THE EUROPEAN

THE JOURNAL OF OPPOSITION

JUNE 1957 Vol. IX. No. 4

Two Shillings and Sixpence

Contents include :

CHALLENGE AND MEANING OF MODERN MARXISM by ***D. V. CHAPLIN***

EDUCATION *versus* THE EDUCATIONALIST STATE *by* ***HARVEY BLACK***

ANALYSIS by ***EUROPEAN***

Further possibilities of a settlement with Soviets :
Defence clarities and parliamentary confusions :
The need for a thinking staff in government.

POLITICS BOOKS TRAVEL

THE EUROPEAN

THE JOURNAL OF OPPOSITION

Number Fifty-two
June - 1957

CONTENTS

JUNE 1957

ANALYSIS by ***EUROPEAN*** .. .. Page 195
Further possibilities of a settlement with Soviets : Defence clarities and parliamentary confusions : The need for a thinking staff in government.

CHALLENGE AND MEANING OF MODERN MARXISM .. .. by ***D. V. CHAPLIN*** Page 205

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF MODERN WAR .. .. Page 222

EDUCATION *VERSUS* THE EDUCATIONALIST STATE .. .. .. by ***HARVEY BLACK*** Page 226

THE FRONTIERS OF LITERATURE AND ART by ***ROY MACGREGOR-HASTIE*** Page 238

A DIARY .. .. Page 241

CINEMA : *YANGTSE INCIDENT ; HIGH TIDE AT NOON ; A MAN IS TEN FEET TALL ; TWELVE ANGRY MEN* .. .. by ***VINCENT MURRAY*** Page 244

NEW BOOKS : *Dangerous Estate* by **Francis Williams**
Meaning of the Disaster by **Constantine Zurayk**
The Moslem Brethren by **Ishak Musa Husaini,**
Mosley : The Facts
Emma in Blue by **Gerald Hamilton** and **Desmond Stewart** .. .. .. Page 246

PRISONER IN RUSSIA by ***GEORGE A. FLORIS*** Page 251

WASHBURN AND SONS LIMITED
QUEENS ROAD, SOUTHEND-ON-SEA

ANALYSIS

GREAT dangers can possibly be averted by great policies, but not by small haggles. We suggested in our last issue that certain reiterated remarks by Mr. Khrushchev could make possible a great policy. He stated in plain terms that Russia would withdraw from the occupied European countries in return for an American withdrawal from advanced bases in Europe and Asia. These possibilities appear to have been entirely ignored by both press and politicians in the West, who have continued to consider small bargains within smaller policies which can bring no decisive results. The explanation may either be a constitutional inability to develop great policies or such a distrust of the Soviet leaders that any offer they may now make is never taken seriously. We share to the full the distrust of Russian policy, but we believe that every Russian offer should be taken with deadly seriousness and turned to our advantage in one of two ways ; we should insist, if necessary in public debate, that the offer be implemented if it be desirable from our point of view, or that it be publicly withdrawn with consequent exposure of Soviet dishonesty and damage to the political position of communism. What is totally wrong is just to ignore a Soviet offer as if it had never existed ; this is usually the fate of any big Soviet move (or we might add of anything big in any sphere when it is confronted by small men). In the struggle both for peace and political position we believe in a dynamic and not in a quiescent policy.

The reasons for believing Soviet proposals may now be serious

In this particular instance there are practical grounds for believing that the Soviet offer may be completely serious. Many weapons exist, or will shortly exist, which can virtually blow up the world, and no man would regard with complete equanimity some of the politicians now in command of the West as they lightly fingered some of these weapons pointed at his heart. The disquiet would be increased if at the moment he possessed no weapon which could reach the heart of his opponent. In fact, he would go to extreme lengths to alter this situation, particularly if he were convinced that

given time he could win the game of life and death with entirely different methods. This is precisely the present position of the Soviets, and good reasons therefore exist to believe that this move is serious ; the only question is whether it can be turned to our advantage in the sense of securing peace and freeing Europe.

It is the position of the Soviets because the West now possesses weapons which can destroy Russia, and no man in his senses can be at ease while universal death rests in the hands of some of the trigger-happy, slap-happy specimens of perennial adolescence who now possess them. Further, America from her advanced bases can reach most of the main Russian cities with these weapons, but Russia cannot yet reach the main American cities with the weapons available. Finally, the Soviet leaders derive from their Marxist creed the fixed belief that the internal contradictions of Western capitalism will ultimately enable them to win the game by economic and political weapons without any recourse to a war which merely jeopardises that end. It is therefore in any sane calculation plainly in the interest of the Soviets to pay a big price to gain time and to avert a risk which can immediately destroy Russia and Europe by mutual bombardment, and must in the end by world destruction terminate all human aspirations whether communist or the reverse. Why make a move which may kill both yourself and your opponent, if you are quite certain that in the end you can overcome him by other means without any hurt to yourself, provided you can alter the immediate situation and avert its mutual dangers. In brief, such are the reasons for believing that Mr. Khrushchev's offer is not just a propaganda gambit and should be taken seriously.

