

This issue should not be sold to anyone under 18 years of age

The UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN

AN INDEPENDENT TRIMLY FOR UNIVERSITY ANARCHISTS,
RATIONALISTS & HUMANISTS

CONTENTS

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD							
<i>About Anarchism</i>	4
JULIETTE MARRES							
<i>Euthanasia</i>	7
YOTI LANE							
<i>Sex and Society — II</i>	9
COLIN WARD							
<i>The New Blasphemy</i>	12
EDMUND J. EGAN							
<i>Freedom and Authority in the Church</i>	13
G. KENDALL							
<i>1956: Crisis and Criticism</i>	15
GEORGE WOODCOCK							
<i>Charles Fourier: the Phalansterian</i>	16
PHIL LEWIS							
<i>World Government</i>	18
J. HENRY LLOYD							
<i>The International Humanist Congress at London</i>	20

No. 4

1957, AUTUMN

ONE SHILLING

An extra 4 pages

THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN

exists to provoke discussion of anarchist, rationalist, and humanist ideas in the universities, and to promote the evolution of those ideas so that they retain their validity and usefulness. It is published termly on the dates below, and is a non-profit venture.

Publication Dates:

about a week before the beginning of each term, as below.

Issue	AUTUMN	WINTER	SPRING
Date of publication	Oct. 1	Jan. 7	Apr. 7
Last date for advertisements and letters for publication	Aug. 27	Dec. 2	Mar. 3
Last date for articles	Aug. 20	Nov. 25	Feb. 24

Manuscripts, Subscriptions and Advertisements

should be sent to the Editor, V. Mayes, 13 Bannerman Avenue, Prestwich, Manchester. Remittances should be made payable to "The University Libertarian" and crossed. Subscribers overseas or in special circumstances may if they prefer make remittances payable to "V. Mayes."

Published by
THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN (non-profit), 13 Bannerman Avenue,
Prestwich, Manchester.

Printed by
Philip Sansom, 84a Whitechapel High Street, London, E.1.

THE UNIVERSITY LIBERTARIAN

AN INDEPENDENT TERMLY FOR UNIVERSITY ANARCHISTS,
RATIONALISTS & HUMANISTS

No 4

1957 AUTUMN

Monolithic Morality

BY A COINCIDENCE this issue contains an article by a member of each of the two most powerful authoritarian forces in the world today, each appraising the correctness of the behaviour of their organizations over specific issues, which is a healthy development to say the least. The two forces, the Catholic Church and the Communist Party, have often been compared, to their mutual disadvantage and mutual indignation. Both claim to be the agent of historical and cosmic forces whose vastness and significance renders petty and contemptible, and even impermissible, individual disagreements. Both regard the errors of individual officials on specific issues

and at specific times as irrelevant to the correctness of the historical view held of the purpose and destiny of humanity, and as not affecting in the slightest the suitability of the organization for carrying out the purpose revealed to it. This makes it possible for episodes like the Inquisition on the one side and the Stalin era on the other to be dismissed as mistakes and deviations, whereas in fact they sprang far more naturally from the psychological roots of the movements than any periods of fear-free tolerance which might be collected by a fine-tooth comb. The movements recruit the same type of personality, the self-dissatisfied personality so acutely described in Eric Hoffer's *The True Believer*. Even the death-rolls of the two movements are similar, deaths for religious offences and in officially-encouraged religious massacres being estimated at nine million by one authority for the last thousand years of the Catholic Church, and the deaths caused by administrative action of one sort or another (but excluding deaths in official wars) being perhaps five to ten million in the USSR. In both cases this sort of thing has tapered off due to the bad publicity which results, and perhaps even due to the missionary activity of liberalism. The Catholic Church burned its last Jew about 1820 in Portugal, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union now employs, as a punishment of incredible subtlety no doubt learned from the Chinese, banishment to electric power stations. Finally, the organizational and ideological aspects of the two movements, because of their common psychological root, show such striking similarities that it has been usual among liberals to apply the entire Catholic vocabulary to the Communist movement. The latter has dogmas, heresies, schisms and a hierarchy; and now, with the development of national-communist movements, it looks as if it is going to have a Reformation as well.

On the other hand, there comes a point at which an analogy breaks down, and in this case we think it appears when the possibilities of self-correction in these movements is considered. The Communist Party has always accepted both explicitly and by its self-praise as "scientific" that it must judge itself by the standards of materialist science; and it happens, notwithstanding the Lysenko episode and Nazi race-biology, that science and scientists as a social and cultural influence are not significantly under the control of the Communist Party or any other coherent movement: not even of the humanist and rationalist movements which have borrowed its empirical and materialist philosophy. The Communist movement is also explicitly committed to change, which it views almost metaphysically in its

THIS ISSUE

is a bumper one by our standards, no less than 20 pages. It is an attempt to arouse whatever interest there may be in the venture, for our own guidance as to its future. Future issues will return to 16 pages, partly because 20 pages costs extra postage, but mainly because we would prefer to use any increased flow of material by appearing more frequently than once a term.

The price of this issue has been raised to a shilling, and the prices for copies by post and bulk orders by 2d. per copy as follows, for this issue only: SINGLE COPIES BY POST, U.K. 1/2d., overseas 1/6d. or 20 U.S. cents. BULK ORDERS (minimum 6), post free, 10d. per copy in U.K., overseas 1/- or 15 cents. SALE OR RETURN (in good condition) ditto, but not applicable overseas.

The following terms remain unaltered: SPECIMEN COPIES TO FRIENDS, 6d. or 7 cents. SUBSCRIPTION RATE for 1 copy each of 6 issues, or 2 copies each of 3 issues, U.K. 5/6d., overseas 7/- or 1 dollar. FREE COPIES on request where there is genuine difficulty in remitting on currency or political grounds. REVIEW COPIES sent regularly on request.

It is the practice of the *University Libertarian* to send a complimentary copy of the appropriate issue to all persons and organizations mentioned by name or quoted, or whose publications are reviewed, and review copies are sent to every English-speaking college periodical of which we have the address. We should appreciate a reciprocal courtesy on the part of other periodicals, particularly where these circulate only locally.

philosophy of dialectical materialism. Consequently the possibility is permanently present in the Communist movement that someone will feel it his duty to point out any discrepancies he may have noticed between the Party's assumptions and actions and the accumulating body of neutral fact in any scientific sphere—sociological facts, economic facts, psychological facts. Nobody really likes the discomfort of reappraisal, but making it a duty increases the chance that it will happen.

By contrast, in the Catholic Church the flock is presumed to be ever on the verge of plunging into error, and timelessness is valued more than change, which is regarded as a mere restlessness probably stemming from spiritual unease. Change is felt as a threat to the Church; this does not stop the Church from changing or from being liberalised against its will, so that to a Spanish Catholic an English Catholic is no better than a Protestant, but it can drag its feet to great effect. And the Catholic Church accepts no external authority or standard of behaviour, except for a god of its own fabrication, which is clearly no protection against error. If the Communist Party has greater resources of self-correction than the Catholic Church, then, it can fairly be said to have greater *moral* resources. In twenty years time the Catholic Church will not have changed greatly, but the Communist Party in the Soviet Union may have changed out of all recognition (this may not apply to Communist Parties out of power, which will lack the educational experience of the CPSU). Already the theory of the collapse of capitalism has been repeatedly questioned; nobody in the Catholic Church has queried the virginity of Mary.

Till you see the whites of their eyes

Recently a subscriber at a front-rank American university, which lies west of the Allegheny Mountains and not a hundred miles from Steubenville, Ohio—but which must otherwise remain unidentified—wrote to us asking us not to send him any further issues of his unexpired subscription. As he did not ask for his money back and expressed no criticisms of the *Libertarian*, and as we like to know why people cancel subscriptions, and particularly because this subscriber gave a dollar donation when the *Libertarian* was being launched, we wrote to ask why the affair had cooled off. He very courteously replied at length:

"... The reason is largely a matter of security. Alone and with no one else to think about, I ran the risk of possessing and reading and discussing what most Americans might label 'subversive'. But since the advent of children I do not feel I can subject them to the possible consequences of the freedom to think and act as I see fit, at least, not until they are in a position to fend for themselves. I am not a socialist, communist, anarchist, etc., but it doesn't matter what you are in a climate that neither tolerates nor appreciates your right to be different. If you criticize governmental policy, you are subversive. If you dare not to strike with a labor union, you are a 'scab'. Group conformity, no matter what the group, may be an inherent feature of life, but today pressure for it has reached an incredible extreme. I seethe against it, have rebelled against it (and paid the price on more than one occasion) and will continue to do so if and when 'the chips are down'. But to subject my family to hardship and criticism is more than I feel capable of facing unless and until the occasion warrants it. Reading radical journals, I believe, is not such an occasion, and is something I willingly give up in order not to run the risks I mention.

But, while I do not agree with all your journal contains, I know its function is vital and people should be glad such a paper continues, agree or disagree with its tenets..."

Naturally being a little perturbed at the picture which this letter conjures up, we asked a humanist friend, who spends his time moving between Britain and America on the slender excuse of a Fulbright scholarship, whether this was a fair picture of the U.S. just now. He said he didn't think so, and that interference with intellectual freedom is still very slight, but that it varied greatly from university to university according to whether the university constitution enabled the governors to interfere with the appointment of staff. He instanced Columbia University as one where the staff were virtually immune from conformity pressures, "even Communists." It does seem to us that power is sufficiently dispersed in the U.S. (at present at least) for it to be likely that any local deterioration in intellectual freedom is due to the default of the radicals rather than to a neofascist offensive. It is true that there are alarming facts in the American scene, such as the fact that the most powerful religious organization by far, and hence the one likely to provide the mystique of any degenerate reaction to war or slump or humiliation, is the Catholic Church, which has a rationale of intolerance matched only by the Communists and Fascists. But it is also true that the first critics of America, and the most effective and informed ones, are Americans. Southern education is being integrated, not by Britons or Russians, but by Americans. The most penetrating analyses of American difficulties and American possibilities are being carried on by Americans, and the consequent innovations are being carried on by Americans.

Sociological work of the most revolutionary consequences, and of irrefutable thoroughness, of which the most publicised has been the Kinsey report, is being produced by Americans in a quantity not matched by the rest of the world put together. Yet America is sniped at incessantly until the American intellectual, in the words of Clyde Kluckhohn (professor of anthropology at Harvard), becomes "weary and irritated by the lampooning of his way of life by friends and enemies." The American is perforce a revolutionary, and since the rest of humanity has opted to follow his road he perforce finds himself more of a vanguard than any communist can hope to be. The American intellectual should count himself privileged to be part of such a cadre; we cannot understand anyone resigning from it. Innovators have always worked in an intimidatory atmosphere, and their opponents have always resorted readily to threats or acts of economic penalties and physical harm. But this was never in itself sufficient reason in the past for retreat, so let us continue to hold the line for the time being.

Coprophilia

At the time of writing there is a terrific furore going on over some very *ordinary* and commonplace remarks made by Lord Altrincham about the impression at present created by the monarchy. Whether this topic will still be of interest when this paragraph appears in print is not certain (already some of those who hysterically screamed for the noble lord's head are on their shamefaced way to their psychiatrist) but we feel the same sort of urge to unburden ourselves as Lord Altrincham did and happen to have the same opportunity as he did—a magazine of our own with no censorship of fake taste. And as this magazine is pub-

lished only six miles from the borough from which his title comes there is the matter of regional solidarity to consider, although it is certain that both Altrincham and its baron will feel this support to be something of a leper's kiss.

The monarchists themselves do not seem to realize that it is they who provoke these outbursts, which come from positive pillars of society like the editor of *Punch* and those peers who edit magazines as well as owning them. Many people are prepared to tolerate the monarchy, in an amiable spirit, because of its negative virtues; for instance, vast numbers of the British people must be considered, non-pejoratively, as emotionally infantile, and it is alarming to think what they might turn to if they were deprived of their mother-surrogate. So those of us who are repelled by the cult of H.M. Personality (at least ten million photographs of her family must be published each week) are not necessarily uncompromisingly anti-monarchist. (This is no attitude for an anarchist to take, and at least one of the *University Libertarian's* co-editors disagrees strongly with it, but empiricism is a greater virtue than consistency.)

But as the bull is piled on week after week, on television and on film newsreels, in the posh papers and in the rabble-rags, until one despairs of the coprophiliac appetites of men in the mass, eventually the emetic limit is reached by someone. Then there is an explosion, not from people of bad taste but from people of good taste who have been sickened to the limit of tolerance. The motivation of Muggeridge and Altrincham is the motivation of Ian Nairn; the monarchy, which could be aesthetically inoffensive at least, is an Outrage.

Conferences

We had hoped to include accounts of the International Humanist and Ethical Union Conference and the London Anarchist Group Summer School, but our arrangements for covering these have broken down. It may be possible to print news of some of the more enduring consequences in the next issue.

Pressure of time and space has also prevented us from discussing, as we promised to do, Professor Ayer's criticism of anarchists that "they do not pay enough attention to the problems of organization". Readers should regard all our promises as provisional.

Our Contributors

GEORGE WOODCOCK, who writes on Charles Fourier in his biographical series on famous libertarian thinkers, will be familiar to readers of the *Libertarian* from the last issue. Although we never got that article we promised on Latin America, his travels in that region have borne substantial fruit in the form of twenty-five shillingsworth of *To the City of the Dead*, published by Faber and well received by all the best papers. The next issue of the *Libertarian* will contain the article on Proudhon promised for this.

