

Freedom

ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

Vol. 11, No. 2

January 21st, 1950

Threepence

ANARCHISTS AND THE ELECTION

Who Do You Want To Govern You?

If a general election invites public discussion of the differences between political parties, it also underlines the cleavage between all these aspirants to political power—of however apparently diverse shades—and anarchism. For the issue of a general election is—"What party is to rule the country?" Anarchism, by contrast, seeks the abandonment of such a method of carrying on the social affairs of the population, and urges that men can achieve far happier results by free agreement among themselves than by decisions taken over their heads by a handful of rulers.

Although anarchism is described as a political theory, it is therefore radically different from all the political parties. Whatever the differences between the latter, they are all agreed that the government of men is necessary, and their aim is the achievement of political power. Anarchists, on the other hand, aim to free men from political power.

Instead of stifling initiative by confining all decisions in the hands of a government, they want to release the vast powers which lie in the creative initiative of free men. The history of social revolutions shows what a tremendous power lies in the creative potential of the masses of anonymous men and women when they take charge for a brief period of the destinies of society. Such periods have shown the glories of man's endeavour. Elections provide just the opposite—they are the very seamiest side of politics, which is at its best a distasteful, and at its worst a downright dirty business.

Political Irrelevance

Who is to govern us? For anyone who thinks in terms of the good of society this question becomes increasingly meaningless. Indeed, the complete failure of political activity to solve the problems of a people or meet its most fundamental needs and desires and aspirations—this failure may well be said to constitute the major sickness of our times. Nevertheless, it is only that our times make glaringly manifest what has always been the case; that government has little or nothing to contribute to human happiness or social progress.

Consider the question of war, for example—a social sickness which increasingly dominates the lives of men and women the world over. The 1914 war was conducted under the Liberals, the 1939 one first by the Tories and then by the Tory-Labour Coalition. Since 1945, the introduction of peacetime conscription and universal military service has been an activity of the Labour Party. Where they have secured power, the Communist Parties of the world have carried out a still more thoroughgoing militarisation. Putting one party rather than the others in power will therefore do little to remove this recurrent shadow.

Nor do the political parties differ radically in their conception of life and work. To an ever-increasing extent they insist that work must be planned from above: the workers' part is to carry it out through production drives, incentives, and the rest. The "social good" comes to mean more and more restrictions and sacrifices of life and relaxation from the individual, instead of meaning more fullness and happiness. The divorce between the apparent function of government and its actual operation is now complete.

How to Vote

But to discuss these wider issues is in itself quite irrelevant for the reason that none but a politics-struck minority conceives that elections are concerned with such matters. For the vast majority vote for the party whose advent to power will make a favourable difference to their own sectional interests in the narrowest sense. If they think the Conservatives will remove certain irksome or economically shackling restrictions on their work, they will vote conservative. If their work is such

that neither party is likely to make much difference, they may not bother to record a vote at all, and are described as "apathetic". The numbers whose decision is taken on ideological grounds without reference to their private economic interest is trivial; and far from being practical hard-headed persons concerned only for the public good, such people are political cranks often enough with merely emotional commitments to one or other political creed.

The nature of the election problem—"who do you want to govern you?"—and the decreasing difference between

the parties on major points of policy makes this attitude of the electorate inevitable. In all countries there has been a trend for the total poll to fall, and this trend is regarded with such hostility by politicians of all shades that they denounce failure to record a vote as the worst sin against patriotism and democracy, and even propose to make it punishable. While it is true that a large poll seems to support at least the system of party government, it would be unwise to attribute a low poll to active disillusionment with such a system for the reasons given above.

Anarchism and Voting

Anarchists usually advise refusal to vote, with or without active expression of rejection by spoiling the ballot paper. Such an attitude is sound enough as far as it goes, and the limited context of an election does not permit of much more. But the substance behind such refusal should be a clear understanding of the alternative to governmental organisation of society—the free society of mutual agreement and equality. In election times, anarchists should not only develop their own understanding on these matters, but should endeavour to make such an alternative clear and living to their workmates and others during the discussions and arguments which election times always bring forth.

Political Prisoners in SPAIN

December, 31st, 1949.

OFFICIAL statistics and statements about political prisoners in Spain vary enormously, from one which declared (1940) that there were then "no more political prisoners in Spain", and another (15/7/1943) that there were then "only 61 political prisoners", to one (24/12/43) which reads: "In the beginning of 1940, the number of political prisoners was half a million, and of these 134,000 have been released up to date." This last statement was issued to the press by Franco's Diplomatic Missions in South America. Yet, on March 19th, 1944, Franco's Minister of Justice, Don Eduardo Aunós, announced that there were only between 20,000 and 30,000 'politicals' still in prison: although everybody knew that there had been no 'jail delivery' between December 1943 and March 1944 to account for the great decrease in the number.

Since then the Franco Government have been extremely cautious in their prison statistics, and any figures now issued are usually those of the Minister of Justice and ignore the fact that the Minister of Interior deals with prisoners who have not yet been through the processes of law. No statistics are ever given of prisoners not yet brought to trial, of prisoners in the hands of the Civil Guard, the Police, the Falange, of men in labour units, of men on ticket of leave, of people 'exiled' from their own town to some other part of Spain.

One must therefore be reconciled to the fact that there is no way of knowing the exact number of people now in custody in Spain for a political offence, or under suspicion, or awaiting trial; and, furthermore, that hitherto official statements have grossly contradicted one another, and that the latest figures deal only with prisoners tried and sentenced. If anything even approaching a rough estimate of the total number of people now in custody for a political offence, awaiting trial, etc., is to be made, reliance must be placed on the word of prisoners in each jail—and, as visitors are permitted, the visitors themselves can often form a rough estimate of the number of prisoners in a particular prison.

WE have received the following information on the number of people in prison in Spain to-day for political reasons. To get an idea of what such figures mean, remember that the present population in Spain is little more than half that of Great Britain, so that a comparable number of political prisoners here would be 200,000!

Add to the figures below 223,563 ex-prisoners out on supervised liberty, 237,413 on conditional liberty, and the fact that 30—40,000 Spaniards die in prison every year, and compare them with the prison population of 1935, which was 12,000, and we can get a picture of the benefits the "Christian gentleman" has conferred on his people.

Prison Survey

The Opposition to Franco has made rough surveys and produced estimates—this is not difficult, as almost every republican family has a representative in jail—but not until two years ago was it possible to check these by any official information which did not conceal important facts. By good luck the Opposition became possessed of a confidential document which the clandestine press published, and the main facts of which people near each prison mentioned, and perhaps with relations in that prison, could verify.

The number of prisoners liberated is always officially announced, and therefore the total liberated since 31st July, 1947—the date of the official document in question—can be computed. This number can be deducted from the total given in the document.

The number of people arrested for political offences, or on suspicion, is known only in certain instances: for example, when there is a round-up after some incident—but, even then, the exact number is not always known. In making a computation of the number (the total, that is) now in Franco's prisons, no figure can be named which could not be challenged, though everybody in Spain knows that hardly a day passes without arrests taking place. Hence, in the computation, the arrests of the last two and a half years are ignored—though they need not be overlooked.

Opposition estimates two and a half years ago varied from a total of 110,000 prisoners to 120,000—men and women.

The official document states precisely: 94,496 men and 20,474 women, and gives the number in each of the 50 prisons occupied. In the prisons in the Madrid 'zone': 18,676 men and 4,884 women. In the Barcelona 'zone': 10,144 men and 3,054 women. At the 'Penal Sanatorium' of Cuéllar: 1,035, suffering from tuber-

culosis. Serving penal labour: 7,933 prisoners, all but a few 'political'.