A settlement can come either through disarmament or the ultimate weapon

This situation will not last long. Before long both sides will probably possess the inter-continental ballistic missile with nuclear warheads and a range of over 5,000 miles. The present advantage of America in the possession of advanced bases will then disappear. But as we remarked in our last issue the reason for those advanced bases will also then disappear, and we might already take advantage of Mr. Khruschev's offer in a great policy which could liberate Europe. Cannot we devise means to use the present advantage of the West in the possession of these advanced bases to secure immediately a final settlement, which will in any case be feasible when new weapons make them irrelevant ? As we noted briefly

a month ago these advanced bases can be made redundant either by weapons of longer range or by disarmament; the new seriousness of the Soviet's approach to disarmament may denote a recognition of the same facts.

If, for instance, a far reaching disarmament of conventional forces is made so effective by a system of inspection—which in the case of conventional forces is relatively easy to devise—that the invasion of one country by another is virtually impossible, the American advanced bases with their constant threat to Russian cities will also become unnecessary in these conditions. If we ever have a situation in which the mobilisation of the Russian hordes for an invasion of Europe must take long months, we shall have time to restore American bases, if necessary, and to mobilise under the stimulus of clear and immediate threat the larger resources of the West in man power as well as in scientific and productive capacity. America in Europe is only a necessity so long as Russia is a threat (or we would add in the vernacular, as long as three hundred million Europeans have not the sense or the guts to defend themselves against a hundred and seventy million Russians).

So American advanced bases in Europe can be rendered redundant either by the production of weapons of longer range or by all round disarmament which should include all weapons—conventional forces, and nuclear weapons also, provided inspection can be made effective.

In such conditions it would appear safe for the West to accept Mr. Khruschev's offer. America could then withdraw from Europe and Asia* if Russia would withdraw from the occupied countries.

Small ideas have failed; let big ideas have a chance

The possibility for a great Western policy is clearly presented by the present Russian position. Why does no party in the West develop it ?—why is this great chance greeted with nothing but a universal hush ? Are our statesmen capable only of small policies which have so far been invariably lost in a tangle of obstructive detail, and have failed because they have none of the force of world opinion behind them which great policies alone can evoke ? Are

* As we noted in our last issue America could not reasonably be asked to give up her position in the island chain on the eastern periphery of Asia which bars the way to a Soviet advance either toward America or to Australia and New Zealand. But the difficulty of this question could also be greatly relieved by disarmament.

some of our politicians even afraid of the consequences of a real settlement coupled with general disarmament, and of the grave economic problems and intensive battle of political ideas which such a situation would inevitably create ? As we have previously remarked, it is necessary first to have an idea before you can enter effectively into the battle of ideas. But those of us in the West who have ideas which we believe are stronger than the Eastern idea have no such fears, and can press for the great policies which alone can bring an all-round settlement. Small ideas have failed, let big ideas have a chance.

German reunion as part of a great policy

All present proposals in the West fall into the category of the small and ineffective. For instance the so-called Gaitskell plan for the reunification of Germany appears to be simply a rehash of Sir Anthony Eden's rehash in 1955 of the plan proposed in the Soviet note of 1952. It brought him at once into collision with the position of the present majority in Germany, which naturally is unwilling to see Germany neutralised, isolated, disarmed and helpless between the contending powers of East and West ; inevitably the victim and the prize of the stronger force in the subsequent game of power politics. The Gaitskell solution is a small solution, and obsolete in present developments ; a central demilitarised zone on a greater scale of all the occupied countries might have been a useful intermediate policy a few years back, but such policies are surpassed by the greater prospects of today. It appears now to be possible to re-unite Germany, which is naturally and rightly the first objective of all Germans, as part of a greater whole of world settlement. Russian withdrawal from all European occupied lands in return for American withdrawal from the advanced bases would enable Germany to unite, and would further permit the political and economic union of Germany with the rest of Europe. Germany would not be an isolated and helpless country between the great power blocs of West and East, but would be in a position to play a very important part within the balancing power of the world, which would be Europe-Africa. It is naturally more attractive to a united Germany to play one of the leading parts in a United Europe than to act as a football between West and East which could easily end by being back-heeled into the Eastern sphere. Germany must not be lost in the small haggle of temporary deals with the Soviets to which social democratic policy is so prone.

It is not difficult to see why the vital elements in Germany reject the Gaitskell plan ; he must think again and think big if he is to get anywhere in the great events of a great age. And in saying this we do not join in the Tory hue and cry against Mr. Gaitskell. He is quite clearly the ablest man in the Labour Party, and for that exact reason is the object of a systematic campaign of denigration by the Conservatives in Parliament and Press ; it would clearly suit the Conservatives much better in many ways to substitute as leader of the Left that big bag of feathers and butter which is labelled Aneurin Bevan.