PHIL LEWIS, after three years as an R.A.F. meteorologist in Africa, Arabia and Palestine, furtively entered University College, Swansea, and got away with a B.A. in economics and philosophy. After a year at Leicester resulting in a post-graduate certificate in education he

taught English for three years at Copenhagen and Elsinore. This year he became English teacher and Vice-Principal at the High School for young Hungarian refugees at Hald, pronounced Hal, near Viborg. He asked us to extend a hearty welcome to any British students (and other academics) wishing to stay at Hald International Student Centre, which runs a season of cultural and social activities during the summer. Unfortunately the details reached us too late to advertise this year's activities in the Spring issue, but next Spring we will publish full details in plenty of time.

G. KENDALL is a Canadian Communist who graduated longer ago than he cares to remember from University of British Columbia, Vancouver. He was asked to write about the current ferment and reappraisal in the C.P. when he expressed great distress over the Hungarian developments, but nevertheless declared his intention of remaining in the Communist Party. Articles by people who criticize the C.P. and leave it are ten a penny, but its policy will be decided by the people who stay behind. Insofar as the C.P., though politically of slight importance in Britain, is of considerable international consequence, an effort must be made to become and remain informed as to what Communists are thinking. (Similar articles will be solicited from time to time from other movements with whom we are normally rather distant.) The contents of the article have not been influenced in any way except that the original terms of reference asked that the article should deal with the current reappraisal being made by the C.P. The author's name is a nom-de-plume, used "for passport reasons." We have reason to be satisfied, in this instance, that it is not because of possible Party repercussions.

JULIETTE MARRES is a nursing assistant. She writes, apropos of her article on euthanasia, "Unfortunately my opinion is not shared by any intellectuals, like psychiatrists or sociologists, only by insignificant people like nursing assistants, who long since have resigned themselves to the absurd, distorted moral standards of society, or if they are trying to rise in the social scale, carefully hide their true feelings. I have paid special attention to the objections of the churches, because I do believe in the validity of Christian principles myself." A further letter appears from her elsewhere in this issue.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD lectures on Government in the Faculty of Commerce and Social Science at Birmingham (for our Alabama readers, this is Birmingham, England). (For our English readers, Alabama is in America.) He read Political Economy at Oxford 1948-50, and extracted a Ph.D. from research into "Socialism and Public Ownership" under G. D. H. Cole. With J. A. Banks he wrote a booklet on *Co-operative Democracy* in 1955. At present he is researching into the sociology of Co-operation.

YOTI LANE is a personal adviser on a national women's magazine with a considerable background of sociological experience. In addition to the details given in the last issue, she is a friend of Kwame N'Krumah, and during his stay in London gathered from him and another African a collection of *African Folk Tales* (1949) written down for the first time. In 1950 she published *If You Would Act* "which has a good deal of psychology in it," and in 1952, under the pen-name of Mark Mayo, *The Red, the Yellow and the Green* (Peter Davies), a "tough psychological novel; I believe it is cherished by the staffs of psychiatric hospitals."

About Anarchism

THE TERM "ANARCHY", as anyone who possesses an etymological dictionary can verify, derives from the Greek words meaning "without rule or government"; and an anarchist is one who advocates such a condition of society. The term today, however, is so surrounded by confusion that, in order to understand anarchism as a social philosophy, it is necessary to state first of all what it is *not*.

The anarchy advocated by anarchists is *not* a condition of social chaos. The term "anarchy" in one of its usages is synonymous with this—as when one speaks of "the anarchy of capitalist production," "the international anarchy," or, less legitimately, of a State with a weak, vacillating or timid government. Far from advocating social chaos, anarchists advocate social order: they believe as strongly in "order" as does the most die-hard Tory or, for that matter, any sane person. They differ, however, from the Tories in not coupling "law" and "order" together. On the contrary, they believe that law—rules enforceable by sanctions of the State—and order—the sort of order they are interested in—are incompatible with one another. Anarchists believe in social order but in a social order without government, a non-governmental order. It may be, of course, that the absence of government under certain conditions might lead to anarchy in the sense of social chaos. Personally, I have little doubt that if, by some miracle, government were abolished tomorrow, chaos would result. Anarchists do not wish to see simply the absence of government in this sense. They wish to establish conditions in which government is absent because it is *unnecessary*; and government will continue to be necessary so long as people believe it to be necessary and allow themselves to be governed. Anarchy in the anarchist sense would only result from the abolition of government tomorrow if, at the same time as government was abolished, people were transformed into anarchists.

The second thing anarchism is *not* is utopianism, in the sense of a belief in the perfect society. There is nothing despicable in being utopian. We all have our utopias—even those so-called "scientific socialists," the Marxians. The business-man's utopia is a society in which income tax is 6d. in the pound, where fat expense allowances are permitted, and where the workers touch their caps to the bosses. The working-man's utopia (1957 version) is a society in which every other week he wins something on the pools and once in a lifetime he hits the jackpot with a £75,000 winning line. The anarchist's utopia is rather more imaginative and attractive than these, as reader of William Morris' *News from Nowhere* may judge for themselves. But anarchists do not equate their utopia with anarchy. Anarchism as a social philosophy does not rest on the assumption that men are perfect or will ever become so. Even William Godwin, the apostle of the doctrine of the perfectibility of man—a doctrine today derided by those who have never understood what it meant—did not believe that men would ever reach perfection. Anarchism, in short, is not the perfect society, although it is, I believe, a condition which would lead to a more perfect society.

Thirdly, anarchism is *not* a political programme and anarchists are not a political party. The only candidate the anarchists have ever run for Parliament is the one they ran at the 1955 election: a mythical character named Joe Soap who was supported by 25% of the electorate—those who abstained from voting. Anarchists don't have a programme one can subscribe to;

if one is "converted" to anarchism there is no organisation to join and pay subscriptions to; anarchists are not peddling any political panacea for the electorate to buy, or offering anything or anyone to vote for. And this is not because anarchists don't have principles or organisations. There are organisations of anarchists and these sometimes publish statements of their aims; but anarchist organisations, in England at least, are functional groups—groups of people doing a particular job like running a bookshop or producing a paper.

Anarchists are not politicians or would-be politicians: they are non-political. In the phrase of Herbert Read, their politics is "the politics of the unpolitical." As soon as one understands what politics is about, it is easy to see why anarchists are non-political. Politics is concerned with the relationship between ruler and ruled. As an academic study, it is concerned with studying how men are ruled—the ruler-ruled relationship in all its manifestations. As an activity, it is the art of ruling others—the art of manipulating men. In dictatorships this manipulation is frequently achieved by the use or threat of physical force; in democracies it is more characteristically achieved by collecting a majority of votes—a process politely known as winning the consent of the people. But the difference between dictatorship and democracy in this respect is only one of degree. No dictatorship rests wholly on force and no democracy can dispense with force: all governments use force or the threat of force and the State, in its simplest terms, is the institution which claims to exercise the legitimate powers of coercion in a territorial society.

Anarchists are rightly described as non-political because they reject the ruler-ruled relationship and the coercion implied in it. They don't want to rule or coerce anybody and they don't want to be ruled or coerced by anybody. The only form of government they subscribe to is self-government—in the literal sense of that term. What is usually called self-government is nothing of the kind: it is the government of the many by the few, for in all societies the *de facto* governors are a small minority. Anarchists reject the sovereignty of the State, whether it be a dictatorial or a democratic State. The only sovereignty they subscribe to is the sovereignty of the individual. In terms of political philosophy, an anarchist society is one in which each individual is sovereign. Each man is his own master, *i.e.*, there are no masters at all. The anarchist ideal was expressed in the words of William Morris: "No master, high or low," and, more ironically, by that American demagogue, Huey Long: "Every man a king." In other words, the anarchist recognises no authority as legitimate save himself. In a sense, anarchism is social Protestantism, Protestantism taken to its logical conclusion.

Anarchist philosophy, no more than any other philosophy, is not a rational doctrine in the sense that it can be demonstrated Q.E.D. The principle of the sovereignty of the individual is a normative principle, a statement of value. And statements of value cannot be proved true or false: they can only be argued about and, in the last resort, either accepted or rejected. The arguments in support of the doctrine are various and in a short space only one or two of them can be presented here. In part it rests on the profound observation of William Morris: "No man is good enough to be another man's master." Power, we are told, corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. But even if this were not the case and it were possible

to breed, as Plato hoped to do, a class of wise, benevolent and incorruptible masters, the anarchist would still maintain his position. For power corrupts not only those who exercise it: it corrupts even more those who are subject to it. The most corrupt of men are not to be found in high places: they are to be found among the powerless, among those who are reduced to servility because of the lack of power. It is at the bottom not at the top of the social hierarchy that one finds the most disgusting love of power—among those who want and like to be told what to do. The corruption of the sycophantic servant will remain even when masters become wise; and subjects will remain servile even when philosophers have become kings.

The doctrine of the sovereignty of the individual does not, however, rest so much on the social effects of power as on a profound sense of the individuality of man. The anarchist is very conscious of his individuality and it is this consciousness which pervades his whole thinking. We are all very prone in talking about other people to place them into categories and to think of, and act towards, people as if these categories exhausted their essence. We say: He is an Englishman, or a Frenchman, a Jew or a German; he is a butcher, or baker, or candlestick maker; he is a Catholic, or a Protestant, or a heretic; he is a bourgeois, a prole, or a *déclassé* intellectual. But however many such labels fit a man, they do not fully describe him. Strip him of all his labels and he still remains a man; a unique creature the like of whom has never been seen on earth before and the like of whom will never be seen again. Not only is he physically different from everybody else—a fact which the police make good use of in their finger-print departments—but he is also mentally and spiritually different. He can stand up and say: "I am I," and when he does that he asserts something which nobody else can assert, for each ego is qualitatively different from every other ego.

When as a child I first read the story of Moses and the burning bush, I was puzzled by the inscrutable reply which Moses got when he asked of the voice in the bush: What is your name? and received the answer, *I am that I am*. How awful it sounded,

Are You What You Are ?

Or is you still us? Believe it or not, your degree of understanding of this vital problem is bound up with your understanding of anarchism.

For this purpose you have no better helpmeet than

FREEDOM The Anarchist Weekly

3d. Weekly.

Special offer to Students:

3 months Subscription: 2/6 (usually 4/6).

Trial copies free. From

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

27 Red Lion Street, London, WC2

where there is a good stock of new and secondhand books. Books searched for.

Any book sent *post free*. Send for list.

how like a god! But later I discovered that there was another character, also mythical, who said much the same thing: Popeye the Sailor man: I yam wot I am! I then realized that *I* am what *I* am; and *you* are what *you* are; and *he* is what *he* is. If God was the perfect being who could say "I am what I am," then, I too, like God, was perfect. Since in myself I am unique, then I am in the last analysis incomparable with anyone else. I am the perfect Geoffrey Ostergaard, for there is no other Geoffrey Ostergaard like me, even if there happens to be someone with the same name. Whatever "bad" qualities I possess in comparison with those of other people, their combination in me is unique and hence perfect in itself. It follows therefore that I am the most important being in the universe—for *me*; and, equally, that you are the most important being in the universe—for *you*. The poem in Jack London's novel, *The Iron Heel*, evokes this godlike feeling:

The man you drove from Eden's grove,
Was I, my Lord, was I,
And I shall be there when the earth and the air
Are rent from sea to sky;
For this is my world, my gorgeous world,
The world of my dear delight,
From the brightest gleam of the Arctic stream
To the dusk of my own love-night.

This, it may be said, is sheer egoism; and so in a way it is. But it is an egoism that recognises the legitimate egoism of every other ego. I do not say that I am more important than anyone else: I say simply that I am the most important person in the world *for me*. The world that I experience with my five senses is *my* world and when I die—when my ego is extinct—then my world dies with me. At the present time the world is plagued not by egoists in my sense but by altruists: people who claim they want to live for others and even to die for others. Their heads, as Max Stirner pointed out, are full of fixed ideas, of abstractions. They are willing to fight for England, for Russia, for Egypt and, if necessary, to die for these words; or they devote themselves to causes—democracy, national independence, freedom, the socialist revolution, or what have you. They would do less harm to others and more good to themselves if they ceased being such altruists, if they started to live for themselves. But such people do not wish to possess their own selves: they wish to lose themselves in a mass movement, to identify themselves with it. The anarchist is no such altruist: if he fights for freedom, he fights for *his* freedom; and if he dies for freedom, he dies for *his* freedom. If he fights for the freedom of others, he does so because he knows that *his* freedom is involved in the freedom of others. The anarchist does not wish to possess anything or anybody; he wishes to possess himself; to own himself. He says simply: "I am a man; we are all men. Alone of all the animals, man is the one that can say 'I,' the one with the capacity to be aware of himself as a separate identity. Let us therefore treat each other as such, as *men*."

A sense of individuality is something which, perhaps, one experiences rather than comprehends in intellectual terms. What I have written in the last three paragraphs would probably make no sense to, say, a member of a primitive clan. Such a man, as Erich Fromm has pointed out,* might express his sense of identity in the formula: "I am we"; he cannot conceive of himself as an individual existing apart from his social group. It would not have made much sense to

**The Sane Society*, pp. 61-3.

the medieval man. In the medieval world, the individual was identified with his social role in the feudal hierarchy. The serf was not a man who happened to be a serf and the feudal lord was not a man who happened to be a feudal lord. He was a serf or a lord and this sense of his unalterable station was an essential part of his sense of identity. It was only with the breakdown of the feudal order that a sense of individuality became at all widespread. It manifested itself first in the fields of art and literature, then in philosophy—Descartes' "I think, therefore I am" marks the beginning of modern philosophy and in one aspect is an attempt to answer the quest for identity—and, finally, in the fields of economics and politics, in the 18th and 19th centuries.