Not included in the statistics are those held in police station calabosses, in certain *prisiones de partidos judiciales*, or in the many *cachots* of the Falange. It is quite impossible to form a reasonably reliable estimate of the number of these prisoners, and even doubtful whether the Franco government could give the number with any sort of accuracy.

Thus, without adding the number of those arrested in the last two and a half years, and allowing for those set free, it is unlikely, to say the least, that there was, at the end of 1949, less than approximately 100,000 men and women in jail in Spain—in the category of Political Prisoners.

The most important fact to remember about this statement is that, because of the nature of Franco's prison system, the public in the neighbourhood of each prison can make a fair estimate of the number of prisoners in that prison. The visiting system permits, in most places, frequent visits and a fair amount of liberty in conversation. The liberation from time to time of prisoners bringing out details of life in prison, and the transfer of prisoners from a 'close' prison to a fairly liberal one—all this makes it possible for interested Spaniards to collect and sift information about prisons. Hence, when officialdom talks of 'now only X-prisoners' the average Spaniard knows how much value to give to such statements. No censorship can prevent prison information from spreading but, as foreigners are admitted only to certain prisons, and the censorship is severe on every attempt to send such information out of Spain, the outside world is left in ignorance of the present position. The general close-down in the West on nearly all information about Spain does the rest. The most that can be said is that to-day, the position may be a little "less bad" than it was a few years ago.

"No matter how piqued aristocrats are with their monarch, they still resent it when the plebs rise against him, too."

HEINRICH HEINE.

The Workers' Way—Syndicalist Action!

THERE are two ways in which the workers' buying powers may be reduced. Firstly, as it has been done in the past, by the simple method of cutting wages, and secondly, the way in which it is being done to-day, by fixing wages in a time of semi-inflation when prices are rising.

In the period of trade "retreat" following the boom immediately after the first World War, a Tory Government applied the first method. The result was a General Strike. In a period of similar economic difficulty to-day, a Labour Government is in process of getting its "wage-freeze" policy accepted by the officials of the Trade Union movements and the result will be—what?

Well, that rather depends on the result of the election. Not that either party in power will be any different. The Tories have obviously watched with interest the manner in which the so-called Socialists have handled the working class—the manner in which the present Government have managed to put across measures which the workers would never have accepted from the Tories themselves.

That is one of the reasons for the current wooing of the Trade Union movement by the Conservatives, who now realise that the task of ruling will be much simpler for them if they can

only get the workers' leaders to co-operate.

A Coalition Government?

It has been easy, however, for the T.U.C. to sell the workers out while the Labour Party has been in power. It will not be so easy if the Tories get in and try to carry on where Labour left off, for the rank and file will then feel no loyalty to the Government at all and will expect the Unions to move into a position of militant opposition.

For this reason it is extremely possible that the Tories, if returned to power, would form a Coalition Government with, among other positions, the post of Minister of Labour held by a Labour Party man. After all, they must look back with nostalgia to the war-time coalition, when they reaped most of the glory, their friends in the City reaped the profits, and Ernest Bevin as Minister of Labour did the dirty on the workers for them.

There are, then, three obvious possibilities for the nature of the British Government after the election; a Labour Government, a Conservative Government, or a Coalition Government. And—here is the point—under any one of them the workers' economic position will remain precisely the same.

Any Government in Britain in 1950 will have to maintain the wage-freeze, while prices could not be pegged without subsidies which would mean increased taxation.

The Syndicalist Answer

There is a fourth possibility—not so obvious to any but anarchists and syndicalists: NO Government.

Inevitably the situation will lead the workers to the same result as the Tories' wage-cuts of 1926—a general strike. Then the syndicalist tradition was still strong among British workers: they knew what to do, and they did it. It was only the stark treachery of the Labour leaders of the time which led to the defeat of the workers, who, had they only realised it, had the power to take over the entire economic life of the country, to run industry for the common good, to prevent the miserable history of the world since then from unfolding.

It is easy to be wise after the event, but the position is the same to-day. The workers have the power—they have always had the power—if they could only direct it into effective channels.

And these channels have nothing whatever to do with General Elections, or politics, or government. They are the channels of direct action, of organising industrially for the precise purpose of ousting government, of concentrating our strength where it is most effective—at the point of production.

The principles of syndicalism, like those of Anarchism, have been created during years of workers' struggles against exploitation. The workers' own experience has led the most militant to realise that the whole wage system serves the capitalists, not the workers; that the State serves the capitalists, not the workers; that government itself is a great swindle based on exploitation and coercion, and that supporting one political party against another solves nothing, but only perpetuates the swindle.

Let the workers rally their forces for the real struggle—the fight against all governments for the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth—the free society of free men producing for their common good instead of for the profit and glory of their masters.

P.S.

DISILLUSIONMENT

According to the political mud-slinging in Britain to-day, the world must conclude that the Labour Party is the party of working men who don't work, and the Tory Party the party of gentlemen who are no gentlemen.

Picture Post, 14/1/50

POWER OVER THINGS

IT is customary for most philosophers to start with an appeal to commonsense. And, unfortunately that is where they finish—in sense, in the man's mind which is doing the sensing. They never extend their views to the things perceived by sense. If they did this of course they would reach the uncommonsense of science. For science is just that extension of common perception—by means of material instruments it measures sense-data with greater accuracy. What we must recognise is that scientific thought comes from ordinary people who are far too sensible to study their senses. Ordinary people focus on concrete things—spades, cups and saucers, furniture, houses—goods. The social problem is simply one of increased access to and control over these things. But after a while doubts arise as to the wisdom of this course. We commonly suppose they arise from further thought. They come from ceasing to think. They are instilled by intellectuals who are unable to think themselves, and who adopted the easier course of teaching others to think. But all real thought comes from the people. There can be no education of the people; all education is by the people. And all valuable public statements are issued by the people to instruct the wise in the conduct of material things.

WORLD GOVERNMENT?

It does not follow, however, that all popular statements are true. They are conditioned by our mentors. Last year, we had the announcement of World Citizen No. 1, Garry Davis, with his plea before U.N.O. for a World Government. This is an activist lead we can respect and to some extent follow. It is so much brighter, for instance, than the idiotic plea of Russell, also made this year, that we drop bombs on the Kremlin. But it is not so clear-cut. Bombs are definite and measurable things. Only a moron could advocate dropping them on cities packed with human beings. But the intrusion of these things into a lead illustrates the urgent necessity of this century—that we must literally and actually impose a government over them. But Davis is as blind as Russell—or as Borkenau, Burnham, as any 20th century thinker to this task. This world government. Will it govern men—or things? If, as we can assume from what Davis has to say, it will be another government over human beings, then we are just as we were. We can have a world government all right, and under this head all wars will be politely called civil wars. Rebellious nations in the last extremity will have to be restrained by modern armaments, by atomics. A government over the peoples of the world would be obliged to wage war on those peoples. To call this war legitimate, constitutional, would not alter its idiosyncrasy. Modern science has made any war—even the class war, at least in terms of militarism—into class war. The followers of Davis will claim their government will prevent war. This is sheer junk. Governments exist, and can only exist, to wage war. Politics is war. But we wage war on material things. We can and must have a world government then, but it must be a scientific government, a government of things.