We will have Europe; they will have Asia

The settlement of the world can be : we have Europe, they have Asia. Everything now occurring appears to reinforce this opinion which we stated in our last issue. It will be the final settlement, if settlement there be at all. An intensive political struggle will follow such a settlement. We shall certainly win in Europe and the Soviets will certainly win in Asia. No formal deal is necessary. If America withdraws from advanced bases in Europe and Asia ; if the Soviets withdraw from the occupied territories in Europe ; if universal disarmament makes impossible the imposition of a settlement through force by some countries on others ; if, consequently, the future is settled by a battle of political ideas—then it will follow, as surely as day follows night, that we shall win in Europe and the Soviets will win in Asia. This conclusion will follow inevitably because our ideas are suited to Europe and the Soviet ideas are suited to Asia ; in conditions of freedom from military force this result is in the end ineluctable. And who fears the results of freedom except those who have no ideas with which to fight in conditions of freedom ? This is the question which leaders of the West will face in a very acute form if they fail much longer to try for a settlement in a great way. But men of honour and of responsibility will surely do anything to end the present world danger, even at any cost to their own fortunes.

Asian menace vanishes in age of quality

The prospect of a united and possibly hostile Asia has always alarmed many Western thinkers ; in particular, the last German Kaiser. In the conditions of his day it could have been a menace ; in the conditions of today it is not so dangerous as one H. bomb. The future will be settled by quality and not by quantity ; most

certainly in the military sphere. Decisive weapons rather than inchoate mass will carry the day ; the issue will rest at last with pure intelligence. It takes some time for the present world to get accustomed to that thought. Yet that thought was implicit in the recent reorganisation of the British Defence Forces, and in all the more serious speeches of the debate on the subject.

Defence clarities and parliamentary confusions

The clearest speeches from their respective sides in the Defence debate were made by Mr. Strachey and the Prime Minister. Mr. Hugh Fraser of the Suez Group also made a clear and honest speech. The phrase, " It is vital that we should be as close as possible to Europe ", will scarcely please his Press sponsor, Lord Beaverbrook, but it is plain logic after the collapse of the Imperial policy has become obvious to the point of finality. These people usually in the end reach a conclusion of sense and integrity. The trouble is that they think so slowly ; it takes so many hard blows from facts straight on the nose to convince them.

Mr. Crossman appears on occasions when a more compendious effort is required, to lack the clarity which distinguishes his succinct contributions to the *Daily Mirror*. At tortuous length he eventually turned round upon his tracks and came to the classic pacifist conclusion that the only safety is to be powerless. The " great deterrent" was a waste of money, because " by definition that is not used ". But by definition, too, it is only not used if both sides have it ; the H. weapon would be used or threatened quickly enough, if the Soviets alone possessed it, and that weapon would then confer world mastery. In effect, Mr. Crossman seeks to make us for ever the helpless dependant of America, while many of his party join with the sillier Tories in constantly devising new points of difference with American policies and in hurling insults at American statesmen. Mr. Sandys made the perfectly valid point that America might one day decide to go home ; it is a very likely contingency if Mr. Bevan were Prime Minister of Britain and Mr. Crossman Foreign Secretary. We should then find ourselves in the fatal position ; one side would possess the H. weapon and the other side would not.

Choice between nuclear and conventional weapons no problem to united Europe

Mr. Crossman and several other critics expressed the justifiable apprehension that the strain of making nuclear weapons would

deprive us of the means of supporting adequate conventional forces : " when there is trouble in a place like Kenya we shall find that we have not the forces to do the job ". Characteristically, most of them state the premise but shrink from the conclusion. For the complete Union of Europe and the entire integration of Britain into that union is the only conclusion. As an isolated island or fragment of an Empire, we cannot go it alone to produce nuclear weapons and yet be strong enough to maintain large conventional forces for diverse purposes, but the resources of a United Europe can do it with ease. We shall all fall together trying separately to support burdens which we cannot individually carry, or we shall all stand together sharing the burden.

Mr. Crossman mentioned correctly and clearly the necessity to find conventional forces to defend what is left of the Empire and its vital supply lines. He was also to the point in referring to the possible necessity of having to find some forces which did not use nuclear arms, to deal with trouble beginning in such areas as East Germany; in this sphere he lacked the same clarity, because such matters require some new thinking. This struggle would be as much political as military in nature and would require a new form of force and a new type of soldier nearer in character to a developed guerilla, half politician, half soldier : it is a theme to which we have often recurred, but we have not seen it mentioned elsewhere.

In any case, it is to be hoped that Mr. Crossman will pursue his studies and in the course of them come to a more realistic conclusion than his belief that the way to attract the Arabs is to divest ourselves of nuclear weapons while the Russians still have them, in short, to become impotent. It is only in the West that impotence is regarded as a virtue because it is at least a security to others ; another form of turning the other cheek.