That most characteristic of 18th century doctrines, the doctrine of the Rights of Man, cannot be understood unless one recognises that it was rooted in this new-found sense of individuality.† Liberty and equality were demanded for men *as men*—whatever their social status or social function might be. And fraternity, it was believed, would result if liberty and equality for men as men were achieved; that is, a relationship of brotherhood would obtain between man and man.

This ideal of brotherhood, of fraternity, is of special significance in the understanding of anarchism. It does not imply, as it is often taken to imply, merely being nice to each other, of liking one another. Brothers are frequently not nice to each other and frequently don't like each other. The distinguishing mark of the relationship of brotherhood is equality of authority. A father may command but a brother does not—unless he seeks to usurp the position of the father. It is precisely this relationship, where no person commands another, which the anarchist wishes to achieve and if it ever became universal, anarchy would be the result: society would consist of sovereign individuals. In such a society, where no person has the right to command another, each person would fulfil his function on the basis of co-operation and mutuality. There is nothing inherently absurd about this. At the present time there are situations in which this relationship exists. The normal relationship that exists between man and wife in their family life is largely determined according to the principle of co-operation rather than by the authority of the husband to command the wife, as existed in older forms of patriarchal society. Similarly, friends in performing services for each other do not dream of commanding each other; they help one another out of a feeling of love and respect. The friend who commands soon ceases to be a friend.

At this point it may be asked: "Is anarchism, then, nothing more than 19th century individualism? Isn't anarchism the most 'extreme' form of socialism? What of those anarchists, like Kropotkin, who called themselves communists (small c)?" It is true, of course, that today most anarchists are communists in the sense that they believe that distribution should be on the basis of individual need; and it is also true that anarchists have played, at one time or another, a not inconsiderable part in the socialist movement. But anarchists cannot be distinguished by their views on property. Some anarchists have argued for a system under which each individual would own the property he used (and no more); others—the anarchist-communists—have argued for a system under which property would be owned in common; where nobody would own anything because everybody would 'own' everything. All that anarchists are agreed upon is that in the economic sphere, as in other spheres, the relation be-

tween individuals shall be one of mutual co-operation and not an authoritarian relationship of master and servant.

Anarchism is certain not 19th century individualism of the type represented by the late Sir Ernest Benn and the Society of Individualists, because it insists on applying the principle of the sovereignty of the individual to all spheres. Clearly, the relationship between employer and employee is not one of mutual co-operation. The employer buys the services of the worker and, however benevolent his attitude may be, he still commands him, not on the basis of mutuality but on the basis of having bought his working time "or so many hours a day. Under capitalism, men are not treated as ends in themselves; man is used by man; some men—employees—are treated as instruments in the hands of other men—employers. As Fromm points out, underlying capitalism there is a system of values which regards things as more important than men. Capital employs labour and not labour, capital: "Capital, the dead past, employs labour—the living vitality and power of the present."‡ The person who owns capital commands the person who owns only his life, his skill, and his creative productivity. The conflict between labour and capital, which had been the most glaring feature of modern industrialism, is thus not merely a conflict between social classes. In Fromm's words: "It is the conflict between two principles of value: that between the world of things and their amassment, and the world of life and its productivity."

When this fact is appreciated, the basis of anarchist criticism of modern socialism becomes evident. Since the days of Marx and largely owing to the influence of Marx, socialism has been conceived in terms of ownership. Until recently at least, a socialist has been defined as one who believes in common, usually State, ownership as opposed to private ownership. However, with the experience of Russia and even this country to guide us, it is becoming increasingly evident, as it has been evident to anarchists all along, that a mere change of ownership effects no radical change in social relations. When common ownership takes the form of State ownership, all that happens is that the State becomes the universal employer and the possibilities of tyranny are multiplied by the union of economic and political power. The values underlying capitalism are not changed; the worker remains essentially a thing, a commodity, a unit of labour; he has only changed one set of masters, the capitalists, for another set of masters, the political and managerial bureaucrats.

A change of ownership in the means of production may be a *necessary* condition for the transformation of a capitalist into a co-operative social order but it is not, as most socialists have assumed, a *sufficient* condition. What matters to the worker is not who owns the enterprise he works in but "the actual and realistic conditions of his work, the relation of the worker to his work, to his fellow-workers and to those directing the enterprise."§ It is for this reason that anarchists remain today the advocates of workers' control of industry—a condition in which all would participate on equal terms in determining the organisation of their working lives; where work would become meaningful and attractive; and where capital would not employ labour but labour, capital.

Anarchism, it may be objected, is all very well in theory but fails, or would fail, in practice. Anarchists, however, would not accept the implied opposition be-

‡ Fromm, *op. cit.* p. 95.

§ Fromm, *op. cit.* p. 275.

tween theory and practice: good theory leads to good practice and good practice is based on good theory. I do not say that it is easy to act anarchistically: the temptation to act in an authoritarian manner—to impose solutions rather than to resolve difficulties—is always very great; and it may be that in the short run at least, authoritarian organisations are more efficient in their results. But efficiency, exalted by capitalist and modern socialist alike, is only one value and too high a price can be paid for it. More important than efficiency is the dignity of the responsible individual and solutions to what used to be called "the social problem" are not worth applying unless they are consonant with individual dignity and responsibility.

Those who are tempted to dismiss anarchism as impracticable should remember, too, that the relationship between individuals that the anarchist advocates is already being applied in certain spheres; not only within family circles and circles of friends but also within the spheres of industry and communal living. The kibbutzim of Israel, the French communities of work, and co-operative co-partnerships are but a few notable examples. The task of the anarchist is to extend these small centres of anarchy until they embrace the whole of social relations. No small task to be sure, but not an impossible or absurd goal.

I admit that many—not all—anarchists in the past

Euthanasia

TO ADVOCATE EUTHANASIA in this country is almost as disreputable as to confess to being a Communist or a drug-addict. The word euthanasia brings forth an expression of horror on the faces of most people, but when one asks these persons if they have ever seen patients dying from cancer, or if they have looked after demented senile patients, they usually admit that after one visit to a mental hospital they decided that they would never enter such a place again. They have succeeded in keeping all such unpleasant sights far from them, and they very conveniently convince themselves that those things do not concern them. If one consistently ignores something, one finishes by believing that it does not exist.

There was a time when I shared the popular opinion about this subject. When I first entered a hospital for mental defective children, I was indignant to find that almost all my fellow-nurses thought it would be better to kill idiot children than to keep them vegetating. I changed my mind when I worked in wards with rows and rows of cots, each containing one of nature's mistakes: creatures with enormous heads, with faces shrivelled like a mummy, or with crippled atrophied limbs. Others had blank eyes staring out of sweet, normal faces. None of them could talk, walk, or eat alone. We fed and cleaned them, feeling that what we did was senseless. We all prayed that if we should ever have a child like that, he would die.

Later I moved to a mental hospital where I saw patients in a state of complete dementia. They were filthy and had lost the power of speech. They squatted in a corner, motionless, or went round the room, some of them uttering inarticulate shrieks.

The disease had destroyed everything human in their

underestimated the difficulties of achieving an anarchist society. Most modern anarchists are under no such illusion. It may be that total anarchy will never be realised; indeed, most of the trends of our time are towards a new age of tyranny; but at least the goal is worth striving for. The task of the anarchist is not, however, to dream about the future society; rather it is to act as anarchistically as he can within the present society; to avoid as far as possible situations in which he is commanded or is impelled to command; and to endeavour to foster relations of mutual and voluntary co-operation between his fellow-men. In the modern world, the State is the most important manifestation of the principle of coercion. To achieve anarchy, therefore, the State must be dispensed with; and it will be dispensed with to the extent that men become capable of living without it. As the German anarchist, Gustav Landauer, puts it: "The State is a condition, a certain relationship between human beings, a mode of behaviour; we destroy it by contracting other relationships, by behaving differently."

In the last analysis, an anarchist is not a person who subscribes to a certain body of doctrine or set of beliefs: he is a person who behaves, or strives to behave, *differently*—in a way consistent with respect for the individuality inherent in all men.

Birmingham.

GEOFFREY OSTERGAARD.

minds; the initial delusions had given way to a complete blank, leaving only a few crude instincts in some of them. Others had less sense left than an animal or even a plant. We had to do everything for them; if one gave some patients a cake and a piece of paper, they put the piece of paper in their mouth first.

I particularly remember a creature with savage eyes glittering in her ravaged face. She scratched and bit us like a ferocious animal. Her husband came to visit her every week. She threw herself on the food he brought her, snatching it out of his hand and stuffing her mouth till she was choking. After that she did not look at her husband whom she did not recognize. He sat there, staring at the thing which once was his wife with a terrible sadness in his eyes. A photo he had, showed his wife as a smart, nice looking woman. She was unrecognizable; really it was not she. A human being consists of mind and body, as an inseparable whole; once the mind is gone the body is something senseless and disgusting. This man's wife was dead, as much so as if she had been laying under a gravestone in the cemetery, but how much less unhappy he would have been, if he could have visited her grave!

In the sick ward many old women and a few younger ones were dying of various diseases. There were some afflicted by horrible progressive diseases like cancer, Parkinson's disease, arthritis, etc. To the demented and very senile patients it did not matter so much; they did not suffer more than a dying animal. However, other patients' minds were but slightly ill; they realized what was the matter with them. Some of these women had tried to commit suicide and were prevented from doing so by the nurses. There were patients who asked us every day to give them an injection to finish them off,

† Leonard Woolf: *After the Deluge*, Ch. 3

but we had to condemn them to months of suffering and despair before the inevitable ending, however much this went against the inclination of many among us.

In general hospitals there must be many more patients dying after a long agony. No doubt some find strength in their religion and would not want to finish their life themselves, but there are others who ask for death in vain day after day.

The death of these patients is less spectacular than Hitler's gas chambers; there are fewer of them together than in the concentration camps, but their numbers over the years must exceed the victims of the concentration camps. It really is the utmost limit of absurdity that the law which compels a healthy man to die for something he does not believe in, makes it a crime for a person to take his own life when this has become unbearable to him.

The strongest opponents of euthanasia are the Christians of all denominations. They base their veto on the 5th Commandment. For Christians who strictly keep to the letter of all the commandments under all circumstances, like the Quakers, one can feel nothing but the highest admiration. Unfortunately this is not the case with the established Churches. They have made many exceptions to the 5th Commandment: death penalty and war. It is uncertain what Christ would have thought about euthanasia, maybe he would have disapproved of it, but would he not have denounced the murder of thousands of innocent children from out of the air? Nobody reading the gospels can be in the slightest doubt about this! Still never during the war has one of the church-leaders raised his voice against bombardments, executed by his own side.

The church-leaders seem to be agreed that Christ's teachings are impracticable in this imperfect world. While they are making exceptions causing people suffering, could they not for a change make an exception which would relieve suffering? Christ's most important commandment was to love others like oneself. Euthanasia is against the 5th, but not against this more essential commandment; war is against both.

The churches teach that suffering is sent by God to enoble a person's soul, but they do not forbid the faithful to call the doctor when God sends them a disease. Once they used this argument against the Socialists' attempts to remedy poverty, but long since they have been compelled to recognize that human beings have the right, even the duty, to make life on this earth as bearable as possible. Why then do they persist in their unreasonable attitude against euthanasia?

Non-Christians are mostly agreed that sane people should be entitled to finish their life when they are suffering from an incurable disease, or should be killed on their request if they are past the stage of doing it themselves, of course under sufficient safeguards that in the patient's condition there is no more possibility of a cure. In some countries a brain operation is performed on incurable cancer patients which severs the connections between the higher and lower parts of the brain. The patient still can feel pain, but he fails to realize what is happening to him and consequently his suffering is far less. From this operation to euthanasia is only one step farther.

Euthanasia of idiots and certain forms of mental illnesses is a subject about which even the opinions of non-Christians are divided. The arguments against do not seem very weighty. It is said that this practice may lead to abuses. Everything can lead to abuses in the hands of dictators or corrupt officials. If euthanasia of idiots can lead to the indiscriminate gassing of all inmates of mental hospitals, then the hanging of mur-

derers can lead to the killing of all the inmates of a prison. A dictator like Hitler needs no precedents for the execution of his criminal fancies. At any rate it is easier to decide whether a person is an idiot, than whether he is a murderer. Euthanasia should, of course, be limited to idiots and patients so demented that they have sunk to the level of idiots, on request of their relatives. If the psychiatrists made a mistake, they would still be killing a low-grade imbecile instead of an idiot; when a jury makes a mistake, an innocent man is hanged or sent to prison for years.

Killing criminal lunatics seems far less wicked to public opinion than killing demented patients, though it is less justifiable, because this would seem to take more the character of a death penalty than of euthanasia. Besides after certain treatments like leucotomy it is often impossible to ascertain if the patient is still dangerous or not, though it might be recommendable for dangerous mental defectives.

It is the general opinion that lunatics are happy in their own way. Indeed many of the chronic patients in a mental hospital are happy, others are violently unhappy; some fall from a state of bliss into the deepest misery; that all depends upon the type of delusions in which their minds live. One can talk about happiness or unhappiness only concerning the patients who go about, dress themselves, do some work, walk in the garden, or engage in some activity, even if it is only hoarding rubbish. Their minds, though diseased and confused, are still working, and one day they may wake up to real life again, in rare cases spontaneously, usually through the invention of some new drug. Demented patients have no more minds, no more thoughts or feelings, except the most primitive ones. They can feel pain or hunger as a plant feels when it is deprived of water; this feeling is not registered, so means nothing to them.