FROM MEN TO THINGS

All history is summed up in the passage from men to things. The historians are right in one respect. Men have

THE following article by our Australian comrade, Harry Hooton, raises many arguments with which we do not altogether agree, but which we think are worth raising. The writer has worked at many jobs in his time, and is at present working in a factory in Sydney.

been more or less successfully governed in the past. When man was the main instrument in the production of wealth he could be treated as a machine. And this treatment in the light of the then existing science was roughly scientific. The problem of the ancient world, enunciated in fact by Plato, was how to govern men. This led to the further problem—in order to govern men we had first to study how they behaved. We had to have the "science" of psychology. And Aristotle completed the task with his work on this subject. It is no accident whatever that Aristotle tutored Alexander. And later, in the first world regime, the Roman Empire, we had the complete application of psychology in politics. All this is finished. The modern world has its prevailing need, its problems: how to govern things. This, too, necessitates its further study—of the way things behave. This is physics. Psychology and politics are absolutely outdated. Their place is taken by mechanics, technics. We commonly suppose that our technical faculties and constructions are near enough to perfection, that what is needed is attention to human, ethical matters. There is nothing more pernicious than this seemingly obvious directive. The shift from men to things is not merely a matter of economic or industrial change; it is a change in culture as a whole. We seek the goods of economics, the commodities, things of to-day—also because they are goods of ethics, the goods of art. There is no accident whatever in this one homonym, good. It is located in the things society manipulates, things which are good for society. What wasted words in sociology, in ethics, in aesthetics, which never focus on a concrete material thing! And what contempt is poured on the people, who focus on nothing else . . . Things are spiritual elements.

CONTROLLING OUR ENVIRONMENT

The world is dividing into two hostile camps, America and the Soviet Union. There is absolutely no more right on the one side than on the other. We must stand in the third camp, that of science and art. These politicians are struggling for power over our persons; but the artist struggles directly with things, for power over them. The third world war will be just as senseless as the second or the first world wars, or as any war in history, but this view depends, of course, on a new approach to history, on an artistic history. . . . We do not know or care what was the struggle in the ancient world which cost Archimedes his life. We know only that his work survived as an index to the lasting values of humanity. In time, our struggles, for or against communism, capitalism, will have no meaning whatever. They have no meaning now to the man with scientific imagination, the man who can assess technical constructions as art. The historians will have it that it is impossible to separate the artist from the common struggles of his age. With art all things are possible. With men enslaved to an all-inclusive determinism all the past seems significant,

every fact an equal determinant. We reject this determinism, and choose instead to determine. We do not merely write history; we make it. We cannot make the past, as we do the future; but we can reject it. Instead of amassing facts, we select them. If the "realists" who preach submission to facts had really studied one set of facts alone, those of the industrial revolution, they would have seen the emergence of art as absolute power. They would have noticed in the 18th century, in the work of Burke, Lessing and others, contemporaneously with the rise of industry, the beginnings of a new science, aesthetics. But without invoking art—modern science itself means just that, absolute power. It means that we are no longer puppets at the disposal of our environment, or of historical processes; we dispose of our environment, create history. And we do this in a very simple way by dealing with observable facts. But the theorists to-day are blind to facts.

REAL THINGS

Every so often the intellectual world is disturbed by a statement about real things. So Litvinoff proposed after the first world war—at a disarmament conference of all places—total and immediate disarmament. It is just as simple as that. It means we are to take hold of several concrete objects and dump them in the Pacific. It means more than that. It is an instance of scientific thought, for these things are measurable; and science is primarily a matter of measurement. Finally it is an instance of scientific government. For steel girders, bricks, houses, machines, armaments—the products of man are relatively static things outside our minds. They will stand still while we study them. We can rely on them doing just what we want them to do . . . But man is not a machine. He is not measurable. We cannot predict or control his behaviour.

We cannot do these things because we are ourselves human beings, and our studies are to that extent subjective. And science is entirely objective. We cannot therefore have a scientific government over men. We can and do have an unscientific government over men. We can and do have an unscientific bungling and mangling of human beings by all governments.

The plea for disarmament was really for a government over things, over technical products. They have to be controlled, not men. In the case of armaments they have to be destroyed. But as we know, this sensible move was deflected by the dialecticians back to men, in the shape of "aggressors", and dissipated by the pastmasters in dialectical confusion, the parsons, with "moral rearmament". We cannot do anything whatever with this "thing". It is a matter of men's souls, men's minds. We cannot think about these. For thinking is entirely a matter of relating together distinct objects outside our minds. And on this matter of war—no matter what we "think" about generalities like "peace indivisible" or pacifist morality—it is certain that while we are dropping bombs on the Pacific Ocean it is a physical impossibility to be dropping them on the heads of our fellow human beings. This is raising morality to the level of exact science. It is also raising thought to the level of commonsense.

CREATORS

But that does not mean we are to prostrate ourselves before them, worship them. The shift in history in its most general terms is from religion to aesthetics. Whereas before we looked up to God as the creator, as the artist; we look down now on the things we make as creators, as artists ourselves. We substitute for the creature attitude the creative attitude. For the final lesson in history is really that of

man's attainment of absolute power. The relativists are quite wrong. In order to get something done we must have an absolute, Art is our absolute. Man is the artist, the ruler with literally unlimited power over everything, including himself. He can rule and destroy himself if he pleases, or he can impose his rule over the world of material things outside himself . . . I am particularly anxious to work out the above—to effect an aesthetic resolution of all problems. But I am also anxious to rebut charges of ivory-tower isolation. I will wind up with a specific policy: The next time our governments give us blue uniforms and bombing planes, let us circle over the blue Pacific, unload our bombs on the poor fish, and go for a pleasure trip round the South Sea Islands; or come back home, rip down the slums and rebuild our towns.

(Sydney, Australia).

HARRY HOOTON.

NEW GERMAN LIBERTARIAN PAPER

NEUE GENERATION (Jan Kolthek, Nwe Heerengracht 35, Amsterdam C, Holland).

THE appearance of a new German libertarian paper is an event of importance for us. The first issue of "Neue Generation" gives promise of fulfilling the desire of the German Anarchist movement for an organ bringing news of events and advances in thought since the terrible interruption in its development during the years of the Hitler movement. Among other articles is an informative interview with a Spanish comrade on what happened in Spain in 1936. Of particular interest to "Freedom" readers are two cartoons from John Olday's "March to Death".

The paper is published from Holland at present. We hope that all German-speaking comrades abroad will give this publication the support it deserves, which has already come from Holland, Austria and France, as well as Germany. "Neue Generation" has also published a pamphlet on anarchism, "Wege zur Freiheit".

PIONEERS OF FREEDOM IN EDUCATION—3 JOHANN HEINRICH PESTALOZZI (1746—1827)

IF William Godwin was to some extent outside the main stream of educational progress and development, a contemporary who was inside it was the Swiss educationist Heinrich Pestalozzi. Almost all the reforms of practical educationists throughout the nineteenth century owe something to Pestalozzi; and important people who came directly under his influence include Herbart and Froebel. To those who believe in freedom in education, however, and particularly to those who are concerned to secure freedom schools for all classes, Pestalozzi's work is valuable in itself.

Pestalozzi accepted the doctrines of Rousseau as a gospel. When *Emile* and *Social Contract* were banned as dangerous to the State, Pestalozzi was one of those who took up the cudgels for their defence. He was under arrest for several days and was in fact never really forgiven by the authorities for his part in the affair. Inspired by the political writings of Rousseau, Pestalozzi was determined to live only for the common people, especially the poor. He longed to help the overworked and underfed among whom he lived in Switzerland but particularly he wanted to help their children. He longed to lift them out of their degradation and to help them regain their self-respect and achieve personal freedom.