Error of thinking use of tactical nuclear weapon must involve great deterrent

The strangest conclusion of the debate arose in the fear expressed by many speakers that the use of tactical nuclear weapons in a limited form of war would inevitably lead to unlimited war with the use of H. bombs and rockets against cities. This surely indicates a failure to think the matter out. A situation has clearly arrived, or will shortly occur, in which each side can destroy all the principal cities of the other side with aeroplanes carrying H. bombs or by the I.C.B.M., carrying nuclear warheads and possessing a range of over

5,000 miles. Further, it now seems clear from the widely expressed fears of scientists that such a mutual bombardment would not only wipe out life in all the main cities, but would also risk poisoning the atmosphere of this earth for generations to come. Whether this view be scientifically valid or not, it is at any rate clear from the popular uproar which greeted the present very limited tests, that the fear of this happening would engender a widespread panic if the use of these weapons were seriously threatened; and such panic will not be confined to the flighty democracies, because no Soviet leader can be at all sure that he will not personally be included in the universal gas chamber. Is it not therefore reasonably obvious that when both sides possess these weapons, no one will use them unless he is mad enough or desperate enough to risk blowing up the world ? (It is probably the Russian conviction that the Americans are mad which now makes them more amenable to relieving the present tension ; the sentiment is, of course, mutual.)

If these conclusions have any force it seems not only possible but probable-to the point of certainty that a local war can occur—in which even tactical atomic weapons may be used—without involving world war and the use of the ultimate H. weapon. Most men would rather lose a province than lose the world, including the loss of their own lives and everybody elses. It may become even less wise to render more desperate both the political and military leaders of the other side by indulging in the savage and imbecile practice of killing the more prominent among the losers in cold blood after victory is won. Our leaders must deny themselves the more ignoble pleasures of the penultimate phase of a civilisation ; " so much for his golden tongue " remarked the ham-handed harpy, whom Anthony made the very temporary error of espousing, as she thrust a golden coin into the mouth of dead Cicero

How Russia will be able to invade despite great deterrent

Yet if we do not possess tactical atomic weapons, the converse of this situation may be equally valid. If the fear of the great deterrent, when it is possessed by both sides, is so great and so universal that it can never be used, it is quite possible that one side will exploit the paralysis of the major weapon to gain a decision with minor weapons. Russia can then advance with her land mass, possibly indeed reinforced with tactical nuclear weapons. Where would Mr. Crossman and his social democratic friends in West Germany then find themselves with their twelve-odd divisions, if they had discarded tactical

nuclear weapons in order not to be provocative and to save expense ? Supposing Russia suddenly announced that a situation of grave disorder had arisen in certain areas of France (which could be quite easily provoked by strong local communist parties). Consequently the Russian armies—ever, of course, in the service of humanity—were advancing to restore order, avert bloodshed and establish peace. If any criminal bandits in America, in defence of their local banditry, should be so criminally insane as to shoot I.C.B.M.s at Moscow (the comradely warning would continue)—then well-concealed I.C.B.M.s in Russian territory would be shot back at New York within ten minutes. Is it quite certain that in those conditions, and in face of popular outcry, an American President would press the button that blew up the world ? That is why we need either, (1) all-round disarmament, both nuclear and conventional, under inspection so effective that it makes impossible the invasion or menace of one country by another ; or (2) our possession of the tactical nuclear weapons — as well as the great deterrent — with which Western science can withstand Russian mass ; or (3), if all nuclear weapons were effectively abolished, an idea, a will and a spirit which could inspire three hundred million Europeans — supported by 150 million Americans — with the resolution and energy for our mass to withstand 170 million Russians of dubious allegiance, without the advantages which Western science offers.

The necessity for a thinking staff in government

Until the situation has so far changed we need what we have often called the four basic requirements of Western safety. This necessity emerged all the more clearly from the recent debates. With equal clarity emerged the urgency for European Union, because this necessity can only possibly be supplied by a united Europe. Every speaker who complained that we could not afford both the nuclear weapons which are necessary to protect our life and the conventional forces which are vital to maintain our life, merely emphasised the bankruptcy of the island policy to which they all cling, and the need for a real European policy which they either reject or accept with a tardy hesitation which lags far behind events.

We reiterate with renewed confidence — gained from the confirmation afforded by the muddled admissions of this debate — that the four basic requirements of Western defence are the following : (1) The great deterrent in the form of aeroplanes carrying H. bombs or long-range rockets with H. warheads. (2) Sufficient conventional

forces armed with tactical nuclear weapons to resist the invasion of Europe by Russian mass, which can well occur in the near future under cover of a mutual fear of the great deterrent. (3) Mobile, airborne conventional forces to guard our vital supplies and their lines of communication ; they will be far flung and the burden of defence will be heavy until we have developed Europe-Africa sufficiently to concentrate on our own vital area. (4) The fourth factor which will be necessary when the new weapons of science have brought paralysis to all regular forces. The fourth man will be half soldier, half politician, a developed guerilla whose base and whose support will be the political sympathy of the civilian population. This is the man who may finally settle the struggle in such areas as East Germany ; the possibility of this clash is now obvious enough even to be mentioned in Parliamentary debate, though the full implications are not yet considered. In fact, Russia could not use nuclear weapons in such a battle because neither she nor anyone else will know where to shoot ; the combatants will be too inextricably mingled with non-combatants, and Russian nuclear weapons would destroy her own forces in addition to other people, as they would have done if they had been used in Budapest. Further, the Russians would in any case be deterred from the use of these weapons by the risk of Western retaliation on Russia. The Soviets will have to fight it out with the weapons of the street like everyone else, and at this stage they would be very happy to do so because they reckon they know far more about such struggle than those who now control the West. It is time that we began to think about the fourth man ; he will be needed. It is time too that we should introduce some clarity to our analysis of these imminent and menacing possibilities, and some reality to our thinking and action. Minds move in the right direction, but always too slowly. Ministers and others who are competent to think are too immersed in their daily tasks. Great Britain needs a general planning staff, which is free to think ; some of the best minds of the country from every sphere should be at its disposal. This was suggested in Parliament more than twenty-five years ago. Cannot we now reduce the time lag of action behind thought in England at least to the lifetime of a generation ?

