretaries of the Communist Party in the U.S.A. was arrested on December 9th by special agents of the government. The interesting and scandalous fact is that contrary to any "law of international rights" the arrest of Hall had been ordered and made in open collusion with the Mexican police, by the F.B.I., an American police organisation which does business in Mexican territory with the sanction and approval of the Mexican Government. The arrest of this man has been made with the brutal and undignified methods always adopted and employed by the police all over the world: violation of domicile, opening of doors with pass-keys, surprise late in the night . . . etc. At three o'clock in the morning, Hall was taken to the frontier and from there, by aeroplane, transferred to prison where already a five-year sentence was waiting for him; a sentence imposed by the American court for the "crime" of "having plotted to overthrow the U.S. Government by force".

The detention of this political fugitive is (if we stand upon the juridical aspect of the question), under every aspect: illegal, abominable and contrary to any judicial law. Hall was accused of a political "crime" before the U.S. court, a crime which is not contemplated in the Mexican constitution. Moreover, the constitution of the Mexican republic absolutely prohibits the extradition for political crime. Thus, under a régime of recognised right of asylum, in the very capital of our country, a land ruled by a constitution lavishly eulogised by moderate revolutionaries, the Mexican police, helped by foreign accomplices, have with impunity violated the constitution of the republic and the invul-

nerable dispositions of the penal code. All this, to consign to the U.S.A. a man persecuted for his political opinion.

Now, our conceptions are diametrically opposed to those of the victim of the abuse perpetrated by the Mexican police. We always fight and will continue to fight the so-called Stalinism, considering that in Russia the State tyranny is practised as in any capitalist country of the universe; but nevertheless, as true defenders of the right of asylum, just as much in cases in which we differ from the political views of the victims, we unite with the general clamour of protest against the consignment of a victim to his hangman, for the simple fact that he thinks differently than his persecutors. We think neither just nor legal the arrest of a citizen no matter what his nationality may be, and the handing over of any man to his country of origin as prisoner. If this absolute power of action should become law, no man on earth could ever be free from the persecutions of dictators and satraps who are abundant in all hemispheres.

The Hall case is a very bad one; it is dangerous for hundreds of thousands of political refugees who have been compelled to abandon their own countries to avoid incarceration or even execution that forces them for having opinions contrary to the dominating régimes. All men persecuted for their ideas and convictions must be vigilant and must courageously defend themselves because on their attitude and firm stand depend their freedom and independence.

However, coming back to Hall's case, the Stalinists must learn to analyze their own charges. The Stalinist totalitarian régime, defended with such enthusiasm and tenacity by its adherents, in reality does not bother with laws dealing with the right of asylum. The communist State, simply does not either consign or expel citizens or foreigners; but arrests and confines them in concentration camps, where they are persecuted and martyred. In the majority of cases they are, indeed, suppressed by a firing squad or by other similar methods.

In conclusion, we assert that if a decided and firm popular action of protest does not materialise pretty soon in the world, scoundrels will repeat the monstrous case perpetrated by Mexico and the U.S.A. and there would no longer be any freedom for the reason that the power of some men upon others means: terror, submission and perpetual tyranny.

—From the Mexican anarchist paper, *Tierra y Libertad*, (trans. J.S.).

Literary Notes

Continued from p. 2

of them were advocates of absolute authority, and the best of them were by no means blind to the benefits of certain forms of western progress. Nor did they all even subscribe to the imperialist doctrines of the pan-Slavs. What did unite them was a common horror at the social demoralisation which set in through western Europe as a result of the defeat of the 1848 revolutions, and an illusion that Russia held some strange mystic force which would enable it not only to bring about its own regeneration, but also to regenerate the rest of the world. This did not preclude a recognition of the faults of the existing social situation in Russia (most of the Slavophiles favoured the emancipation of the serfs), but it did deliver them up to the lemming-charge of messianic nationalism, and brought a tacit acceptance of autocracy and orthodoxy even among those who sought a social transformation. The naive idea of the Tsar as the little Father of his people lay behind all their attacks on corruption and bureaucratic tyranny.

But the Slavophiles are nevertheless extremely significant in the tradition of Russian social thought. For their central idea of Russia as a self-regenerative and world-regenerative force (most dramatically expounded in Dostoevsky's novels) was shared to a surprising extent even by those Russians who were revolutionary in other respects. Herzen, it will be remembered, turned towards this view after the shattering experience of revolutionary ineptitudes in 1848, westernisers like Chaadeyev and Belinsky showed occasional touches of it, and this nationalist itch even played its sad part in the lives of some of the leading Russian anarchists. Bakunin had his period as a fervent pan-Slav, and the heritage of the Slavophiles came out with a vengeance in Kropotkin's actions during the 1914 war and also in 1917 when he returned to Russia and called upon his fellow countrymen to join a patriotic crusade to drive the German barbarians from their native soil.

Finally, as Mr. Hare makes clear, the messianic rôle of Holy Russia is a conception which the Bolsheviks, despite their failure to pay due tribute to the Slavophiles, have inherited from them in full measure. But the difference between

the present-day Communists and the earlier social thinkers who contributed in varying degrees and ways to the messianic illusion lies in the fact that the former are the administrators of a monolithic state which is forced to rely on nationalism as a self-preserving force. The men of the nineteenth century, on the other hand, were responding to the nationalist urges which still dominated the revolutionary movements of their time, and which were embraced in western Europe by men like Kossuth and Mazzini and even, despite their socialism, like Marx and Lassalle in Western Europe.

It is for his complete lack of nationalist messianism that Chernyshevsky is in some ways the most appealing character in Mr. Hare's book. He had neither the mental subtlety nor the literary ability of Herzen, his social ideas were woolly and his attitude to the State, while he distrusted it, was rather of the "necessary evil" kind. But at least he had a vein of genuine internationalism and a tendency to debunk accepted views and institutions which prepared the way for the later nihilists and for the anarchists.