School for the Poor

By 1774 he had succeeded in establishing on some waste land near Zurich a farm school, Neuhof, for the children of the very poor. He had no capital but only the romantic notion that he was prepared "to live for years like a beggar among beggars in order to teach them to live like men." Pestalozzi was in fact extremely poor but he hoped the scheme might become self-supporting. In summer the children were to work in the fields and in winter they were to spin and weave. In the intervals and even while engaged in their handwork they were to receive their academic instruction. The children benefited enormously from this environment and the contribution to Pestalozzi's development as an educationist was incalculable. But he knew nothing of business and financially it was a hopeless failure. Within a few years the whole project had to be abandoned.

Pestalozzi now knew what he wanted to do with his life; he would devote it to educational experiment. No practical possibility being to hand, however, he began writing in order to keep his family from starvation. He had a lot to say and this proved to be his period of greatest literary activity. The first book to be published was *Evening Hours of a Hermit*,

a series of aphorisms and reflections. Then came in the following year *Leonard and Gertrude*, his masterpiece, which told the story of the gradual re-education of a family and finally of a whole village by the efforts of a devoted and intelligent woman. It was widely read, especially in Germany, and Pestalozzi's name quickly became well-known.

The French invasion of Switzerland in 1798 gave him his chance to show the earnestness of his purpose. The little town of Stanz, on the shores of the Lake of Lucerne, was reduced to ashes; and many children were left without parents or homes. Pestalozzi collected a number of them into a deserted convent and spent his energies in reclaiming them, body and mind. He tended them with the utmost devotion and in this atmosphere of love and freedom his exertions met with considerable success. Once again, however, as a result of external circumstances his venture was short lived.

Home Education

In 1801, Pestalozzi gave a full exposition of his ideas on education in *How Gertrude Teaches her Children*, educationally far the most important of his books. Part of its purpose was to show that by reducing teaching to its elements it should be possible for even a comparatively ignorant mother to fulfill the duty which Pestalozzi considered that nature intended to be hers, namely the education of her children. This point of view may be of interest to those who have met the argument that in a free society schools and teachers will not be needed! Whether Pestalozzi's claim is valid or not, it is certain that this book established principles of education which are applicable both to the family and to all kinds of schools.

With Pestalozzi the importance of the family was almost an obsession and this idea of home education loomed large in his scheme of things. In one of his letters it was explicit and categorical, "I wished to prove through my experiment (at Stanz) that the advantages which home education has over public education are such that the latter has no value for the human race except in so far as it makes home education its model."

Theoretical Influence

It was the school which Pestalozzi established at Burgdorf in 1799 which gave him his first immediate and substantial success. Its results attracted wide interest. In 1805 he founded another school at Yverdon, on the Lake of Neuchâtel which was his most permanent establishment and where he was allowed to work without interruption for some twenty years. While there he was visited

by students from all parts of Europe and his fame had spread all over the educational world. But success did not bring happiness to Pestalozzi. Misinterpretation of his ideas, dissensions among his followers and misunderstandings of all kinds clouded with sorrow his last years at Yverdon. In 1825 he retired to Neuhof the home of his youth where he wrote an account of his life and his last work, *Swansong*.

The real value of his influence in re-organising the theory of elementary education lay in his belief that actual experience of things is the foundation of all knowledge. He thought that education should be based on direct observation and that understanding is only possible by the spontaneous perception which is the result of sense impression. The validity of this theory was proved by the successful practice of the method in his schools. Unlike Rousseau, who was a thinker only, Pestalozzi was a man of action who tested all his theories in the concrete facts of practice.

Experimental Schools

In addition, he was the pioneer of education for the people. But he did not want State education. It was his constant dream to see the widespread establishment of experimental schools and his idea of a training college for teachers was a place for research where the students would be engaged in experimental enquiry.

Perhaps the chief objection to Pestalozzi's work is that it was conducted in a religious atmosphere. He claimed that he taught neither religion nor morality but this is a travesty of the facts. His whole conception of self-discipline for the child was a religious one and religion was implicit in all that Pestalozzi did. His philosophy, too, was a benevolent form of Christian socialism based on the brotherhood of man. But his attitude to social service was coloured always by the dictum contained in his *Views and Experiences*, "The best service man can render to man is to teach him to help himself."

Pestalozzi's books are often unreasonably didactic in tone, his style unattractive and prolix. For contemporary progressives in search of new ideas on education, to wade through his writings to-day would be a rather unrewarding task; and in the light of new developments much would be found to criticise. But it is easy to be wise after the event. He must be judged, like all the pioneers, by the extent of his departure from the prevailing tradition of his time and the new direction which he gave to education. By this criterion the value of his work is immense.

TOM EARLEY.

... from our stock ...

Margaret Mead's 'MALE AND FEMALE (A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World)	18/-
Dorothy Macardle's 'CHILDREN OF EUROPE'	21/-
Charlotte Haldane's 'TRUTH WILL OUT'	12/6
★	
Paul Reiwald Society and Its Criminals	2/-
James Joyce Ulysses	18/-
Lewis Mumford Technics & Civilisation	21/-
Hamilton Fyfe Illustration of National Character	2/6
R. M. Fox James Connolly, the Forerunner	10/6
George Orwell Down and Out in Paris and London	8/6
Aldous Huxley Science, Liberty and Peace	3/6
K. J. Kenafick Marx & Bakunin boards	7/6 paper 6/
Harold Picton The Ordinary German	7/6
Herbert Read The Meaning of Art	2/6
Ignazio Silone Fontamara	8/6

Just Arrived . . .

RESISTANCE (New York), Dec. 1949

(Articles include: "The Crime of Revolution"; "Statistical Methods in Sociology"; "A Study in Anti-Anarchist Hysteria"; "Psychoanalysis and Anarchism"; "Psyche, Soma and Freedom"; "Infantile Radicalism")

Now Ready . . .

The new reprint of M. L. Berneri's

WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA

(with a foreword by the publishers and photograph of the author) 88 pages 1/-

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

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

Focus on the Far East

Report from Hongkong

HONGKONG "society" has just ushered in yet another New Year with the sedate but extravagant jollifications proper to a well-ordered British colony, and it seems almost incredible that these few years ago, the Japanese were masters here and the efficient, self-satisfied British were herded in internment camps over at Stanley Bay. In all outward appearance, indeed, it would seem as though no storm had ever ruffled the placid surface of this colony's brisk and business-like existence, and one might be inclined to admire the extraordinary resilience of the British if, after closer consideration, one did not detect the underlying lack of imagination and the capacity for more or less unconscious self-deception. The British, in fact, are having a prolonged picnic on the edge of a concealed volcano, and seem too absorbed by pleasant reveries of export profits and race-course programmes to notice the ominous rumblings coming from beneath the ground.

Before the war, of course, they could afford to ignore the discontent of the native Chinese: after all, we still gave them a higher standard of living than their brothers across the border enjoyed, didn't we—and if they made trouble it was simple enough to banish them; there was a never-ending labour supply and it was cheap labour, too. Hongkong was on top of the world, provision merchant, banker, procurer and pawnbroker for the whole of the Far East!