It is true that it is very difficult to make sure when a patient has reached this depth of dementia. In a state of complete inertia, accompanying katatonic schizophrenia or severe melancholia, the patient may present a picture similar to dementia. So I want to advocate euthanasia only for idiots and for patients suffering from the worst forms of senile dementia and other organic brain-diseases, involving destruction of the cells, like G.P.I. or Huntington's chorea. I suspect that once a schizophrenic patient has been in a state of complete degeneration for many years, his brain cells will have lost the capacity of functioning and recovery is beyond possibility, but I should like to see this fact established first before including them in euthanasia.

Of course, it can be argued that this type of patient does not suffer and thus there is no harm done in keeping them alive. I agree that it is far more important to propagate euthanasia for sane people suffering from incurable physical diseases. Still it is my opinion that keeping these patients alive is an insult to the dignity of human beings, while they are a source of sorrow to their relatives.

At some future date euthanasia will no doubt be permitted by legislation. This measure, together with the early discovery and treatment of curable mental illnesses would make our large mental hospitals superfluous. Before this can happen public opinion will have to change. Everybody should be made to realize that an idiot child may be born to him; his father or mother may finish as a senile patient in a state of pitiable degeneration; he himself may be afflicted by an incurable, progressive disease.

Liverpool.

JULIETTE MARRS.

Sex and Society - II

TO WHAT EXTENT does education up to University standard enable young people to deal with their sex lives along rational lines? I have not had access to very much material provided by students from Oxford, Cambridge or London Universities but have studied many anonymous letters from students of other universities. The majority of these letters were written by young women who intended to enter the teaching profession, a small number came from young men also planning to become teachers.

The letters from the young women fall roughly into two categories. Approximately half the writers seek information about "how far it is safe to go" and, apart from this, devote the remainder of their letter to justification of their behaviour. In practically all such letters the young women are engaged and propose to indulge in pre-marital sex relationship because marriage is considered to be impossible for four or even five years, sometimes longer. In all but a very few instances the pressure for sexual relationship has come from the fiancé. Few of the girls mention that they desire it on their own behalf. In the smaller group sexual activity has already been indulged in for some time and the letter is written solely to justify this. In such cases the girls are also engaged and state that marriage cannot take place for some years.

IGNORANCE OF CONTRACEPTION.

It is significant that in the first and largest group there is apparently a complete ignorance of what contraceptive measures are available, on the part of both the young women and their fiancés, and also in the case of most of the girls, ignorance about sex and the physical aspects of conception and procreation.*

This ignorance they share with those of non-university education. The main difference between the university and non-university groups seems to be in their attitude to society. These who have left education behind in their early teens indulge in sexual intimacy to hold their boys by "proving" their love. They invariably mention that their own friends say "everyone does it." They appear to believe it is the general custom in their social environment. Usually, when pregnancy follows, they regard conception as some sort of

* No wonder, in view of the censorship on their knowledge of male anatomy. An uninitiated girl must be baffled by the mechanics of copulation since she is never allowed to see even a diagram of an erect penis. If she does see a daring item of municipal statuary showing quiescent male genitalia she must wonder what it's all about. (Even scientific publications have to be very cautious in this respect; as recently as 1949 a standard sexological work expressly aimed at the medical and legal professions, and priced so that hardly anyone else could buy it, prefaced some very unerotic diagrams showing conjugation with defensive remarks that they ought not to be construed as pornographic.) Apparently the only place where there is unrestricted publication of such diagrams is on the walls of male lavatories.

For the benefit of our female, and even our lady, readers, it may be helpful to remark that, in a state of sexual excitement, the penis becomes enlarged, hard and rod-like, being about 33 millimetres diameter and 140 long, and standing at an angle rather above the horizontal according to Kinsey's investigations. In this condition it is very sensitive to longitudinal friction, over its entire surface. Notwithstanding a lot of boasting on the one hand, and inferiority feelings on the other, there is not a great deal of variation in these dimensions, less for example than in body weight. Spontaneous erection begins between 12 and 15, occurring several times a month, hence the choice of this age by primitive societies for ceremonies of sexual adulthood, but deliberate arousal can take place almost any time. The average boy's peak potentialities are at about 16 according to Kinsey (who considers he is probably capable of regular daily intercourse), declining slowly thereafter.—ED.

"punishment" from God, rather as if God had taken a mean advantage of their trust in Him. They are usually distressed at parental anger or afraid to tell their parents. They have, as a whole, little consciousness of any larger society than their parents or the people next door, and it is quite obvious that the pregnancy is regarded (if not as a punishment) as a mistake of judgment, a *faux pas*, in fact.

Among those who write from universities there is, on the contrary, an intense awareness of social morés but there is little disagreement with them. The length of time before marriage can take place is regarded as justification for pre-marital intimacy between engaged couples. When, as frequently happens, the engagement does not long survive departure from university, the girls are usually deeply embittered because basically their attitude to sexual intimacy is exactly the same as that of the most conventional members of society. In other cases the girls find that after a couple of years their feelings have changed—and sometimes those of the man have changed also. They are in a state of considerable conflict because they feel that as they have had a full sexual relationship on the assumption of eventually marrying, they should marry. In many cases they do so and very often the marriages break up or are very unhappy. It must be said, however, in all fairness, that it is only those with problems who seek advice. It is not possible to come to any conclusions as to how many of the engaged pairs who indulge in pre-marital intercourse marry and lead normally successful married lives.

BASIC ATTITUDES.

It seems likely, however, that the initial need of the majority of betrothed girls who seek to justify pre-marital intercourse within the framework of the strictly conventional social code, will contribute little to clearer analysis of this problem either in the handling of their own lives or in guiding younger people later on. They demand no universal change, they only demand privilege. Their letters invariably stress how much they are "respected" and how much their families are "respected." Their attitude is defensive, the tone aggressive. It is certain that the writers of such letters see themselves as in a completely different category to the teenagers who accept intercourse as part of the price of securing a "boy friend," because "everyone does it." When efforts are made to impress upon the writers the fact that they are trying to "have their cake and eat it," in some cases they abandon their claim to "privilege" and retreat to the socially safe rearguard of conformists.

Even allowing for the fact that young women who were genuinely emancipated would be unlikely to seek advice, it seems at least open to doubt whether any enlightened climate of opinion prevails in the provincial universities or that one can look to them for any genuine pioneer movement towards changing social attitudes. Too much is at stake for such expectation to be realised. It may be that, at best, there are numbers of young people who are sufficiently enlightened to be less on the defensive, who do not claim privilege but quietly, and more or less discreetly, behave as their sex drives dictate during these difficult years. Such people probably have little awareness and less interest in the great social issues that are involved in this question.

THE DYNAMIC FACTOR.

Social and psychological development always lag behind technological development and economic change. No doubt some sort of safe and simple contraceptive will be discovered and because it has been long sought is likely to achieve much more publicity than the primitive methods of contraception so far available. Social morality must, by its very nature, be based not upon foresight but on hindsight and experience. So the existence of a safe and simple contraceptive will result in gradually changing moral attitudes.

THE DRAMA OF OEDIPUS.

Other factors will have to play their part in this change. It has been said that the theories of Freud were based upon his findings in the society of his time and environment. Since the drama of Oedipus has its origins in ancient Greece this is, if not a misstatement, at least an over-simplification. So long as our social ideal is the small individual home occupied by the father, mother and child—or children—with the wife economically dependent on the husband and a greater or lesser degree of servility her lot, then the Oedipus situation must continue. The worship of the "virgin" and the social value of "chastity" are inevitable in such a set-up. However, as wives seek economic independence—or are forced to seek it as is at present the case—the small, exclusive family unit will undergo a transformation. The mother and father will come to have more equal social status and the child will, from a very early age, mix in a less restricted society. He will have less reason for jealousy and more outlet for his emotions both aggressive and benign, in so far as the latter exist. It seems likely that in the interests of survival all of a child's emotions may, of necessity, be basically aggressive. Even if this is so the child brought up in a wider circle, where he can be confident of care and affection from others besides his mother, will enable him to have a greater sense of security and less need for exclusive possession of his mother, and as a result of another or other females in later life. It is claimed that among the Polynesians sexual jealousy is unknown. We cannot however return to tribal life but we can progress towards communal living.

WHICH COMES FIRST?

In the near future much depends on which comes first: the change towards communal living through economic factors or the discovery of a safe, simple contraceptive. There would probably be less conflict if the former comes first, because by its very nature it must come about gradually. Many changes might occur over a period of four or five years if progress is fast but the discovery of a safe and simple contraceptive would affect human behaviour much more quickly for many reasons. All progress takes time but repressive measures can be blown up overnight. The Christian faith has fought a more or less successful battle against dynamic sexual instincts for thousands of years but its greatest weapon has been a negative one. In so far as it has won the battle of repressing sexual instincts outside marriage it has succeeded because pregnancy in such circumstances has been regarded as a punishment from a God who apparently acted on that "Eleventh" commandment, "Thou shalt not be found out." In fact the battle has largely been won because a reliable and simple contraceptive did not exist. Once it does exist the repressive forces of Christianity and social tabu will be disarmed. But if this discovery of

a contraceptive comes before communal living has developed a new social pattern the Oedipus situation will be largely unchanged and terrible individual and social conflicts may arise.

A REVOLUTION IN MARRIAGE?

If sexual relationships become more and more usual prior to marriage—and there is no doubt that among young teen-agers this will be so when the threat of pregnancy is removed—why should they not become equally usual after marriage? That is, why should not extra-marital intercourse be very much more usual than it is now? In fact, if women become economically independent why should marriage, as we now know it, exist at all? There could only be two reasons. One, if those who were believers in Christianity truly regarded marriage as a sacrament and a contract binding for life, and adultery as a mortal sin, or if those who were not Christians believed implicitly in the sanctity of human relationships and saw marriage as the most valuable of all human relationships. There is little to support the idea that Christian belief in Britain today is sufficiently strong to withstand the appeal of "love without fear" and little more to support the idea that humanists (by that or any other name) would give strong support to monogamy if "love without fear" could be possible.

Among those who are more knowledgeable about contraception there are many, both men and women, who do not live monogamously. They are usually married men and women or married men and widows. Advice from women's magazines is sought by wives of such men. In the majority of cases the men do not desire a divorce, quite the contrary. They seem anxious to assure their wives that they love them, love their children and do not wish to lose their homes. As they are usually muddled, and following a blind emotional pattern, they are not able to explain to their wives that they really desire a form of tolerated polygamy. So long as "the other woman" does not make excessive demands on them, and the wives accept the situation, the husbands are apparently prepared to make the best of both worlds. It is only when, as they feel, the wives become unreasonable and nag, that a divorce may eventually be sought. Comparatively high as our divorce figures may be, they are very small indeed when compared with the number of married men who have mistresses, or at any rate, affairs. The largest number are probably in the forty to fifty group.

These husbands are not facing up to the logic of the situation. Judging by the material I have studied they would not be prepared to tolerate "unfaithfulness" on the part of their wives. They would claim privilege themselves on pleas of various kinds, and very possibly apparent frigidity on the part of their wives would be at the top of the list.

CHANGING PATTERNS.

It seems possible that we may, in our society, pass through a phase when the economically independent woman, who has a simple and absolutely reliable contraceptive available, may see far less attraction in marriage than she does now. She may pass through the romantic phase of many love affairs, and either not marry at all or only marry when—or if—she desires children. Even at the present time the social pattern is very different from what it was before the last war. Young married women usually keep their jobs until such time as they are pregnant and in later years they take part-time work or else return to their former employment. We are in fact very largely giving only

lip service to the ideal of the domesticated *hausfrau* completely dependent economically on her husband.

There are, of course, in all social groups, women who still adhere emotionally to this ideal, even if they work outside the home. Women who write that they never "go anywhere" because their husbands do not "take them out." It has been pointed out by social psychologists that the wife leading an isolated life, practically a prisoner in her little suburban home, and caring for her children, is resting such an enormous weight of emotion on her marriage that the marriage very often cracks under the strain. On the other hand, among the less cultured people in all classes but naturally more numerous among the proletariat, husbands regard their wives solely as a sexual object and have traditionally sought companionship outside the home and very largely among males.

MASKED HOMOSEXUALITY.

This may be partly explained by a psychological factor mentioned in a recent report published in the journal of the Family Planning Association. That is the high incidence of what may be called "masked homosexuality." Here is one case which is typical. An uneducated but intelligent young man seduced and then married, before a child was born, an illiterate teen-age girl. Their subsequent life was extremely unhappy. The father considered his wife very inferior and the males in the family grew up with the conviction that all women were inferior since they believed their own mother was inferior. They all led—or desired to lead—social lives apart from their own wives and seemed only capable of evincing real respect and affection for other males, although none of them practised homosexuality. They all made their wives unhappy and in middle and old age became aggressive, tyrannical and seclusive.

A writer who studied the social habits of the men of a village a few miles from an industrial town in the midlands told me that the married males all led completely separate social lives from their wives, whom they regarded as housekeepers and sexual objects. Among these men, after an evening spent in a public house horseplay and sexual intercourse was quite usual. When my friend ventured to suggest to one of these men that these were homosexual practices the man was puzzled. After having it explained what the word meant, he was incredulous, roared with laughter and said "it was only a bit of fun," and "no harm done to anyone."

In more self-aware and enlightened circles masked—or partly realised—homosexual tendencies are also indulged in by men who would not be prepared to admit that they were homosexuals.

The facts seem to be that as modern civilisation frees people from economic struggle, excessive working hours and fear of unwanted children, instincts that have been suppressed since very primitive times are being more freely expressed: instincts that had already been partially or totally suppressed even among tribal societies whose habits we can still study. We have always been aware that all societies subscribed to a "double standard" of behaviour and with increasing freedom the façade is becoming less and less effective.