EUROPEAN

From our first number The European has pursued an open forum policy, and readers will understand that this article is published in accord with that principle.

CHALLENGE AND MEANING OF MODERN MARXISM

by D. V. CHAPLIN

" *Before the Proletariat fights out its battles on the barricades, it announces the coming of its rule with a series of INTELLECTUAL VICTORIES* "—K. Marx.

I

IN the August 1956 issue of *The European* there appeared under the authorship of Mr. A. J. Gregor, an article entitled " Marxism as Philosophy ".

Historically well informed, in his well annotated document of observations he deserves some credit for his painstaking approach to his subject, and draws several original conclusions that certainly throw a much-needed light on the historical development of Marxism.

In spite of these merits, I feel that there are good grounds for supposing that the author falls short of his apparent intention, which would seem to be that of finding and exhibiting fundamental contradictions in the heart of Marxist ideology.

My purpose is here to show that in spite of minor apparent discrepancies which, since there are perhaps no *perfectly consistent* philosophies of any school, may always be found, the fundamental scientific logical and experimental bases of Marxism are not only still intact but still in an active course of development, and to show that Marxist logic can give definite and conclusive answers to at least one problem over which the philosophers of the bourgeois

world are still bruising their heads.

Marxism as a doctrine, contends Mr. Gregor, is composed of three elements :

(1) The " completion " or fulfilment of classical German philosophy.

(2) The revolutionary aspirations of French Socialism.

(3) A " further development " of classical English economics.

The author then goes on to say that consistently with the nature of his essay, he will concern himself with the first of these, " the completion " or " fulfilment " of classical German philosophy, which is, he maintains, the philosophy of Marxism : dialectical materialism. This he proceeds to do, giving various quotations from Lenin, which I think personally he is inclined to misinterpret, in order to prove (which I find rather astonishing) that Lenin and Engels drove themselves aground upon a " naive materialism ".

The author then takes us with a wealth of detail through to his final conclusions, that there are in effect " two " Marxisms ; the one an advanced Feuerbachianism which extended to man a creative role in the making of his own history, and which he claims has made its later appearance through Sorel and Gentile, in the philosophy of fascism and through Pierce and James (that very inferior copy of Pierce) to the revolutionary idealism of pragmatism.

My object is to vindicate Marx, by showing that he was right in his partial rejection of Feuerbach by examining the assertions of Feuerbach as quoted in the body of Mr. Gregor's article and footnotes, and to defend Lenin and Engels against the charge of naive materialism, attributed there to them.

In section I of his article it is worth noting that Mr. Gregor speaks of the three listed components as " posing " as " dialectical materialism ", " historical materialism ", and " Marxian economics ", as though to suggest or hint darkly that these developments are some form of plagiarism or " refurbishment " of Hegel, etc., Marxism only being a superficial restatement of classical German philosophy. In contradistinction, I wish to show that Marxism was based on a genuine logical revaluation of these philosophies.

II

Consistently with Mr. Gregor's attitude to dialectical materialism as being a mere " pose " he devotes very little time to a discussion

of Hegel, entirely ignoring Hegel's contribution to Marxism, passing almost straight over to Feuerbach.

Having remarked firstly the study of the entire system would " exceed the limits of this essay ", he has failed to remember that nearly all philosophies and systems of thought are based on the development of a few fundamental ideas. This is true of all systems, as Peano has shown all mathematical theorems can be deduced from a few concepts such as number " o ", succession etc., and just as Euclid's ideas are developed from a few definitions so in *philosophy* Mr. Gregor's criticism is weakened by this and would have been much more to the point if it had considered the fundamental logical ideas of Marxism, which are of course the existence of social classes and the various laws of dialectic etc.

Marxism claims to be a completely scientific philosophy based on the study of objective law and of processes existing in nature at all levels. These laws are fundamental to all branches of life and science, and can be found to be exemplified in all events from " the development of thought in a poet's brain to the structure of a raindrop ".

Engels quite clearly acknowledges Marx's Hegelian basis.

If Mr. Gregor has any doubts about this I can only refer him to page 27 *Dialectics of Nature* where Engels acknowledges the Hegelian basis of Marx's logic in the following words. This acknowledgment is quite clear, frank and decisive. . . . " Moreover " (writes Engels) " anyone who is even slightly acquainted with his Hegel will be aware that in *hundreds* of passages Hegel is capable of giving the most striking individual illustrations from nature and history of the dialectical laws. . . . "

It was indeed the very purpose of *Dialectics of Nature* to give concrete instances of these laws (or more correctly we should say regularities of form and structure in changing processes).