But times, alas, for British imperialism (however enlightened) change, and if the British out here have found it easy to forget the war's more unpleasant aspects and implications, the Chinese have not. Chiefly, it destroyed effectively the carefully nurtured legend of the European as a member of an infallible master-race, and, of course, it enabled the Chinese communists to enhance enormously their own strength and eventually to throw Chiang's corrupt carpet-beggars out of China. The result is that Hongkong Chinese are no longer content to view their British rulers as omnipotent semi-gods, while the Communist victories to the north have given a spur to the long-suppressed xenophobia which has always been the companion of China's subservience to foreign interests. These factors are responsible for the paradoxical situation in which Hongkong's Chinese are beginning to agitate violently for independence although it is quite certain that their livelihood depends entirely on continuation of British rule. Hongkong is a largely artificial creation—a great international banking, exchange and barter centre, a high-class smuggling and currency manipulation headquarters and a convenient operational base for European-American tycoons and politicians. If it should come under Chinese control it would quickly revert to the bare rock from which the British hewed out one of the more astonishing examples of 19th

century business enterprise. A more logical nation might reflect carefully before plunging into nationalistic demonstrations, but the Chinese in Hongkong are fascinated by one overwhelming fact: in China the Western imperialists have been sent scuttling, and Chiang and the other "running dogs of imperialism" have been well whipped. Why then should Hongkong remain under foreign domination?

PERHAPS the situation to-day in this colony provides a classic example for anarchists of the stupidity inherent in both political nationalism and 20th century imperialism. If Hongkong's communists got their way, the vastly overcrowded population would soon be far worse off than it is now, yet the British administration is currently playing the rôle of the communists' best ally, simply because it does not give a damn for the welfare of the Chinese masses within the colony, is too weak or too reactionary to compel the big business and Public Utility interests to give their workers a decent living wage, and is apparently incapable of reducing by effective measures the present appallingly high and ever-increasing cost of living. As a result, the government has to face a mounting volume of revolt, fanned by the flames of communist nationalism which is, as always, only too ready to make use of popular discontent to further its own ends. Probably Hongkong will have a general strike on its hands within a few months, and the British may then, at long last, learn the sad truth that no police force or army garrison can compensate for the lack of intelligence and imagination which appears to be the hall-mark of our colonial administrations.

At the moment, tramway workers are on strike, with a demand for a 3s. 6d. increase in cost of living allowances plus certain annual bonuses. Bus workers are presenting similar demands to the employers and threatening strike action in sympathy with their colleagues. Gas, Telephone, and Light & Power Co. workers are also agitating for increased allowances, and the movement shows signs of spreading to the industrial workers at the Dockyards and employees of Hongkong's quasi-monopoly restaurant and catering company. All these demands have been unconditionally rejected by the respective managements, who seem content to sit back

and wait for the agitators' courage to evaporate, a hope which may possibly be disappointed.

TO turn to the other side of the medal, one cannot help realising the dominant part played in this labour discontent by professional communist agitators: their attempt to formulate similar demands on the part of every category of worker without regard to particular circumstance, mob demonstrations with all the signs of communist stage-managing, and disquieting signs of coercion and terrorism such as that revealed in the speech of a tramway strikers' leader at a delegates' meeting, in which he threatened to report the names of workers' delegates who advocated settlement by arbitration to the Communist Trade Union Councils at Canton and Peiping "for appropriate action after Hongkong's liberation". There is no doubt, too, that the absence of secret balloting at workers' meetings is forcing many non-communist Chinese workers to vote in favour of their communist leaders' policies for fear of being ear-marked as "unreliable" and exposed to certain reprisals in the event of communist domination of the colony.

As far as one can see, the government seems more likely to attempt a banning of "extremist" trade unions, wholesale arrests and deportations of workers' leaders and general police intimidation than to take any steps to redress the workers' legitimate grievances and force reform upon Hongkong's reactionary employers. Already 36 strikers from the South China Match Co. have been arrested after a mass picketing of their employers' offices, given jail sentences and recommended for banishment. The complete idiocy of such a policy is, of course, colossal, and one is again drawn to marvel at the pig-headed stupidity of the administration: local communist leaders must rub their hands with glee each time the British commit a similar folly. One could regard the whole conflict with a cynical indifference if it were not for the fact that there are involved, also, the lives of millions of harmless, underprivileged, simple folk who want only to earn enough money to buy rice and provide a roof for their families—ordinary people who have little reason to love their British rulers but may one day be just as bitterly deceived by their communist "liberators".

White imperialism or Red imperialism—in Hongkong as elsewhere, the people lose every time.

SIMON WATSON TAYLOR.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY

Business is Business

THIS country's "allies" seem somewhat upset at British recognition of Communist China at a moment when America was considering the bolstering up of Chiang Kai-Shek's tottering regime in its attempt to make a last stand on Formosa and other islands in that area.

But from the political point of view Britain's decision is obviously the most practical (and hypocritical) one. The Government and its advisers realise that nothing can be done to save the "butcher of the Chinese Revolution", as Chiang Kai-Shek has been called, from ultimate defeat, and have, in accordance with British tradition in these matters, withdrawn to new positions from which they obviously hope to derive at least some benefit in the long run.

It is possible that in the back of their minds the Government's advisers have reason to hope that China may become a second Yugoslavia so far as the Cominform is concerned and, though the new China may be Communist in ideology, if Britain can sign a few trade pacts with the new rulers, and drive in the thin end of the capitalist wedge with loans (with strings attached), all will not be lost. And surely it is the essence of capitalist strategy to accept the inevitable and save what they can from the wreck to be perhaps turned to full advantage in an unpredictable future.

Meantime, Chiang or Lin Shao-Chi, Britain goes on exploiting whatever advantages she can from both sides. A Hong Kong report (7/1/50) states that: "British shipping lines in the Far East are to continue trading with Nationalist Chinese in spite of Britain's recognition of the Communist regime."

"A spokesman for the firm of Butterfield and Swire in Hong Kong said that the lines were notified some

time ago that the Nationalists wanted them to continue trading with Nationalist ports regardless of the diplomatic position."

In our opening sentence we referred to British "hypocrisy" in politics. We think the above report explains what we mean well enough, but if further evidence of the fact that so far as politics is concerned, business comes first and "ideals" second the following extract from the annual report of the China and the Far Eastern section of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce (which was published before recognition of the new Chinese regime took place) should clinch matters.

The report accuses the British Government of being "content to

JAPAN'S C.P. MUST TOE THE LINE

OBVIOUSLY it is one thing for Stalin to give orders to his followers in the smaller satellite countries and expect them to be carried out or else... but quite another proposition in a country as vast as, and with a population the size of that in China, particularly as his organisation for the control of his new empire must already be stretched almost to its limits.

As it is, Moscow is dissatisfied with the way the Japanese Communists are doing their job. A fortnight ago, Pravda published an article criticising the most prominent Japanese C.P. leader, Sanzo Nosaka for his "erroneous theories". Sources close to the party point out that the Soviet Union's attack on Nosaka is not to be construed as criticism of Nosaka

Might is Right

HAVING been, a year or two back, in the position of being able to contribute a series of "Middle East Notes" to *Freedom*, I have naturally since been interested to read the commentaries on the situation in that part of the world by journalists for the capitalist press. They are not only able to devote their whole time to studying the situation but very highly paid for doing so, yet they, needless to say, can produce nothing that could not as easily have been written in Fleet Street, where much of it probably is. Running through every commentary and feature article I have read is the constant theme that "the Arabs worship strength", that the Arab pays his respects to the strongest force and so far as he is concerned the mightiest is in the right.

You have only to read one or two articles or listen to an occasional broadcast to grasp what I mean, and the cool impudence of the insinuation is really breath-taking for the most superficial thinker—not that it is untrue so much as that it implies that the European is different. To see evidence to the contrary, however, we need only to look at China.