EMOTIONAL MATURITY.

Since dogmatic religious concepts have lost their authority, psychologists and others concerned with social studies, have erected a standard called "emotional maturity." Those who deviate from accepted social behaviour are said to be emotionally immature. What is emotional maturity?—if, as seems likely, some

eighty per cent. of us fall below the standard of the psychologists in regard to this matter.

Patterns of social and sexual behaviour are geared to the laws of survival. As technology makes survival easier, customs change and modify accordingly. Naturally there is a time lag. Obsolete customs and modes of thinking remain long after they have served their purpose. At the same time the twentieth century has seen swifter changes than any other. Few people now dare to refer to "standards of morality." They are preoccupied with another problem known as "standards of living." It might seem that here are two planes that run parallel but do not meet. Yet in the letters to which I have referred the following may be read in a large number of cases. "I ought to be happy. We own our own house, and have a car and a television. Perhaps I am just silly but . . ." There follows an account of personal sexual frigidity, or frigidity and semi-impotence in the spouse or in many cases non-consummation of marriage of short or of long standing. Or "I would be quite happy if we had no sexual intercourse. I dislike it very much." It is therefore evident that so-called "standards of living" have little to do with living in the real sense of the word, and that attitudes towards marriage may be of the kind that an old-time priest might have regarded as immoral and lacking in true understanding or a sense of responsibility. Or, to use the modern jargon, one can say that the writers of such letters are emotionally immature.

However, one of the unique characteristics of the human race is that it has always set itself ethical standards towards which it is presumed to struggle. The standard now to be desired is "emotional maturity." Perhaps if this phrase is kept clearly defined, and is not simply another way of saying "social conformity," we may take a great step forward. When we do so the number of letters to the omniscient advisors on magazines and newspapers may be much reduced. In fact these advisors—and their function—may become as much a part of past social history as the now vanished sooth-sayer, the legendary "family doctor," and the oracles of ancient Greece.

London.

YOTI LANE.



—from the *Manchester Evening News*.

The New Blasphemy

It is all but twenty years since Herbert Read began his *Poetry and Anarchism* with the words, "To declare for a doctrine so remote as anarchism at this stage of history will be regarded by some critics as a sign of intellectual bankruptcy; by others as a sort of treason, a desertion of the democratic front at the most acute moment of its crisis; by still others as merely poetic nonsense." One would have thought that events since 1938 would have shaken a good many accepted notions, but it is all too evident that Read's words are still true. When the American journalist Dwight Macdonald wrote a few months back in *Encounter* that "I think anarchism makes more sense today than any other radical philosophy," he got a sharp rebuke from a fellow-countryman, Mr. John R. Searle (research lecturer in philosophy, Christ Church, Oxford), declaring that this was hardly the view of "a responsible, much less idealistic and rational citizen." To which Macdonald replied, "I admit anarchism is not popular now even among intellectuals, but that is another question."

Even among intellectuals, he writes, as well he might. For in these twenty years there has been enough evidence of the nature of government, every government, and of the inadequacy of socialist panaceas of every kind, from Marxism à la Russe to state capitalism of the Labour Party kind, to make intellectuals, i.e. thinking people, turn to anarchism, if only out of despair. Anarchism's destructive criticism of existing institutions has had such ample justification that one would have thought it difficult, especially among research lecturers in philosophy, to find anyone who disagreed with it. (What does Mr. Searle want of Dwight—that he should choose between Ike and Adlai?)

But when it comes to a serious advocacy of anarchist alternatives, the 'new failure of nerve' of the intelligentsia shows up. There are only two respectable types—committed and uncommitted, and to both anarchism is bankruptcy, treason and poetic nonsense. Worse, in fact, it is fighting against history. The committed types make a virtue out of their commitment. Insisting on the need to be 'practical', 'tough-minded', etc., they aren't going to drift into an anarchist backwater, they are going, as the first step to putting everything right, to push out the Tories, by supporting the dear old Labour Party, getting back to Socialist Fundamentals by working inside, outside, above or beneath it. The jolt they got from Hungary and Suez has sprouted meetings, forums and magazines, spouting Marxism, ex-Marxism, sub-Marxism, post-Marxism and Socialist Humanism, which is a sort of Marxist MRA, with quiet times and confessions. And it's all the same old stuff. One of the cheer-leaders, Mr. Mervyn Jones, writes in one of its organs, "In many profound and encouraging ways, we are back in the thirties" (*Universities & Left Review*, Summer 1957). He goes further in the next one (*Forum*, July-Sept. 1957), declaring "I must say I am still a bit dazed by this revival of socialist energy in both the directly political and theoretical sphere, which is often compared to the 1930s but surely has no real parallel since the 1880s." It sounds like Billy Graham, looking back to Moody and Sankey.

It is almost a relief to turn from these depressing revivalists to the uncommitted types who have at least a little variety—from wide boys to Top People. But they too face the anarchist search for a decentralised autonomous society with a ready-made sneer. Whether they are empiricists, conformists, organisation men, or

bluff "let's face it" characters, they regard it as a kind of sacrilege to query the necessity of mass societies. When in a radio discussion Dr. Bronowski said that he thought people would be happier in small communities, a good uncommitted type from the London School of Economics rounded on him and said "You're one of those people like Napoleon, Hitler or Stalin, who know what is good for people." Such a display of fury would never have fallen on poor Bronowski's head if he had said he thought that people were happier in mass societies. For the essence of the uncommitted position is that, while you don't believe in historical determinism when it predicts change, you are a thorough-going determinist when it comes to predicting a continuance of whatever is happening now.

An instructive example of what happens when you question accepted ideas is provided by the fate of a recent book *The Breakdown of Nations* by Leopold Kohr (Routledge & Kegan Paul). The author is no anarchist or anything outrageous like that, he is an American professor of economics from Puerto Rico. His book sets out what he calls the size theory of social misery. Wherever something is wrong, he says, something is too big:

"If the stars in the sky or the atoms of uranium disintegrate in spontaneous explosion, it is not because their substance has lost its balance. It is because matter has attempted to expand beyond the impassable barriers set to every accumulation . . . If the human body becomes diseased, it is, as in cancer, because a cell, or a group of cells, has begun to outgrow its allotted narrow limits. And if the body of a people becomes diseased with the fever of aggression, brutality, collectivism, or massive idiocy, it is not because it has fallen victim to bad leadership or mental derangement. It is because human beings, so charming as individuals or in small aggregations, have been welded into overconcentrated social units such as mobs, unions, cartels, or great powers. . . .

" . . . all I have done in fusing apparently disjointed and unrelated bits of evidence into an integrated theory of size is to demonstrate first that what applies everywhere applies also in the field of social relations; and secondly that, if moral, physical, or political misery is nothing but a function of size, if the only problem is one of bigness, the only solution must lie in the cutting down of the substances and organisms which have outgrown their natural limits. The problem is not to grow but to stop growing; the answer: not union but division."

A very valuable book could be written on this thesis, and Prof. Kohr's lively and provoking treatment of the theme, while not the best that could be made, should be welcome, if only because it is over twenty years since the appearance of the last book in English devoted to it. (Justice Brandeis' *The Curse of Bigness*). But what sort of reception did Prof. Kohr get? The book has been largely ignored. I have seen only two reviews. The first of these, in *The Observer*, grossly misrepresents it and concludes that "Professor Kohr's remedy for social decline is reminiscent of curing senescence by death." The second, in *The Times Literary Supplement*, discussing the book under the title "Back to Bows and Arrows," says, "Perhaps Professor Kohr is just having fun and rather laboriously pulling our legs. But the evidence is unfortunately against this

charitable explanation." Nobody argues with the author, they simply cannot bring themselves to take him seriously.

Small wonder then, that Dwight Macdonald blotted his copybook when, in his offending article in *Encounter*, he declared that:

"The revolutionary alternative to the *status quo* today is not collectivised property administered by a 'workers' state,' whatever that means, but some kind of anarchist decentralisation that will break up mass society into small communities where individuals can live together as variegated human beings instead of as impersonal units in the mass sum. The shallowness of the New Deal and the British Labour Party's post-war regime is shown by their failure to improve any of the important things in people's lives—the actual relationships on the job, the way they spend their leisure, and child-rearing and sex

and art. It is mass living that vitiates all these today and the State that holds together the *status quo*, Marxism glorifies 'the masses' and endorses the State. Anarchism leads back to the individual and the community, which is 'impractical' but necessary—that is to say, it is revolutionary."

He is speaking a different language from the political revivalists, because while they are talking about the conquest of power, he is talking about people, and while the acceptance men are talking about Inevitable Historic Trends, he and Prof. Kohr are simply talking about making life livable. If you attack the monarchy, thoughtful people will regret your lapse of taste and agree with you, but if you suggest that the state, that other sacred cow, is harmful and unnecessary, you really have overstepped the mark with everyone. It is worse than *lèse majesté*, it's blasphemy. COLIN WARD.

Freedom and Authority in the Church

This discussion of recent Papal and Episcopal statements touching upon the freedom of conscience of the Catholic first appeared in the New York Catholic Worker, and is reprinted by kind permission.

RECENT EVENTS in the general area of ecclesiastical magisterium have thrown into sharp focus once again the problems of freedom and authority in the Church. I have reference to the Pope's Christmas message in its bearing upon conscientious objection to war, and to actions taken by members of the American hierarchy regarding attendance at certain motion pictures. Before dealing with these specific issues, however, it may be well to scrutinize, in a very general way, the meaning of and reason for authority in the Christian Church.

It is necessary first, I think, to make one very basic and broad distinction of Church authority into two areas. First, we have that core of moral and dogmatic teaching which must be followed because it is true, because it has upon it the seal of the Holy Spirit, Who guards Christ's Church from error in such matters as constitute a permanent part of her message to the world. It is this authority which categorically commands the conscience of the believer, as entailing his very membership in the Church.

The other great area of authority is that which binds, not because of the truth of its decisions, but because of that hierarchal, authoritative structure of the Church which is necessary if she is to exert a general influence from day to day in the care of souls. This area is concerned not with the theoretical safeguarding and development of truth, but with the effective implementation of the Church's teaching. This implementation is an essentially social task in which the responsible commanding and commending of obedience on the part of superiors, and the conscientious response of the faithful, join as inseparable aspects of a single work. This character of collaboration explains why neither obedience nor the authority which commands it can function ideally when one or the other is defective.

The position of the superior and the authority he possesses are not some mysteriously "direct pipe-line" from God, but rather have their character logically from the end to which they are ordained. The very notion of the superior is based upon the general assumption that those who have achieved the position of teachers and leaders in the Church will, through their training and effort, and the grace of God, understand and articulate moral and dogmatic truth preeminently

among the faithful. Thus it may be observed that the authority of spiritual superiors in this area is of a directive or legislative kind, in which the obedience commanded is itself characterized by that common end which is purity and vitality in the life of the Church.

What must be grasped with respect to this area of authority is that it has a genuine binding power by virtue of its apostolic mission, yet in its nature is not such that it can directly command individual consciences. This is a point not generally recognized, and the reason would seem to be that the distinction between binding power and absolutely binding power is seldom understood. Legislative and directive authority in the Church binds us, even aside from the rectitude of the content of the legislative or direction, because, if the Church is to function, the action patterns which its structure necessitates must be respected. Thus, while such authority must needs be distinguished from absolute authority, the presumption is always in its favour, and it is only with strong certitude and grave reason that the individual conscience may defy its command.

To take an example from the most august area of papal authority, we have the instance some years ago when Pope Pius XII commanded Italian citizens to vote in the elections as a major moral duty under the special set of circumstances prevailing. In such a matter Catholics would generally be bound under obedience to comply, but given the case, for example, of a sincerely convinced Christian Anarchist, who would regard voting as proximate co-operation in a seriously immoral enterprise, an exception would obtain to the binding power of the command. This, as cannot be insisted too strongly, does not infer that the authority of a papal command is not binding, but merely that the authority is not unequivocally binding. When, on the other hand, a Pope issues a directive in the context of making a moral definition (which generally strengthens or settles an already existing general theological opinion—as for example done in the matter of artificial birth control) the issue is then not one of mere legislation but of irrefutable Church teaching. And in such a case any individual whose conscience would have him in the Church would necessarily submit to the teaching.

In the light of these principles and distinctions such a matter as the recent Christmas message of the Pope becomes clarified as to its bearing upon conscientious objection. First, it may be observed that no new interpretation of Catholic faith or morals has been made.

However, when the Pope spoke of "the situation wherein, every effort to avoid war being expended in vain, war—for effective self-defence and with the hope of a favourable outcome against unjust attack—could not be considered unlawful," he clearly restated a standard position of Catholic theologians regarding certain requisites for "just war" i.e., those of last recourse, probability of victory, and just cause. And such a clear restatement of a matter of principle would seem to cement the position of such principle in the moral teaching of the Church.

It must be realised, however, that this statement of principle is seriously circumscribed by what was not treated by His Holiness, and that the very issues which Christian pacifists have found most germane to the problem of war are the issues absent from the Pope's message. The entire problem of means, especially regarding nuclear weapons, a matter treated with some concern in previous writings of Pius XII, is scarcely touched upon. Likewise, absent from consideration is any serious analysis of the proportion of good to be achieved by a war opposed to the evil which could be expected to result. And perhaps above all, there remains the profound moral perspective witnessed by Bernanos and others, which questions in the light of Christian personalism the underlying suppositions of modern military organisation as such.