Marx did not claim to invent these " laws ", neither did Engels. Both recognised them as original contributions of Hegel of great value in the construction of a scientific philosophy, what was really Hegel in Hegel, and not a mere copy of his predecessors' ideas such as state absolutism, etc. which had existed as far back as the Greeks in one form or another, so any restatement of it in Hegel could not claim to be as entirely original, as was his restatement of the laws of dialectic.

We do not need to rely on Hegel for a doctrine of the absolute, it can be found in scores of others, and would no doubt have been

formulated and as widely promulgated if Hegel had never existed.

What then was really original, important and helpful in the construction of scientific philosophy was the dialectical laws.

In the same chapter of the preceding laws, Chapter II, p. 26, *Dialectics of Nature* the three main dialectical laws are stated . . .

The law of transformation of quantity into quality and *vice versa*. . . .

The law of " interpenetration of opposites ".

The law of " negation of the negation ".

Having stated which Engels continued :

" All three are developed by Hegel in his idealist fashion as mere laws of thought." Certainly then there was no question of " posing ", as Mr. Gregor asserts.

Marx and Engels adopted these laws because they believed, as I do, that these laws were to be found in operation everywhere in nature, and since science takes nature as its province, so may the understanding of these laws help scientific understanding.

Surely Marx and Engels could not be accused of " posing " in this ; they accepted what appeared to be genuinely logical and scientific and rejected the rest, just as all scientists do.

Just because Einstein's theory is accepted as true it does not mean to say that everything in Euclid is wrong, and scientists do not therefore deny all validity to Euclid : philosophers, if they wish to be scientific, must adopt the same procedure.

The author or discoverer of these laws of nature was then Hegel. Engels and Marx accepted them ; the only difference was that Hegel took them to be, as it were, psychological laws in the brain of some absolute. Marx and Engels accepted them as " laws ", but not as laws existing in the brain of an absolute, and held that the laws did not depend on an absolute but were immanent in nature itself independently as to whether there was or was not an absolute, and therefore quite acceptable to others such as materialists and atheists who do not accept the possibility of an absolute, simply as " observed formal structures in the occurrence of processes ".

Nobody can therefore master the theory of dialectical materialism unless he really understands Hegel's views, as promulgated in the " Doctrine of Essence " which is part Two of his Science of Logic.

All that Mr. Gregor says about this is to observe that there was a group of University intellectuals who had taken it upon themselves to " revise ", reinterpret and " develop " the philosophy of Hegel.

After giving further quotations in support of this, he says that the main body of these young " Hegelians " fell away from his philosophic idealism and were driven back to various materialistic postures, taking his quotation from Hegel.

He, the author, cannot wait apparently in his hurry to get to Feuerbach, says nothing at all about the fundamental laws of the dialectic, gives no indication as to why and for what logical and philosophical reasons they rejected Hegel's idealism.

As Mr. Gregor is a supporter of idealism, he should be able to state whether or not their reasons were logically valid. Had they logical reasons ? Did they just baldly postulate the existence of matter as some philosophers and theologians " postulate " as an article of blind faith the existence of their absolute ?

Mr. Gregor seems therefore to dodge the issue, to avoid and skate round the question which is alone of any importance to philosophy—i.e. the degree of logical justification, if there be such, of the beliefs concerned.

All these reasons are set out in tabular form in any good textbook on Marxism, such as *Dialectical Materialism* by M. Cornforth. Yet Mr. Gregor does not even mention them, leave alone refute them.

He quickly passes on to Feuerbach. Apparently with better historical than logical insight he makes an interesting remark about the neglect of Feuerbach.

" The philosophy of Feuerbach is today almost unknown to the Anglo-Saxon Marxist ". This remark is original ; it is a fact that in Marxist catalogues Feuerbach's works do not appear ; neither incidentally do those of Eugene Dietzgen such as *Proletarian Logic*, *Letters to my Son*, etc. Why the lack of acknowledgment ? I could never understand. It is certain, and I do not hesitate to agree on this point, that much drivel has been written in the form of anaemic interpretations of Marxism.

What the author fails to note is that historical and social conditions may determine that " University intellectuals may adopt such and such a belief as distinct from another, as may indeed determine to a great degree the beliefs of anybody at any time whatsoever, but they tell us absolutely nothing about the logical justification of the belief, its consistency, the degree of evidence for it or anything that really matters to the logician, philosopher and scientist.

The fact that social influences may induce or favour certain beliefs may have nothing to do with the logical truth of the beliefs

nor of any degree of untruth existing in them.

III

" Hegel had dealt with ideas and their development ", says Mr. Gregor. The real world of common experience was understood to be a product of the real " self-activating world of ideas ".

Mr. Gregor does not trouble to explain any meaning or interpretation of this expression of Hegel's, but goes on to state the views of Feuerbach and how he regarded God and the Idea, etc., as being mere projections and fantasies. Now it seems to me that Feuerbach was absolutely correct here.