First of all the British Government has already surrendered to force, and recognised Mao Tse-Tung just as Chamberlain recognised Hitler's "room for expansion" at Munich. Other capitalist countries have fallen into line and recognised Communist China. America doubtless will as soon as it suits her interests to do so. In Formosa this has already been denounced as a shameful betrayal, but Whitehall declares smugly that it must recognise facts as they are, and the fact is that Mao has won. They must therefore enter into relationships with the stronger side, that is to say, the side that is actually ruling, or else have no relationship with China at all. What is this but the "worship of force" we choose to ascribe to others?

It Was All Only Lies

What is more noticeably power-worship is the recent sudden fall of Chiang Kai-Shek from democratic grace. The Communist change of front on Chiang is well-known enough—he was first of all "the butcher of the workers and peasants", then in the war years "the great democrat" and afterwards returned to his old position, just like Churchill, etc. But what of the "democratic" build-up of the soldierly Chiang and his wife, the "Chinese Mrs. Roosevelt", the Christian ally, maker of brave new China, etc.? How soon have been forgotten the wartime stories of a great forward-looking new China being built in the struggle against Japanese aggression, or even the post-war stories of national resistance to communism! Of course, they were lies. But some gave their lives for those lies. Suddenly, it has been discovered the Japanese War stories were fabrications; suddenly is revealed the rottenness of the government of China; suddenly the

Western powers have found that the Kuomintang is corrupt! Nothing funnier has been said since Moscow's discovery that Tito was guilty of "shameful and entirely Turkish" methods in having his picture hung up everywhere for public adulation.

"Even the Ranks of Tuscany..."

Why have they suddenly turned against Chiang? Why is his government suddenly known as a "rotten bureaucracy"? There is only one answer. He is losing. So Whitehall has recognised Mao Tse-Tung. The "Communists" have already celebrated Mao's victory—in the famous words of Harry Pollitt, "We may have lost St. Pancras but we have got China." But who has gone delirious with joy over the recognition? The Stalinists might really have preferred a bye-election victory in England to a possible Tito in China, but the City went really mad with happiness. Yes, the City, that same capitalist class against whom one may read indignant remarks in the *Daily Worker* when they are not in alliance with the Russian dictatorship. Were they fearing the triumph of the world proletariat as expressed through the vanguard party? You bet your life they weren't—they were beside themselves with pleasure that the Foreign Office had recognised Mao promptly and safeguarded their millions in Communist China. It is all very well writing indignant letters to the *Daily Telegraph* about atheistic communism and bureaucratic socialism, but money talks in the Lombard Street area and they wanted no funny business with the new Chinese government lest it should spell the end of their exploitation of the Chinese masses, and let in their competitors. Moreover, American intervention on the Nationalist side had tended to oust American influence, on the opposite side; Britain was much more neutral and could soon start business as usual. Without any shame, completely oblivious of all that had been said about gallant, new, struggling, etc., Nationalist China, the British Press announced that the Hong Kong merchants would have opened up in occupied Shanghai before, but a Nationalist gunboat was taking shots at the mainland. Now, however, "the Royal Navy could deal with it as a pirate!"

Our trade relationships with China opened with Opium Wars in which we forced the killing drug on the Chinese. This type of relationship is what recognition is needed for. Money first, and bibles for the Chinese to save our consciences (and make them amenable to Western ideas).

Ideologies do not count in the sordid tale of trade rivalries and rival systems for the exploitation of the common man. Wars between imperial rivals go on whatever form of exploitation is in being. Our aim is for imperialism to dissolve in freedom. A.M.

THROUGH THE PRESS

APPROPRIATE

"I had a boyish ambition to join the R.A.F. On All Fools' Day 1925 I signed on at West Drayton for six years, with six years on the reserve."

—Interview in *Daily Express*, 2/1/50.

THE THING TO DO

Citizens of Anzi, near Potenza, Italy, yesterday stormed their town hall and burned all the tax lists.

The mayor fired shots over the heads of protesting councillors, starting a riot in the council chamber.

All the trouble was over a "family tax" recently imposed by the council.

News Chronicle, 13/1/50.

IT MAKES YOU THINK

Because a 15-year-old boy at a school for sub-normals refused to be caned, the London County Council yesterday asked Chelsea Juvenile Court to certify him as mentally deficient—so that he could be sent to the only other kind of school that can help him.

But the Court, adjourning the case for a week, said it was not satisfied with the evidence of feeble-mindedness.

Daily Express, 12/1/50.

SMOOTH TALKER

Paul Schmidt, Hitler's former interpreter, now denazified, will be given a job in the External Department of the Western German Government in Bonn because of his extraordinary command of foreign languages.

Reynolds News, 8/1/50.

C. Berneri:	
KROPOTKIN—HIS FEDERALIST IDEAS	2d.
Errico Malatesta:	
ANARCHY	6d.
VOTE WHAT FOR?	1d.
M. L. Berneri:	
WORKERS IN STALIN'S RUSSIA	1/-
F. A. Ridley:	
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE MODERN AGE	2d.
Gaston Léval:	
COLLECTIVES IN SPAIN	1d.
Charles Duff:	
A HANDBOOK ON HANGING	2/-
John Olday:	
THE MARCH TO DEATH	1/6
THE LIFE WE LIVE, THE DEATH WE DIE	2/6
A. Ciliga:	
THE KRONSTADT REVOLT	2d.
Icarus:	
THE WILHELMSHAVEN REVOLT	6d.
"Equity":	
THE STRUGGLE IN THE FACTORY	3d.
McCartney:	
THE FRENCH COOKS SYNDICATE	3d.
William Godwin:	
SELECTIONS FROM POLITICAL JUSTICE	3d.
ON LAW	1d.
P. J. Proudhon:	
GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE 19th CENTURY	Cloth 5/-

★
FREEDOM PRESS
27, Red Lion Street,
London, W.C.1.

(Continued on page 4)

THE INTERNATIONAL ANARCHIST CONFERENCE

The International Anarchist Conference took place in France recently. It was attended by delegates from many countries and lasted over a week. The delegate of the Union of Anarchist Groups was our old comrade, Mat Kavanagh, who has reported on it personally to several groups. In this and succeeding issues of *Freedom* we are publishing translations of the resolutions passed by the Congress, and when publication is complete we hope to publish comments on the resolutions by the readers and editors of *Freedom*, who of course do not necessarily agree with the Conference's resolutions.

General Affirmations

ANARCHISM is essentially humanistic; a conception of human relations, and thus of social relations, based on the practice of freedom, and not exclusively on a concept of the economic structure of society. Anarchism is opposed not only to the modern State, or to such and such a form of capitalism, but to all aspects of authority and the class and caste systems they engender.

Anarchism combats all the diverse forms of authority: moral and religious, political and economic, all of which are inter-related to one another.

In fact, anarchism takes shapes from: (1) A struggle in the field of education: for a free environment and the development of the individual through freedom of action.

(2) A struggle for the realisation of federative forms of social and economic organisation.

It is in this sense that anarchism fights for a world without classes, without authority, where each individual will obtain the maximum of well-being and liberty in each epoch of the progressive development of mankind. Anarchism is thus a real socialism, in fact, the only true socialism, achieving freedom through the practice of freedom.

The methods of struggle of the anarchist movement are thus directly linked with these principles. The anarchist movement attacks all forms of authority: religions, states, armies, exploitive economic systems, and could never in any circumstances consent to collaborate with authoritarian bodies, churches, states, etc.