It is clear in respect of these considerations that when the Pope states: "Therefore a Catholic citizen cannot invoke his own conscience in order to refuse to serve and fulfil those duties the law imposes."—that the context (from which "therefore" takes its direction), is concerned basically with the justice of cause of those who resist or prepare to resist aggression. The same critique must be made of the concomitant endorsement of democratic conscription, which likewise relies on a series of "therefore's" pointing back to the issue of just cause, which, it must be stated again, is only one aspect of the issue where the morality of war is concerned.

That the Pope personally does not approve conscientious objection is I think apparent, and it is well for pacifists to realize this without either evasiveness or undue distress. For the personal ethical evaluations of the man who is Pope, as well as his political, economic and cultural critiques, are basically to be evaluated on their intellectually accessible merits, as are the opinions of other men. If, as it would appear in the Christmas message, the Holy Father assumes the probability of just means in modern war, and assumes the fact that certain moral principles are verified in present circumstances (such as the very debatable notion that "every effort to avoid war [has been or is being] expended in vain"), we ought to regard these positions as what they are, perfectly fallible analyses of a difficult situation. And of course a papal statement as to what constitutes right action is likewise in the area of opinion if the statement relies upon, as well as moral principle, data which is not certain, and not itself in the realm of faith or morals. It must be remembered that a political situation entails a dynamic complex of variables, which cannot be treated as a fixed condition in the application of moral principle.

And since the basic contentions of contemporary Christian pacifism involve evaluation of the most subtle yet profoundly significant terms of the political and cultural situation, the specifically limited points indicated by the Pope's Christmas message can have little bearing, as authority, on the pacifist position. It is very likely, of course, that the effects of the message will do harm to pacifism conceived as a cause desirous of increasing

its following and its acceptability; but such "harm" is at most a very accidental thing to pacifism conceived as a movement ultimately concerned neither with size nor "effectiveness," but rather dedicated to maintaining a perceived moral truth with a certain purity and intransigence.

The principles of authority and obedience which we have considered, "writ large," as it were, in the specific matter of a papal message, apply also to the issues of episcopal magisterium alluded to earlier in the discussion. The authoritative pronouncements of bishops, however, are innocent of the complexity of papal statements, since they never define Church teaching in any binding fashion (as would command assent) but rather are directive toward actions. As such, in the area of faith and/or morals, localized in a diocese, a bishop may command the obedience of his flock in a given matter. The authority exists in that area, discussed previously, in which the command binds, not absolutely, but generally, and in which the individual conscience must have certitude of its own position and sufficiently grave reason if it will justly consider itself exempt.

Also, as in the case of papal authority, episcopal authority binds at all only within its prescribed area and when its commands are not conditional upon factual, aesthetic, etc., data which a given ordinary may perhaps consider as certain, but which may well be debatable.

In the United States, most instances of episcopal magisterium seem to have appeared in connection with the film, and a brief consideration of specific instances may well be illustrative of principles involved. First, it may be said that in the case of an actually worthless and condemnable film like "The French Line," an action like that of Archbishop Ritter in forbidding Catholics to see it would appear quite unequivocal in the obedience required, since no serious reason to disobey could be admitted, save perhaps for a film critic, sociologist or psychologist on an unhappy assignment.

If, on the other hand, a serious artistic achievement such as "Letters from My Windmill" or "The Miracle" were condemned by a bishop who also forbade his flock to see the films, any individual with a genuine aesthetic involvement in the art of the film would have in favour of his disobedience an argument similar to that of a serious literature whose bishop forbade the reading of, say, Faulkner, Proust, or Greene. And, needless to say, a directive, to have valid claim to authority, must needs be clear and unambiguous in terminology, unlike the recent condemnation of the film "Baby Doll" by the Cardinal-Archbishop of New York.

These latter observations on episcopal authority are not put forth in order to carp at the individual incidents mentioned, but rather to indicate a point touched upon earlier. And that is, that the responsibility of those commanded must wait upon the responsibility of the superior if their obedience is to be that joyous and confident collaboration which is the Catholic ideal. We must of course withstand that attitude of nervous rebellion which is so ready to forsake God's Church whenever the authority of her ministers becomes distasteful; nevertheless we must with equal fervour assert the responsibility proper to those who know that the Church is not only *for* but *of* all her people. Obedience is a rational, a complex and a dignified thing which must never be servile. We must not fear to wrestle with the angel.

New York.

EDMUND J. EGAN.

1956: Crisis and Criticism

TO ANYONE who like myself took out Communist Party membership in 1937, and is today still holding a Party Card, the year 1956 was one of deeper crisis than 1939. Nevertheless, although the key events were undoubtedly of greater importance to the future course of Man's development than the prelude and opening passages of World War II, I find myself to have been less disturbed personally by them. To say this is due to greater maturity elucidates nothing important; I prefer to discover the processes that have been at work.

As my ordering of the importance of 1939 and 1956 may be challenged I give my reasons for the selection. The Non-Aggression and Trade treaties with Germany in the late summer of 1939, and the later war with Finland while important and disturbing, arose out of events in the then immediate past and were the results of judgments consistent with Marxism-Leninism. By reason of this consistency they did not demand the close examination of fundamentals that was an axiomatic necessity in 1956.

The critical re-orientations brought about by the 20th Congress C.P.S.U. were necessitated by processes that went back beyond the memory of many Communists and were revealed as having been developing aberrations in the application of Marxism-Leninism and in the understanding of the role of the Communist Party as it should be. It entailed, still entails and will do so for much longer, a painstaking re-examination of all that has been organisationally said and written over the past two or three decades. Corrective readjustments have been made on the main points but most of the work has yet to be done. For this reason I must stress that the present article, though much more than tentative is anything but final as a statement. To a Marxist no statement about reality can ever be final, absolute.

Two questions have arisen during this re-assessment, viz.: "What are the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism?" and "Are they true?" By remaining in membership I have politically given an affirmative to the second question. Only history can decide for or against my decision. The present article is in part an attempt to answer the first question, and by making the attempt I am contributing to the making of that history which could give an affirmative to the second. Some Anarchists and others may raise ethical objections to the concept of my participation on either side in a process which will decide the truth of a statement I have made. My view is that being a living entity, I have no choice but to do this very thing insofar as many generalisations about society are concerned; there is no alternative win, lose or draw.

By remaining in membership I have not obviously given an answer to the first question, "What are the fundamentals?" However, under present material conditions some thought upon it is a necessary condition to my continued membership. I have already indicated that the 20th Congress C.P.S.U. had revealed a series of departures from principle which developed in magnitude over many years. Both the departures and their revelation had consequences which were serious to all within and without the Party and personally tragic to more than a few. In my view it is these personal tragedies as in Hungary and Poland which have weighed most heavily in the minds of that minority of comrades who have left the Party.

None of them, I believe, has given sufficient consideration to the fact that the terrible events in Hungary including may it be said the brutal murders by fascist-led mobs, of communists who had openly opposed the policies of Rakosi and Gero, were only the inevitable consequence of several series of wrong decisions begun decades before. Only one of these series of wrong decisions had anything to do with the 20th Congress, although they had all flowed together by the time of the October events. Up to that time the situation could have been retrieved by the Hungarian Workers Party without bloodshed given clarity and unity within. That clarity and unity receded further into the distance as October approached, and a weak but active enemy was able to reverse the order of things like a string of cards being flipped over from one end. The art of doing this given the right conditions is assiduously studied by fascists and is outlined in Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

The deck was poised ready for the surge that could reverse it and would have reversed it but for the recall of the Red Army. Whether Kadar was persuaded by a handful of experienced Hungarian marxists or by the Soviet government to form a new party dedicated to Marxism-Leninism or even if both pressures existed simultaneously as is most probable, is of no more than secondary importance. To a marxist the local decision in Hungary, no matter what the nationality of the people initiating it, had to be made after weighing the whole international situation.

Once past mistakes were recognised rectification would necessarily be a long involved process. The immediate issue was, "are we to have an environment within which it will still be possible to rectify these things?"—to which the only answer was "yes, if it is physically possible". I was relieved to know that the physical means were to hand in the critical hours and that Hungary was not to be sacrificed as was Spain. It would be naive to assume that Mindsenty and other leaders of the pre-war clerico-fascist regime would have allowed peaceful rectification or that the situation would have rested merely with their re-assumption of power. The international political situation which would have resulted at that time had to be weighed up.

The resurgence of Prussian militarism and of fascist groupings in West Germany is too well known to need repetition. So far, in spite, of the rebirth of the Wehrmacht it has made rather sluggish progress due largely to popular opposition in Germany and elsewhere in Europe. If to it were to have been added a Hungary where fascist groupings were reborn in the open and a Middle East where Britain, France and Israel were openly defying the U.N. Assembly, then their progress would have been far from sluggish; it would have presented a dangerously explosive political atmosphere to the world. In strategic Hungary the paralysing transformation of unpopular forces was prevented. Six months later when these lines were first written we were still a long way from the Geneva atmosphere but the situation was greatly improved in favour of Peace. In July even the mud stirred up by the suspect U.N. report on Hungary has failed to check the flow towards international agreement on disarmament and the banning of nuclear weapons.

Against all the evidence the writer presumes that the rebels were fascist led. (The nearest thing to a fascist was a ... who had been ordered to ...)

15

in fact, the Smallholders Party. He states that anti-Rakosi communists were killed, again against the evidence, and finally he assumes that the C.P. has ...

of Marx - London; in other words he is
a thorough, or better stage. His reference
to the H. Bond is probably do honest source
the C.P. Union voted for it at Brighton, and

The analysis of the events of 1956 as I have outlined it, while showing that they provide in themselves no certain grounds for leaving the Party since all the difficulties were due to violations of Marxist principles and not to the operation of those principles, neither do they show except indirectly any positive reasons for being in membership. These positive reasons which are the only important ones, are to be found at home in Britain.

The role of the Party and the need for it has been further unfolded by the engineers' strike, the campaign to ban the H/bomb and the struggle against the Rents Bill. The atmosphere which is necessary to develop a grass roots struggle against the Tories cannot be found in the Labour Party or any other alternative to the Communist Party. The primary function of the Labour Party is to elect Labour members to the House of Commons, not to develop a struggle for Socialism. Only the Communist Party at present is geared to think in these terms and only the C.P. conducts a constant warfare against sectarianism, the most serious obstacle to the achievement of Socialism. These and not the purely negative reasons based upon an analysis of 1956 are my reasons for remaining in the Party. Hungary has shown the need for unity in the Party but not directly where it would have clear meaning to the

Why I surely they are not so rare as to think that young libertarians are potential phalanxes. Do they perhaps think that for someone reading the U.S. the first line

Charles Fourier,

ON A DARK NIGHT in the early nineteenth century a ship put out into the middle of the harbour at Marseilles and began to dump its cargo into the water. It was filled with rice which had been allowed to spoil because its owners had hoped for a rise in prices. This kind of event was common enough in those days, and is not unknown into our own time. But the particular incident was made memorable by the fact that one of the clerks who supervised the dumping was troubled by this destruction of food at a time when thousands of hungry men and women were wandering in the alleys and along the waterfronts of the city, and beyond it on the roads and through the towns of France. The clerk's name was Charles Fourier, and he decided that his life's work must be to search for the means by which such criminal acts of waste might be made impossible. His vow might have ended at that if Fourier had not been a man of unusually original mentality.

To all outward appearance, he lived an uneventful and pathetically lonely life. He was the son of a French draper, and in his youth worked as a commercial traveller in Germany and the Netherlands. Later he set up his own shop in Lyons, and then lost his business as a result of the fighting there during the French Revolution. After that he served for two years in the army, and then he settled down to live out the last forty years of his life in the dull drudgery of office work. He did not marry, and he dwelt in a succession of cheap hotels and shabby furnished apartments. His closest friends were probably his cats, and to them he was passionately devoted.

What made this seemingly miserable existence endurable was the rich and fantastic nature of Fourier's inner world. Over a period of thirty years he wrote down his thoughts on the reformation of the world in a series of large volumes in which cosmology and

since the C.P. member the Russian Bomb
not to the P.O. circulation giving. It may
be presumed that, that coming from such a source
the article has the highest importance.

members of the British Party. That need has been demonstrated in domestic affairs by the failure to prevent the Labour Party vacillations and the splitting tactics of Gaitskill, Carron and Co. which twice in six months wasted splendid opportunities to force the Tory government to go to the polls. We may not get another opportunity before the legal limit expires and untold suffering can be inflicted on workers, children and old-age-pensioners in that time.

As was predicted last year, the Party is recovering from its crisis, now it is growing and the *Daily Worker* circulation is increasing. British workers have yet to be won for the only policy which will bring to an end the rule which brought us two World Wars, the great depression, Malaya, Korea, Guiana, Kenya and Cyprus, and not least the ruins of Port Said. That policy can be put into effect only by the unremitting struggle of the British Working Class spurred on by a party based on Marxism-Leninism. They cannot succeed if the only party dedicated to such a policy is weakened by the time-wasting arguments about personalities, hair-splitting rehashes of stale history, by sectarianism and by too great pre-occupation with theory at the expense of practice. A Leninist party is needed; I intend to help in its building.

Manchester,

G. KENDALL.

might believe facts to be started with that statement to wish. I can think of no other reason they can't expect us to believe it or indeed to believe that they do.

The Phalansterian

sociology are mixed together in the most bewildering manner. The cosmology is astonishing, entertaining and often absurd. The sociology, on the other hand, contains an unusual amount of very sound common sense, and for that reason it might be as well if we did our best to separate them.