Not only was it necessary in the psychological sense that Feuerbach meant as a sort of " guiding myth ", but materially necessary as a temporary stage in the development of man's psychology which all races have to pass through. For consider the state of primitive man, in his dreams he doubtless had encounters with wild animals, tribal foes etc., more vivid than those people dream today, as being more emotionally concerned with his struggle for survival. On waking he might sometimes tell and relate the nature of these dreamed incidents to his companions, who would no doubt say: "No! You had no such adventures, you were sleeping round the camp fire with us". It would then gradually come to be believed that the "soul" was detachable and would leave the body during sleep and wander away and have adventures of its own. There is no doubt that by analogy he probably regarded death as a " big sleep ", and imagined that likewise this detachable something again left the body, this time for good. Thus was born the idea of the soul existing without a body " the objectification of man's subconscious activity " which appears later on in the guise of " the idea " " self-activating ego " at a later and more sophisticated period of man's evolution.

Not having a conception of evolution, he could not ask himself the question of a modern man : " Why have a body and intricate nervous system which have taken millions of years to evolve through the precarious working of natural selection, trial and error ? If the soul or idea can exist without a body surely such a thing is inconceivably redundant ! Deprived of any material evidence of his evolutionary past he could but accept the " detachable soul " as irrefutably evident.

In the light of the consideration (which could not have presented themselves to our remote ancestors) how could the group of

" University intellectuals " avoid suspecting that the absolute was a purely arbitrary postulate on the part of the idealist, and not deduced either from pure logical considerations or observation of objective processes in nature.

Mr. Gregor quotes Feuerbach as saying : " In the object is the nature of the eye manifest to us " " What is light without the eye ? Nothing ! "

Of course Feuerbach was utterly and hopelessly wrong here if he meant by " light " the actual light waves which travel through space and various mediums at different speeds, but normally at about 180,000 miles per second. Of course if Feuerbach meant by " light " the " sensation of light " which occurs when light waves impinge on our optical system, there can be no sensation without a sensory nervous system as a constituent in the production of a sensation. " It all depends on what you mean by ' light ' ", as Joad would say.

That the two things are described by the same word " light " probably confused Feuerbach. If Feuerbach really believed that about the " light " of the physics textbooks, which Sir James Jeans says originated from disintegrated matter from the centre of the sun, he *was wrong*.

That words like " light " and " heat " thus have a dual meaning, and therefore lead to semantic errors, is even true today. Thus you get Joad asking in *Teach Yourself Philosophy*, does the " heat " exist in me or in the fire before which I am warming myself ?

Feuerbach must have been incredibly ignorant of science and physics if he really meant that light waves depend in any way on the existence of the eye. That they do not depend on the eye is shown by the fact that they act on a photographic plate in the absence of any observer.

By confusing the two uses of the word " light ", and using the word in two different ways, we can obviously derive conclusions such as :

Light travels at 180,000 miles per second ;
I am experiencing a patch of light ;
therefore the patch of light is, i.e. (my sensation of light . . .)
travelling through the air at 180,000 miles per second ;

which is obviously both absurd and false.

It is ridiculous to speak of " sensations travelling through space ", but if anyone should still be in doubt about the two meanings of the word, let him consult Van Nostrand's excellent " Encyclopaedia " of science where it defines light waves, i.e. " physical light ", which

we never see directly but which we only know through the resulting "light sensation", under two distinct headings.

Long and detailed treatment is given under "light waves", the different speed of light travelling through different materials at different temperatures, etc. Under the heading of visual sensations of light on the contrary it distinctly says that light "as a sensation" has been the object of very little scientific investigation.

Unless we go back and look at the text we cannot be sure in what sense Feuerbach was using the word ; for depending on his use of the word he was either talking ignorant unscientific nonsense or saying something which was too obviously true to be worth mentioning, and which any educated person would accept.

To say that a sensation can occur without a sensory nervous system, besides making all our human nervous apparatus redundant, is absolutely unprovable. Of course there was a scientist who used to hold that grass suffered pain when you trod on it, but he was never taken seriously and could offer no convincing proof.

IV

My guess is that Feuerbach was not much of a scientist, and that caused Marx to reject him as Marx's own scientific learning and standard of scholarship increased.

Referring to the psychological and crude anthropomorphic relativism of Feuerbach, Mr. Gregor says a sense perception only becomes true when it is found to be consistent with the perceptions of others.

Now, this doctrine of Feuerbach was obviously false, and a stupidity which no Marxist could concede.

When I have a toothache I do not have to consult other people's experience before knowing that I have a "real" toothache. Obviously Marx realised the crudity and lack of subtlety in Feuerbach, and no wonder Marxists became ashamed of it and dropped Feuerbach out of sight.

We have, of course, sensations about our own bodily states which no one else can share. This is not true, however, of what lies outside us and which can be viewed by all...

Suppose I and a colour-blind man look at the same book. We have a different sensation, but it is related to the same book. We both see a different colour, because although the same light waves may be reflected by the book into his eye, one ingredient in the system is changed, for a colour-blind man has different shaped

rods and cones in his eye.

Obviously light of a certain wave length falling on to one type of nervous system gives rise to a different type of sensation to that falling on a different type of nervous system. Just as the alteration of only one constituent (the flavouring essence for example), gives rise to a different taste pudding.