Yesterday and To-day

In September 1872, the anti-authoritarian delegation from Spain, Italy, France, the Jura Federation and North-America which constituted the effective majority of the First International, declared at the Congress of St. Imier, that "the social aspirations of the working-class cannot have any other object than the establishment of an organisation and an economic federation, both absolutely free, based on the labour and the equality of all, absolutely independent of all

governments, and that this organisation and this federation can only result from the spontaneous action of the workers themselves through industrial organisations and autonomous communes.

Seventy-seven years of historical experience; in the course of which other Congresses and all the propaganda of the anarchists have unceasingly repeated the same ideals; have proved the correctness of these basic principles that anarchist thinkers first of all enumerated. And as the first five decades of this century have passed, the federalist and anti-authoritarian solution of the social problem has become a more and more pressing necessity.

The liberal capitalist system has shown its bankruptcy. It has taken terrible economic crises to make public opinion admit this truth which very few people would dispute to-day. The exploitation for private profit of the land, minerals, factories, all the means of production, transport, distribution and exchange, is in such contradiction with the needs of society that almost all mankind desires a form of economic organisation on a collective basis.

This has led many countries to experiment with controlled economies brought about by governments of Marxist or totalitarian origin. But this "State Socialism" does not resolve economic or financial problems, or ameliorate the condition of the working masses. It reinforces the power of the State and adds to the existing evils of capitalism, new ones resulting from the existence of an insatiable parasitical bureaucracy, it adds to the limitations of the rights of the individual, and to the monopoly of power which represses and stifles the rights of the workers to defend their interests.

Moreover the experience of the Russian Revolution monstrously perverted by Bolshevik dictatorship which has created a new privileged caste of exploiters and oppressors sustained by a police terror, is a confirmation of the anarchist position which sees that the State can never serve as an instrument of liberation, and in consequence cannot possibly institute a society without class-divisions or op-

pression.

Socialism without liberty is not socialism; whatever new form the state takes, it creates new privileged classes or consolidates those already existing, establishing a vicious circle which can only be broken by the disappearance of the state itself. We can only repeat what we have always maintained: that only free methods will lead to freedom. This is outside the scope of all states, all forms of government, all authoritarian institutions.

The experience of the revolution in the Ukraine (that of the Makhnovists) and of the Spanish Revolution have proved the constructive and creative capacities of the organisations for production, distribution, transport, health services, education, defence, etc., set up by the manual and intellectual workers and peasants, by the application of libertarian principles outside of the state. These revolutions have given imperishable examples for future social revolutions. They have shown that in the relations between individuals, groups and peoples, can only be the work of organisations working from the bottom upward.

In the face of this evidence, and in the face of the dangers of the totalitarian state, and of the total extermination threatened by a third world war and before the prodigious progress of science and techniques which, while they could have been the means of well being and economic liberation, have created the monster-state and the prospect of annihilation; the International Congress declares:

(1) That it is incumbent upon anarchism, in its historic rôle as an anti-authoritarian and constructive force, to reinforce and participate in all struggles for freedom, and to demonstrate to the peoples effective ends and means.

(2) That the social problems which weigh on the world to-day, will find no solutions except in a profound transformation of human relations in the economic, political and moral spheres, which will do away with privilege and will guarantee the same rights to all individuals in a society founded on freedom and solidarity.

(3) That this profound transformation must be brought about by the oppressed working masses, whose insurrection for the expropriation of capitalism and the suppression of the State, does not imply the abandonment of the vital social organisations; quite to the contrary, their functions will be organised by the people themselves.

(4) The International Anarchist Conference appeals to all men and women who wish to end the eternal tragedy of our society, to oppose war, exploitation and servitude, with peace, liberty and justice in a free world.

(To be continued.)

ABC OF AUTHORITY

(Continued)

E is for Economic Authority. It is often said that some "incentive" (or threat) is needed to make people work, but if commerce (the exchange of property) and wars (which are all between governments) were abolished, people would need to work for less than they do now to ensure a reasonably high standard of living for everybody. Consider how many "man-hours" a day are now used up in purely financial calculation, in advertising and bargain-driving, and in destructive jobs like soldiering and munition making, or absolutely useless ones like bank-clerking and ticket-collecting. Eighty per cent. of the work done these days must be non-productive, and much of the remaining twenty per cent. is spent in the production of goods eventually to be destroyed in war or by way of trade. If technicians could earn their livings by inventing labour-saving devices, instead of engines of destruction, the average time worked by each person could be reduced still further, and the "unpleasant jobs" which nobody would choose except through economic necessity, could be eliminated altogether.

F is for Fantastic Authority. Nowadays, when most people have ceased to believe in Heaven and Hell, and in many cases in religion itself, the idea that fear of punishment "later on" is the principle incentive for righteous living has been largely discredited. But a much more dangerous fallacy, also of religious origin, is the "human nature" doctrine that all men are fundamentally evil, and that the natural desires of men and women should be repressed. This idea is still widely held in spite of the Churches' decline, and in the face of all schools of psychology which show the unpleasant results of such repression and the essentially social nature of human instincts.

(To be continued)

D.R.

FOREIGN COMMENTARY—Continued

The Old Story

WE know all about the fact that the last war was an ideological one—or do people still believe that tale?—but for those miserable individuals who still hold the old-fashioned view that markets still play a part, two items of news may encourage them not to abandon their viewpoint altogether. And curiously enough the items we have in mind refer to Japan and Germany!

The Manchester Chamber of Commerce report, already referred to, expressing the hope that the Government will attach the greatest weight to the conclusions of the forthcoming joint mission to Japan, states: "It is to be hoped that the initiative and effort of the trade will result in some long-term policy for Japan, for there is yet no sign of a true realisation in official circles of the fundamental dangers in the present redevelopment of the Japanese cotton textile industry."

There are three "causes for great concern" which are, briefly, that the aboli-

tion of "floor prices" allows Japan to sell all exported goods, except silk, at lower prices than "world levels"; that the decision to allow the flow of trade between the two market groups to be increased by 100 per cent. may seriously affect Lancashire trade; that it appears to be the policy of certain Colonial Office officials to be "only interested in obtaining the cheapest textiles for their market no matter from what source they come. It should not be forgotten by them that the purchasing power of the consumer in those markets largely depends upon purchases of raw materials and commodities made by the United Kingdom, and unless consideration is given to the importation of British goods in return this country may find itself unable to buy such domestic produce in the future."

And in the annual review number of the *Shipping World* published this month, undercutting of British and Continental prices by German ship-repairers is dis-

cussed by Mr. George S. Cromar, chairman of the Dry Dock Owners' and Repairers' Central Council. The Germans are able to do this, he says, because of lower wages, low overtime rates where they exist at all, few labour laws and regulations, and lower taxation.

These factors alone, he adds, do not explain the mystery of some recently quoted German prices which are half as low as British prices. This raises the question whether German ship-repairers have been deliberately quoting below cost to rebuild their foreign connections and are receiving undisclosed exchange privileges or subsidies. (Our italics.)

What a predicament for Capitalism in the next war! Obviously their policy will have to be wholesale genocide. But then the trouble will be that though they will wipe out competition, they will wipe out the markets at the same time! And then what?

LIBERTARIAN.