First, for the cosmology. Fourier had worked out, by some method that is not very clear to men of ordinary reasoning, that the life of the earth is divided into three periods. The first 40,000 years is what he calls the period of ascending vibrations, by which he means a time of continual and progressive movement. Then follows a period of 8,000 years which is called the summit of happiness. Finally, there will be a concluding period of 40,000 years, during which the world will deteriorate and return to its present state of chaos. If there are any men left at the end of this time, they will be transported mysteriously to another planet and the earth as we know it will come to an end.

However, this eventual possibility need not concern people living today, since, according to Fourier, we are on the *up* grade, and are fast approaching a great period in history which is to be known as Harmony, and which will last for the remaining 35,000 years of ascending vibrations. But the changes that will take place when we enter Harmony are by no means restricted to human society. Fourier believed that God would celebrate the transition by special acts of creation, and he let his fertile imagination run fast and loose when he set out to describe them.

Our poor old barren moon would be replaced by six new and shining satellites. Above the North Pole would appear a kind of atmospheric wreath, called the Northern Crown, which would shed fragrant dews upon the earth. The seas would be turned into lemonade, the climate would everywhere become temperate, and all unpleasant beasts would be replaced by beasts with

opposite qualities—the lion, for instance, by the vegetarian anti-lion, the bug by the sweet-smelling anti-bug, and the whale by the genial anti-whale, which would draw ships across the ocean. Finally, humanity itself would undergo a considerable refurbishing. We would grow tails equipped with eyes, we would live for 144 years and make active love for 120 years, and after death our bodies would drift through interplanetary space as clouds of aromatic vapours.

It was in this fairyland of a lonely, inventive and undisciplined imagination that Fourier planted his ideal social communities. He declared that, in the future world, men would be organised into exactly 2,985,985 units called phalanxes. Each phalanx would consist of approximately 1,600 people; they would live together in a kind of enormous hotel called a phalanstery, from which they would go out each day to work in the fields and gardens and workshops of the community.

The phalanx, in fact, seemed to be an odd kind of compromise between an ordinary capitalist undertaking and an experiment in socialist co-operation. People with money would be invited to invest it in the community, and they would receive interest, though Fourier was enough of a Leveller to stipulate that the larger the investment, the lower the rate of interest. Any possibility of want would be eliminated by guaranteeing everyone a minimum standard of existence. And here Fourier the visionary quietly slips into the place of Fourier the sociologist, and whispers to us that this minimum standard will provide meals beside which the greatest banquets of our present society will be mere snacks for beggars. Once this more than adequate minimum has been provided, there will be special rewards for those who show exceptional talent or diligence.

Fourier based the organisation of work in his community on the very sound idea that, if it were made attractive enough, people would work because it would be more pleasant than to be idle and bored. In order to reach this desirable end he suggested a number of means. First, people should be able to choose their occupations. Then, those occupations should be varied, and Fourier promised that in his community nobody would be expected to work more than two hours at one task. Thirdly, the workers would organise themselves into groups of friends, and these groups would compete with other groups to fulfil various work targets. By means of all these incentives—choice, variety, co-operation and competition—Fourier felt that there would be no difficulty whatsoever in getting people to work. And he had a pat answer for the old question, "Who will do the dirty work?" We always complain, he pointed out, that children are dirty little beasts who love to wallow in filth. Instead of lamenting the fact, we should make use of it, and he suggested that the children should be organised into what he called "Little Hordes," who would swarm out every morning to clean the streets and to perform all the other dirty tasks which fastidious adults find unpleasant.

In the present space I cannot delve into all the other involved byways of Fourier's utopia, and I must be content with pointing out a few of the master ideas which reveal the sound insight into social questions that sometimes flash through the apparent confusion of his ideas. I have already mentioned his insistence on co-operation and a minimum standard of living. But there are still two or three other points that should be emphasised. For instance, Fourier was one of the important early feminists. He recognised that nineteenth century women were often little more than slaves of the household, and that they were almost completely barred from careers in the outside world. Accordingly,

he planned a co-operative organisation of household work that would free women from their perpetual concern with the kitchen, and in other respects he advocated a complete equality between the sexes. Another way in which he anticipated modern ideas was in his desire to abandon the large industrial city—just appearing in his own day—and to replace it by small communities in which agriculture and industry would flourish side by side. In this way he was an important forerunner of the founders of modern Garden Cities. But perhaps his most important role remains that which was suggested to him by his experience in the harbour of Marseilles. He was the most rigorous critic in his time of the perpetual waste of goods, labour and human potentialities that occurs in an unorganised society.

Fourier believed that the Phalansterian communities would reach their most complete fulfilment when the earth had entered the stage of Harmony. But he thought that it was possible to make a start here and now, without waiting for any such miraculous event as the turning of the sea into lemonade. Accordingly, he announced that, as soon as he had gathered 1,600 members and collected a million francs in cash, he would be ready to begin the great experiment that would revolutionise the world. Neither he nor his few friends possessed more than a fraction of a million francs, but Fourier convinced himself that one day some friendly capitalist would open his purse for the good of the cause. Accordingly, he let it be known that he would be in his room every morning at eleven o'clock sharp, ready to receive the benevolent financier. And each day during the last years of his life he scrupulously kept his own appointment. But no visitor arrived, until one day in 1837 Fourier went to his room and waited as usual. A little later he was found kneeling motionless beside his bed; the visitor, though perhaps benevolent, had been no financier.

When Fourier died, it looked as though his doctrines might disappear with him, for he had gathered only a very small group of disciples, and none of them was very influential. But as the years went on, students of society began to delve into his books, to separate the common sense from the elaborate fancy, and it became evident that, in his own eccentric way, Fourier had a good deal to say that was worth hearing. And then his influence began to work in two rather unexpected directions.

First, during the 1840's his ideas suddenly became popular in the United States. At that time one of the most interesting aspects of American pioneering was the large number of experiments in community living which were going on in all parts of the country. One writer has estimated that at one time about the middle of the last century a total of about 100,000 people were engaged in these experiments. Some of them were religious groups, like the Shakers and the Hutterites. Others were inspired by the ideas of the British co-operator, Robert Owen, and there was a considerable group who followed Fourier. In all, twelve phalansteries were established in the United States. One of them, which was called the North American Phalanx, survived for twelve years; it seems to have been fairly successful, and it came to an end only because of a fire that destroyed all its buildings. Most of the other Phalansteries failed either for lack of sufficient capital or because their members had not enough experience in farming. The best-known was Brook Farm, whose latter days were dominated by phalansterian ideas, and through this community, with links with Hawthorne, Melville, Emerson and Thoreau, the ideas of Fourier touch, not only on American political thought, but also on American literature.

The great American community movement belongs to the past, and on the whole Fourier's influence has perhaps been more important as a kind of diffused light that has influenced the libertarian, co-operative and socialist movements since his day. Their ideas of a society organised for happiness rather than for profit, and of guaranteeing a minimum standard of existence for all men come directly from Fourier, while it was he who first drew the attention of the early socialists to the question of the equality of the sexes and to the need for considering children, not as the property of their parents, but as members of society with their own particular functions. Also, with his emphasis on the voluntary principle in work, he stood out against the authoritarianism that was implicit in the doctrines of

World Government

ARE YOU AN IDEALIST? Do YOU seek the abolition of War? Are YOU disillusioned with Communism, Capitalism, Nationalism, Socialism, or Vegetarianism? Then why not try World Government?

For only World Government can abolish War. And this is what we all want to do, isn't it? The problem is simple. War is an armed struggle between states: if there were only one State, there could be no War. (Of course, if there were *no* states, there could be no War, but Man cannot live without the State, as every school-boy learns.) And as we are all desirous of achieving Peace as the first step towards Progress, then the establishment of World Government must have first priority in our thoughts!

Just think! No more War! Only the maintenance of Law and Order. No more Armies! Only a World Police Force. Please do not let it be said that the Korean Police Action shows how World Government would work in practice: that regrettable incident was caused by armed *resistance* to the Forces of Law and Order, and under established World Government there could be no armed resistance to the Authorities.

Under World Government the Authorities would, of course, also be idealists, and the purity of their motives therefore above suspicion. It is true that the glorious course of History has often been marred by suspicion of the Authorities on the part of the Man-in-the-Street, but this suspicion has been due mainly to scurrilous propaganda. If one Government has been forced to take action in its own country—or in another one—to protect its legitimate interests, other Governments have often presented its actions in the worst possible light. As an idealist, interested in the removal of causes of international misunderstanding, you can help to establish World Government and thus remove this perennial source of sorrow to statesmen: no democratic World Citizen would cause misunderstanding between a democratic World Government and its subjects (an undemocratic World Government is unthinkable), and undemocratic citizens would fall under the "Maintenance of World Democracy" Laws.

World Government would also:

(1) avoid the necessity of costly extradition proceedings. There would exist no awkward possibility of criminals seeking asylum in another country: there would be no other country. Police problems would be immensely simplified;

(2) put present U.N. agencies on a firm foundation. What has made UNESCO and WHO failures, compared

most of the socialists of his time, with the exception of his fellow Bisontin, Proudhon. There are, indeed, enough fruitful and revolutionary ideas in Fourier's works to ensure him a permanent place among the world's important social thinkers.

Even his more fantastic aspects should not be dismissed too lightly; there was a great writer of fantasy lost when Fourier turned to politics, and his speculations found at least one interesting echo in literature, for Bulwer Lytton's Utopian romance, *The Coming Race*, owed as much to Fourier as Lytton's earlier novels had owed to Godwin. In an age of science fiction, moreover, Fourier has his place as a precursor.

Vancouver.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.

with the Security Council? The inability to enforce their decisions. Today we need compulsory World Health, compulsory World Education, and compulsory World Culture. For example, an important objective of World Government will be the rationalisation and reorganisation of the different Official Form systems at present found in the different civilised countries, the development of their own independent Official Forms by the underdeveloped peoples of the world, and the integration of the various systems as sub-systems of the World Government's own Official Form system. All school-children throughout the world will receive a common basic training in form-filling, which will not only oil the wheels of administration, but also lead to greater understanding, as the children of the world grow up with a common cultural background;

(3) finally establish Basic Human Rights. As any Russian or American politician will tell you, only in large states like Russia or America is the Government strong enough to defeat any attempts by internal undemocratic forces to oppress the people, and any present restrictions in those countries are due to the threat of America and Russia respectively. No such threat could exist under World Government, which, with its monopoly of power, could unquestionably suppress undemocratic power-seeking groups. All Basic Human Rights would be inviolably enshrined in the World Constitution, which only in the gravest emergency could be suspended.

What form will World Government take? Perhaps there will be a World Parliament. In that case your Representative will hear your views as eagerly as those of your 999,999 fellows in his constituency, and he will be just as influential as any one of his 2,335 colleagues in the World Parliament.

Or perhaps a loose Federation will develop out of the U.N. In that case, if you have a personal problem for which no Form is provided, you need only write to the Prime Minister of your country, who will raise the matter in the World Assembly of Democratic Nations, and if the World Assembly approves your point of view, the World Government is sure to adopt it.

There need be no fear that World Government may misuse its monopoly of power: this possibility is practically ruled out by the Constitution. Undemocratic action will be forbidden, and the vigilance of the World Un-Democratic Activities Committee will ensure severe penalties for anyone, right up to the World President, actually found acting undemocratically.

The first aim of World Government will be Disarmament: only the World Police will be allowed weapons. It will unfortunately not be possible to abolish the Atomic Bomb immediately, in case of opposition to Law and Order, but eventually its use will be prohibited, except for recognised scientific purposes, such as the 1945 Nagasaki Experiment.

In order to prevent internal misunderstanding, atomic weapons will be scattered around the world, but in the (unlikely) event of local insubordination, or a quarrel between two World Police Commanders, a Special Service department, directly responsible to the World President, will be available to restore World Law and Order—with the Hydrogen Bomb, if necessary. Under World Government, in fact, the fear of Atomic War stifling modern civilisation will be a half-forgotten nightmare of the past.

The cost, administratively speaking, of World Government will not be excessive, when one considers its benefits: the extra burden on the taxpayer will probably be no greater than what he now pays. This does not, of course, include the special costs of World Defence, which will be unavoidably heavy for a few generations, until a World Defence Base is established on the Moon. Is another World watching us? It would be foolish to ignore the potential threat.

So much for idealism: if you are an idealist, you will now understand that World Government should be your ideal. But how is World Government to be achieved in practice? We must also be realists. And as realists, we must admit that the possibility of Communist co-operation in forming a World Democratic Federation is remote. However, if the peace-loving countries of the world, especially the peace-loving North Atlantic Community, were to federate (only as a first step towards World Federation, of course), they could show misguided peoples that Federation is practicable, and the only way to abolish War.

If these misguided peoples do not then overthrow their governments or force them to join the Federation, the necessary Police Action against the forces preventing the establishment of World Peace would unquestionably result in the victory of the World Peace Movement, with Peace at last and forever on this troubled and war-weary old world of ours. Any lesser aim would surely be a betrayal of the millions who have already died in the name of World Peace, as well as the millions more who will die before the goal is reached.

Now it can be seen why realists, including many practical and far-sighted politicians, also support the World Government Movement. However, as realists, they also welcome the support of all those profound philosophical thinkers like Bertrand Russell who see in World Government the ultimate realisation of their ideals.

And you, dear reader, which are you? Idealist or realist, thinker or politician, whatever you are, there is room for YOU in the WORLD GOVERNMENT MOVEMENT!

Hald, Denmark.

PHIL LEWIS.

BACK NUMBERS

The first issue, Winter 1956, is out of print, but copies are still available of No. 2 (Winter 1957), and No. 3 (Spring 1957).