Indeed, that a man like Chernyshevsky should have risen up and have had such influence in Tsarist Russia when he went not only against authority, but also against most of the current intellectual trends, is a somewhat inspiring thought. We all know—and do not need Stalin's former friends of Potsdam and Yalta to tell us—that the oppression of intellectual liberty under Tsar Joseph is much more intense than it was under Tsar Alexander. But thought has not yet been efficiently repressed and it has its own devious ways of communication even where the written word is banned. Mr. Hare has shown how the messianism and autocracy-worship of the Slavophiles has survived among the Bolsheviks. Personally, I cannot believe that the heritage of Chernyshevsky is entirely dead, that the spirit of iconoclasm and internationalism is wholly lost in Russia today; indeed, when the chance does come for it to emerge, I think we may well find it vastly strengthened from the sickening experience of the last century of Tsarist and neo-Tsarist imperialism.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

Indoctrination of American Youth

IN an article on "Classroom Movies," in an American magazine *Coronet*, Frank H. Grover describes some of the ways in which film-shows in high schools—"the most effective means of youth-propaganda to date," are to become a focus for the co-operation of innumerable American local education authorities with the Department of National Defence:

"The diverse efforts of school administrators, educational leaders, and private industry were all being focussed on a single objective: to make available to the schools of the nation for the school year

1951-52 an adequate series of instructional films which would help young people prepare to give their best to, and make the most of, military service.

"With the beginning of the Korean War, and especially with the passage of the Universal Military Training and Service Act last June by Congress, the nation endorsed new principles which demand great psychological adjustments by our young people and by their parents.

"We now, as a nation, have declared that boys in high school will be trained to fight, no matter what their past experience . . . We do not know whether or not war will come; if it does come, we don't know when it will come. These boys may be men with sons of their own in high schools before the next war. But these boys will be trained for military service."

Mr. Grover notes that the reconditioning process will perhaps be very difficult to achieve, since "youngsters have been taught to abhor violence and to value 'getting along with others'."

HOTEL TRUMAN

THE Federal Government has just taken over a surplus Florida military installation for use as a prison camp if the nation ever starts "a round-up of subversives".

The installation at Avon Park, Florida, is the fourth designated by the Federal Prison Bureau as a "stand-by" subversive prison. Others at Florence and Wickburg, Arizona and El Reno, Oklahoma, already have been "activated".

Under the McCarran Act the President is authorized to declare an emergency if there is an "internal rising". Then all persons the Government "suspects" might be engaged in sabotage or espionage would be "picked up".

The Prison Bureau is expected to set up other "subversive camps" in the future and it seems quite clear that the Federal Government is confident of supplying enough guests to make the project worth while.

The enthusiasm, speed and efficiency with which the accommodations are being provided seems to indicate that the Government is expecting subversive camp business to be good in the immediate future and anybody with a tendency toward subversion would be wise to get himself into the neighbourhood of whichever Truman hotel he thinks will provide the best service.

—*Industrial Workers*, 11/1/52.

LIFT UP YOUR HEARTS

I wonder how many people felt their patriotic hearts uplifted by the news that the first British atom bomb is to be tested some time this year in an Australian desert? Mine certainly was not. We have just been told by Mr. Butler that we have no money to replace schools which were condemned half a century ago and that we must cut the free health service in order to make ends meet. Yet, we can find scores of millions of pounds for the project of adding to the huge American stockpile of atom bombs half a dozen British models. If anything makes nonsense of our defence plans it is this kind of waste. We are to have no air-raid shelters, but we can find the money for nice new air-raid sirens all over the country and for mustering the Home Guard east of a line from Flamborough Head to Selsey Bill. Now, in addition, we shall possess an A-bomb, in order to make us feel really safe.

—*New Scientist*, 23/2/52.

COOKERY CORNER

Stalin is a man of taste when it comes to food and drink, says the French newspaper *France-Soir*. He likes spiced dishes. The authority is a close relative of Stalin's cook, Ivan Andreivitch Karachev, who said Stalin often discusses a menu for an hour with his chef.

—*Manchester Evening News*, 9/2/52.

MANKIND IS ONE

Selections from FREEDOM, Volume 1, 1951

This 240-page volume contains 120 articles which were published in FREEDOM during 1951, and is the first of similar volumes to be published annually.

The selections cover a wide field, from Terrorism in Malaya to the Population Problem in Italy; from Industrial questions to the problems of Housing and Planning; from One-man Manifestos to Schools and Prisons.

Readers will find this volume—and subsequent volumes—an invaluable source of reference and a commentary on our times. For new readers it will be also an opportunity to have at a very low cost and in volume form, the most important articles published in FREEDOM during 1951.

240 pages 6" x 8½" paper 7s. 6d.*
A few cloth-bound volumes at 10s. 0d.

* This Edition is available at present to readers of FREEDOM at the special price of Five Shillings (postage 6d.) (U.S.A. readers \$1.00, post free).

And if you have not yet ordered your copies may we remind you of four recent FREEDOM PRESS publications—

YOUTH FOR FREEDOM
by Tony Gibson

A Consideration of the Factors Influencing the Development of a Free and Socially Effective Youth.
48 pp. Demy 8vo Two shillings

DELINQUENCY
by Alex Comfort

16 pp. Cr. 8vo Sixpence

SEX FREEDOM FOR THE YOUNG
by John Hewetson

16 pp. Demy 8vo Sixpence

SYNDICALISM— THE WORKERS' NEXT STEP by Philip Sansom

48 pp. Cr. 8vo. One shilling