NEWS IN BRIEF

Cold War Anxiety Creates Mental Sickness

CONCERNED about the effects of the "cold war" on countless human beings, the International Congress of Military Doctors, meeting at Mexico City, summed up its official viewpoint in this resolution:

"The anguish of uncertainty, whose origin can be laid to the cold war and the sensation of temporariness created by a reading of the press in the minds of those who have just lived through a war, has much graver consequences for the mental equilibrium of humanity than the psychoses of war itself. These can be treated and cured, for they have well-defined clinical characteristics. The anguish of uncertainty is a collective state of mind which is manifested more clearly in those who have been participants in a war, and for which there is no healing remedy other than the cold war's cessation."

Delegates adopted the resolution after hearing frank talks on the mental condition of the world by doctors from France and China.—*Worldover Press*.

NEW SCHOOL TO FOSTER WORLD OUTLOOK

Copenhagen.

AFTER three years of preparation, an international school has been started here, to foster a world outlook.

As a tribute to Count Folke Bernadotte, U.N. arbitrator killed in Palestine, it has been named the Bernadotte school. Enrolled are 270 boys and girls from nine countries.

The idea of the institution was suggested by two Americans, Mrs. Eno Stewart and her son, the U.S. agricultural attaché in Copenhagen. Also instrumental in its creation was a Dane, C. J. Arvin, who has become the first director.

The school was sponsored by an international committee and Danish educational bodies. Teaching, from the kindergarten up, is in Danish and English. All shares are held by the parents. There are 500 names on a waiting list.—*Worldover Press*.

THEY "ESCAPED FROM HELL"

Bonn.

THREE babies in a single baby carriage set out the other day from a refugee camp near Giessen, heading a "protest march" on Bonn. Three babies and three carriages arrived nine days later in the federal capital. Sympathetic spectators, watching the sorry procession pass by, had contributed to two lacking prams en route.

This little episode is characteristic of the nation-wide interest in, and sympathy for, the sad plight of refugees from Germany who are pouring into the federal republic in an ever-swelling tide. If the refugee sometimes create friction, they also find warmth.

The babies were part of 30 "protest marchers", ragged and hungry men,

THE WAY IT HAPPENS

THE question "How do people become Anarchists?" is one with which we are constantly intrigued. If only we could accept the process described in the letter below, which appeared in the *Daily Express*, as likely to lead to mass support of our ideas, we would give up producing *Freedom*, and start selling the *Daily Express*!

LETTER OF THE DAY

I have recently switched to reading the *Daily Express* with its famous cartoonists. Before doing so I was a peace-loving social democrat, who thought the Conservative Party completely hopeless. Now I support anarchism and am certain the Conservative Party is completely hopeless. That's the way it happens.—RONALD MOSS, Cricklewood, N.W.2.

women and children, who walked a distance of 110 miles to make their case. All had escaped from the Soviet Zone and were asking for sanctuary in the West.

Eight of the refugees had been working under inhuman conditions in the uranium mines of Aue, Saxony. They carried a placard which read: "WE ESCAPED FROM HELL—AUE."

A delegation of the group was received by a minister of the Bonn government, who promised the early passage of a law that will grant asylum to bona fide refugees from the Eastern Zone.—*Worldover Press*.

SLAVERY IN SOUTH AFRICA

THERE was an angry scene in Johannesburg when a large group of Europeans and non-Europeans crowded round a farmer's lorry parked in Commissioner Street. The rear portion of the lorry had been converted into a wire cage in which two Natives were padlocked. They were convicts being taken to work their sentences on a farm. Shouts of "slavery" were heard among the crowd and, at one time, it looked as though an ugly incident might develop. But the driver emerged from a building and drove away. A senior official at the Fort said there was no regulation to prevent a farmer conveying hired convicts in a "cage" of the type described. He considered, however, that the farmer had been indiscreet in parking the vehicle in the city, and promised to discuss the matter with him.

—*Cape Argus* (Johannesburg), 28/11/49. [quoted in *New Statesman*, 7/1/50.]

THE FORMIDABLE BEVIN

Colombo, 12/1/50.

MR. BEVIN, when he was Minister of Labour, showed "the wisdom of Solomon and the authority of Stalin, a truly formidable combination," said Professor J. Rodrigo, of Colombo University, to-day.

He was speaking at the ceremony of conferring an honorary degree on Mr. Bevin.—*Reuter*.

★ Colombo, 6/1/50.

SWEATING Ceylonese bearers surrounded by anxious officials struggled up and down Senate building stairways here to-day in a test with the bamboo palanquin chair which may be used to carry Mr. Bevin.

To make absolutely sure that four bearers could carry Mr. Bevin without risk of accident two Ceylonese officials sat in the chair.—*Reuter*.

It seems he weighs as much as two men, too!

Special Appeal

January 1st to 13th:

Cambridge: C.L.D.* 5/-; Glasgow: A.M.C.* 4/-; Stirling: R.A.B.* 10/-; Seattle: F.H. 22; Llanelli: L.W. 10/-; London: F.E.D.* 5/-; Tunbridge Wells: P.S. 1/6; Swansea: R.R. 24/6/6; Horwich: W.H.B. 3/6; Birmingham: E.W. 1/6; Glossop: H.S. 5/-; Denver, Col.: R.B. 2/-; Washington: R.G.A. 1/6; Dover: D.J. 8/3; Shepton Mallet: D.F.M. 5/-; Camberley: J.W.F. 6/-; Crewe: F.O. 1/6; Nottingham: K.N. 1/6; Anon 2/6; London: V.R.* 10/-; London: L.G.W.* 5/-; Gosport: A.J.M.* 5/-; York: H.A.A. 5/2; Attlebridge: C.S. 3/-.

1950 TOTAL TO DATE ... £11 8 5

Gift of Books (1): Anon.
Gift of Books (2): Anon.

*After initials indicates contributors to the 5/- a month scheme proposed by a London reader.

FREEDOM

Anarchist Fortnightly
Price 3d.

Postal Subscription Rates
6 months 4/6 (U.S.A. \$1).
12 months 8/6 (U.S.A. \$2).

Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies
6 months 7/6 (\$1.50).
12 months 15/- (\$3).

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.

Meetings and Announcements

UNION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS: CENTRAL LONDON

INDOOR Lecture-Discussions every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. at the

Trade Union Club, Great Newport St., W.C.2 (near Leicester Square Station).

January 22nd Speaker: Alan Smith
"WILLIAM GODWIN"

January 29th Speaker: Allen Vaughan
"MARXISM AND ANARCHISM"

February 5th Speaker: S. E. Parker
"DIRECT ACTION & THE INDIVIDUAL"

February 12th Speaker: Margery Mitchell
"THE HISTORY OF GOVERNMENT"

February 19th Speaker: Albert Meltzer
"THE FUTILITY OF ELECTIONS"

GLASGOW ANARCHIST GROUP

INDOOR MEETINGS every Sunday at 7 p.m. at the

CENTRAL HALLS, 25 BATH STREET, GLASGOW.

Frank Leech, John Geffney, Eddie Shaw.

MERSEYSIDE ANARCHIST GROUP

OPEN DISCUSSION MEETINGS held fortnightly

PLEASE NOTE: NEXT MEETING Sunday, January 29th at 7.30 p.m.

Meetings fortnightly thereafter. Enquiries: Ring Royal 4669

COLNE & NELSON DISTRICT

Discussion Group to be held fortnightly.

Sunday, January 29th, at 3.0 p.m. at

Twisters and Drawers Club, Cambridge Street, Colne (Lancs.)

HAMPSTEAD

Discussion Meetings are held every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m. prompt at

5, Villas-on-the-Heath, Vale of Health, Hampstead, N.W.3