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

SIR,—I was pleased to see that you will print my article on euthanasia in the *U.L.* I hope it appears because it is about the only magazine I know of which gives hospitality to all points of view—certainly nobody else would have accepted my article.

I agree with you that the views of rationalists and humanists are under-represented. The press and BBC are too much under influence of the churches who suppress free speech because they know that most of their members are Christians from convention, not conviction. That the general public does not like rationalists is understandable: to them religion is an insurance against death. Their premium consists of going to church once a week or once a month and for that they expect when they are forced to retire from this life, to be paid out eternal life. So they do not like people who try to tell them that their insurance company is a swindle, without offering them another one.

This refusal of the English to discuss essential problems makes life rather dull. *E.g.*, when the 51-Society discussed crime and responsibility some time ago, not one of them dared to take it up for determinism and so they missed the whole point of the problem. In such a gathering of intellectuals in France or Germany a number of them would have been determinists and the debate would have been worth listening to.

If I may make a suggestion: could you persuade two psychologists to write about free will; one for and one against. If you cannot find one against in England, there are plenty in Germany. I think that this is one of the most vital and fascinating problems.

Liverpool.

JULIETTE MARRS.

Donations

We gratefully acknowledge the following donations, received between April 15th and August 13th. This help makes a great difference to our ability to sustain this project over the period of circulation growth, and we appeal to all readers who would like to see the *University Libertarian* firmly established to share our deficit in this way.

CW, £2/2/0; CM, £1/1/0; G, 12/-; Malatesta Club via PS, 4/10; AL, £1/15/3 (\$5); VHDH, 1/6; AS via AL, 5/8 (80c); CM and ML via AL, 5/8 (80c); Anon, 4d.; B, 10/-; D, £1/2/11; AWS, 2/-; RE, 10/-; I, £1/16/0; S, £1/15/5 (\$5).—TOTAL, £12/3/7d.

The deficit before paying for the printing bill for this issue is now £132.

You may be a Genius but Professors are human . . . and if your thesis is held together by paper clips, string or wishful thinking it is likely to get less appreciative consideration than you are sure it deserves.

We can bind your thesis in two styles: (a) temporary (for reading), hard covers quarter bound at 3s. per volume; (b) permanent (for the Library), cloth bound with name, title and year in gold at 1 gn. per volume. *Postage extra.* Time: (a) 3-4 days, (b) 2-3 weeks. Send cash (allowing for postage) with order to save bureaucratic waste.—PHILIP SANSOM, 84a Whitechapel High Street, London, E.1.

The International Humanist Congress at London

Some reflections by a British participant.

We have succeeded in obtaining, at the last moment, this account of the IHEU Congress to repair the omission referred to elsewhere in this issue. We apologize both to its writer and our readers that it appears abbreviated by over-third in order not to delay an already full issue.

THE TITLE of Prof. ten Have's address at one of the Congress meetings which I was regretfully unable to attend—"The Humanist adventure of our time"—expresses a feeling which pervades all who have taken part in the movement started in Amsterdam in 1952. This sense of "adventure" makes us keen to note signs of progress and anxious about aspects of our task which seem to be neglected. On each occasion, Amsterdam, Antwerp and London, the personal contact with men and women sharing one's basic convictions (although often differing in their practical interpretation) has meant as much as if not more than all the book learning and lecture listening in which we have engaged.

Here then are the impressions of one participant recording candidly his opinions of the progress made by the International Union since 1952 and of its adequacy to its present tasks—a short period indeed, but to be considered in the context of a rapidly changing international situation which does not encourage leisurely thinking.

What can be achieved in a six-day conference depends largely on the thought devoted to its organisation and an important feature of this is the skill with which its subject matter is divided for discussion. The four sections (Philosophy, Personal life, Social life, Organisation) which have hitherto been adopted for this purpose and obviously have much value now seem to require revision. The discussion in the first overlapped to some degree . . .

. . . I was myself a member of the Social Life section which had a particularly complex task as it not only had to consider two papers with distinct problems but a very provocative commentary by a third writer, raising some fundamental issues of social outlook and policy which most Humanists have hitherto been reluctant to discuss—acquisitiveness and individualism. The syllabus for the section seemed to me to invite this ambiguity. In the first paragraph it said "Humanism is as much concerned with political and social policies as with its own teaching" but in the second it deprecates "identifying itself with any special form of society . . ." Dr. Schaper in his paper on "The social question in the Western World" seemed very conscious of this inconsistency and weakness of the Humanist attitude because after affirming the non-commitment of the Humanist to particular policies he says towards the end of his contribution "Humanism can never restrict itself to a theoretical awareness of the problems. In each possible environment its contribution to the discussions may be a positive one, yet avoiding any dogmatic assertions." Mr. Parikh in his paper on "The social question in under-developed areas," bearing in mind the special problems of his own country was particularly concerned that economic development should be achieved with the cultural and democratic participation of the people, summed up in the significant sentences "Such countries (under developed) will have to have the boldness to recognise that economic development *per se* has no intrinsic value, only in instrumental significance, and that it must therefore serve the larger ends of growth of free life and institutions." This wisdom might well also be pondered by the developed countries.

Notwithstanding considerable discussion in the section and the collation of many excellent suggestions in the report of the Social Life section, I felt it lacked any unifying conception of Humanist social policy. The stress was almost wholly on immediate specific problems such as industrial relations, population and economic under-development but ignored the need for an inspiring conception of society which would act as a dynamic in solving these problems and those of the just distribution of wealth and income, and international mutual dependence and co-operation.

It is possible that the difficulty in arriving at such a conception is related to another matter included in the recommendations of the Social life section, the need to broaden the basis of membership and to make Humanism more appealing to working people instead of remaining a predominantly intellectual and middle class organisation. The Organisation Section was also conscious of this problem, recognising that the Humanist movement should make greater effort to reach all sections of the community. While making several suggestions for the greater efficiency of local and national organisation, the sectional report was particularly concerned with the development of the International Union, focused in the proposal for a full time Executive Secretary.

To me the most disappointing feature of the Congress was the statement with regard to nuclear weapons submitted by the Board of Directors at the final plenary session. This is a matter of most profound human concern where a clear and emphatic declaration of Humanist principle by the International Congress might have aroused general public interest and have had some influence. Instead of such a declaration, the directors submitted a wordy statement of the need for "new" and "world wide" thinking by the "experts," finishing with a suggestion for an international conference of such experts. It was impossible to discuss or amend such a statement which was perforce accepted by a dumbfounded Congress. It is unlikely to have the slightest influence on the course of events and can only disappoint many Humanists that the opportunity for a forthright demand for the stoppage of the drift to international suicide—a danger which the common man sees clearly enough without the help of the experts—was missed. In this we are behind the Christian and other churches.

The Congress did not appear to elicit any interest in the British press or radio, despite the efforts made to draw their attention. The explanation is probably that in Great Britain the Humanist movement is dismissed as a small pressure group of intellectuals without any substantial public backing, which indeed is the case. This reinforces the recommendation of the Social Life section to widen our membership. Notwithstanding these less satisfactory features of the Congress, it yet remains a sign of progress and hope for the future. There were many more young people than at Amsterdam and they made constructive contributions to the discussions. The representative of the constituent bodies in the International Union showed a greater confidence in their mission and sense of fundamental unity of purpose despite the variations in organisational form and policy which exist . . .

. . . The Congress was held at Conway Hall, the substantial building of the South Place Ethical Society, whose hospitality and the service of whose members in matters incidental to the proceedings contributed greatly to its smooth running.
Welwyn Garden City.

J. HENRY LLOYD.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Advertisements will be accepted at the cost to us of publishing them, which is 1d. a word. Terms for display advertisements will be quoted on request. Remittances (made payable to the *University Libertarian*) and the full name and address of the sender (though not necessarily for publication) must accompany advertisements. We reserve the right to refuse any advertisement we think likely to harm the reputation of the journal but advertisements will not be refused merely on grounds of political or religious disagreement. We must, however, not be presumed to be associated with, or to endorse, matters advertised. When replying to advertisements, readers are asked to mention the *University Libertarian* as the source of their interest.

QUEEN MARY COLLEGE HUMANIST SOCIETY, apply Sec., A. Eze, Q.M.C., Mile End Road, London, E.1.

THE CAMBRIDGE HERETICS: apply Sec., Philip Riley, St. John's College, Cambridge.

MALATESTA CLUB, 32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, London, W.1. London's most sociable anarchists invite you to lecture-discussions every Sunday at 7.30 (questions, discussion, and admission all free), to hear Bonar Thompson speak every Wednesday at eight, and just to be social every Friday and Saturday evening.

MORALS WITHOUT RELIGION? — the ETHICAL UNION, 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, London, W.8.

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP holds open-air meetings (weather permitting) in HYDE PARK on Sundays at 3.30. (You are warned that these meetings usually start late.)

PROGRESSIVE LEAGUE: details from the Secretary, 20 Buckingham Street, London, W.C.2. Contemporary Poetry and Music Circle, meets on the second Monday of every month from October to May at Stanton Coit House, 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, Kensington Road, London, W.8, from 7 to 9 p.m. Music Organizer, Ashton Burall, 2 Antrim House, Antrim Road, N.W.3; Poetry Organizer, Alec Craig, 5 Avenue House, Belsize Park Gardens, N.W.3.

MONICA HALL: If the generous but bashful soul who wrote for the second issue of the *University Libertarian* ("Cry from a Training College") under this nom-de-guerre will communicate with the *U.L.* she will hear something to her advantage, to wit, an offer by another reader of congenial employment.

THE ORPINGTON HUMANIST GROUP holds regular meetings with speakers and discussion, arranges rambles, and organizes discussion circles. It is a centre for the distribution of Humanist and Rationalist literature. Visitors are always welcome at any of its functions, which are regularly advertised in most Humanist publications. Enquiries to W. E. George, 5 Gillmans Road, Orpington, Kent.

WANTED: ST. LOUIS CLUES: In March of this year a Money Order for \$1.00 was received from U.S.A., in the usual way via the British Post Office. The MO had been paid for at St. Louis, Mo. So far no letter has been received explaining what this is to be used for, despite enquiries of the U.S. Post Office. Will the sender, if already a reader of the *U.L.*, please write? In the meantime we have paid it into the bank.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

(Subscription rates are those for readers in the U.K.)
LE REVEIL ANARCHISTE/IL RISVEGLIO ANARCHICO, 44 Eaux-Vives, Geneva, Switzerland; 30 centimes; 6 francs (Swiss) per year. Anarchist monthly in French and Italian.

THE CATHOLIC WORKER, 223 Chrystie Street, New York 2; 1 cent; 30c. yearly. Catholic-anarchist monthly.

CONTEMPORARY ISSUES, 37 Penton Street, London, N.1; 2/-; 8/- yearly. "A magazine for a democracy of content."

DISSENT, 509 Fifth Avenue, New York 17; 75 cents; \$3.00 yearly. Radical quarterly.

THE FREETHINKER, 41 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1; 5d.; 30/- yearly. Atheist weekly published by the National Secular Society.

L'ADUNATA DEI REFRATTARI, P.O. Box 316, Cooper Station, New York 3; 5 cents; \$4.00 yearly. Anarchist weekly in Italian.

THE HUMANIST, 12 St. James's Place, London, S.W.1; 1/-; 14/- yearly. Humanist-rationalist monthly published for the Rationalist Press Association.

INFORMATION, H. Freitag, Hamburg 22, Beim alten Schützenhof 19; no price given; published (bimonthly?) by the Hamburg Anarchist Group.

JEUNES LIBERTAIRES, Paulette Fourrez, 80 Boulevard de Picpus, Paris 12^e; no price; *bulletin de liaison* of the *Jeunes Libertaires*, anarchist youth organization.

LIBERATION, 110 Christopher St., New York 14 (in U.K., c/o Housmans, 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4); 30 cents; \$3.00 yearly. "An independent monthly"; radical-socialist.

THE MONTHLY RECORD, Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, London, W.C.1; 3d.; 4/6d. yearly. Published by the South Place Ethical Society for "the study and dissemination of ethical principles and the cultivation of a rational religious sentiment," monthly.

THE NEEDLE, 216 Second Avenue, San Francisco, California; supported solely by voluntary contributions, so the price is up to you. Anarchist irregular.

NEWS AND NOTES, Stanton Coit House, Prince of Wales Terrace, London, W.8; no price; monthly organ of the Ethical Union.

THE PLAIN VIEW, Stanton Coit House, Prince of Wales Terrace, London, W.8; 2/6; 10/6 yearly. Ethical Union quarterly.

PLAN, 22 Mapesbury Road, London, N.W.2; 9d.; published by the Progressive League.

TODAY, Yves Reyne, 139 rue Beauducheu, Bordeaux, France; no price or frequency. Gandhist-Christian non-violence movement.

21ST CENTURY, Box 3015, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W., Australia; 16/- yearly. "The magazine of a creative civilization."

VIEWS AND COMMENTS, 813 Broadway, New York 3; no price. Published by the Libertarian League. "Equal freedom for all in a free socialist society."

WORLD SOCIALIST, 54a Princes Park Ave., London, N.W.11; 6d.; 8/- yearly. Organ of the International Society for Socialist Studies, "debarred by its constitution from holding or publishing collective views on political matters".

THE SUN, 3 Middleton Buildings, Langham St., London, W.1; 1/9d.; £1 yearly. Published monthly by the Company of Free Men, "formed to establish Social Credit".

EL SOL, J. N. Mourelo, Asociacion Medica Alajuelense, Alajuela, Costa Rica; no price. Monthly organ of the Asociacion; Freudian-radical; in Spanish.