I have never looked at Feuerbach's own writings, but if the standard of scholarship was no higher than that I do not feel I have missed much.

The fact that there is a human " reality," as Marx said, does nothing to prove that there is no " grasshoppers' reality ", no " dog's reality ", " fishes' reality " etc. why confine reality to one set of creatures' experience ?

A dog can hear a higher pitched note than a man, thus there is real sensation composed of a particular speed of sound wave vibrating in the auditory system of a dog which can have no counterpart in human experience.

There is not, of course, just one reality but many different equally real realities. This is the true objective relativism of Lenin, and not psychological relativism with which it is sometimes confused. In footnote 48 p. 17 of his article Mr. Gregor cites two instances of explanations, one by Russell, the other by Gentile.

To the question is one sensation subjective, objective or both, the answer is : both subjective and objective, as Russell acknowledges when he speaks of *interaction*. Gentile says, however, " Reality is according to Marx a subjective production of man, production however of man's sensuous activity."

It is quite clear that the question is : " Is sensation subjective or objective ? " To say that it is subjective alone, or objective alone, would be half truths.

V

Sensation as Interaction (*Simultaneous Interaction*)

The question " Is sensation subjective ? " would be answered by three types of philosophers in the three possible different ways. It is a question about a *non-exclusive conjunction* to borrow a phrase from a logical textbook. . . . . The three ways are :

(1) **The Subjective Idealist**—*Sensation is subjective and not objective.*

(2) **The Objective Materialist**—*There is no mind only matter, therefore it must be objective.*

(3) **The Dialectical Materialist**—*Sensation arises through the interpenetration of the subject and object.*

Therefore it is both taken in conjunction, and cannot exist in isolation as in (1) and (2) above.

Before Marx there existed the two irreconcilable schools of thought. The objective materialist view that " mind " did not really exist. The subjective view that all was mind, that *matter* was *illusion* only sensations were objects.

These two schools had then between them an apparently irreconcilable gulf. The philosophical gulf precluded the very question which would otherwise have sooner become a central question for science, logic and philosophy. That question, can " mind " be interpreted as a process in terms of matter in motion ? Dialectical materialism was the first philosophy to look this question in the face ; the only philosophy revolutionary enough to face the problem of building a bridge of understanding across this gulf.

Yet Mr. Gregor asks himself : " It is indeed difficult to understand how such a philosophy in which the subject has an *active role* in perception could be classified as other than idealistic."

This question is to a Marxist like the question : " Is the ladder touching the wall or the wall touching the ladder ? "—capable of only one answer—*both*—so there is sensation, as Russell rightly says, both subjective and objective.

We cannot rid ourselves of the object. For imagine a human being suspended in infinite empty space ; there would be nothing to stimulate consciousness in him outside ; but there would still remain the consciousness of his body if such a man could survive. His body would be the one sole object. Take away his body : what remains to be aware of ? Annihilate every nerve, limb and brain cell. There would be nothing to be aware of and therefore no " awareness ", no " consciousness ". That is why some lower animals fall into a trance when held still with their eyes covered. With little consciousness of sensation in their own bodies and no impulses from outside all activity ceases. That is why Japanese torturers are said to incarcerate prisoners in round cells : the sameness of the unbroken surface, the lack of stimulus induces madness and deterioration of consciousness.

Every healthy sensation requires a stimulus from the object. That is why Marxists are right to say no object without a subject. This is reflected also in popular maxims of education such as " we learn by doing " etc.

We come at last to the dividing line, the barrier of sensation between subject and object, that third world of being that cannot exist between non-living objects but only between living and non-living.

The question is put by Mr. Gregor thus, as the " time-worn philosophy of materialist representationalism ".

(1) That the world is real and independent of man's consciousness.

(2) The mind is passive and " reflects " this external reality.

I will deal with these two assertions.

To the first question that " the world is independent of man's consciousness and really exists quite independently of being perceived ".

Proof

In the first place, to speak of representationalism in the sense of " exact copy " is false, and is not what is meant by Lenin or Marx. Indeed it is doubtful if there is such a thing as an exact copy in this sense. Does a photograph give an exact copy ? What about a number of different photographs taken with different coloured types and quality of film ? Let us imagine these cameras to photograph the same object. The photographs might all vary in some slight way, especially if some were colour film and some not. There is no such thing as " *the* " *real one*, there are a number of real ones, and they are all real, no more or less one than the other. There is no way of judging which is *the* real one. The only question is, is there something outside the cameras to which they are all related which reflects light into the cameras and causes a chemical change in the film ? The answer is undoubtedly, Yes, otherwise there would be no reason to expect any photos so taken to be even recognisably like the same object.

To be a signal, a correlate, it is never necessary to be a copy in this sense.

Bishop Berkeley of Cloyne in an attempt to refute materialism tried to show that we can never get beyond our sensations, that in fact as sensations are nothing else than sensations and not correlated to objects in any way because a sensation was to be nothing but a sensation. Therefore he concluded materialism was just a bald postulate ; one might just as well postulate God. But later David Hume pointed out we might just as well postulate nothing, as nobody presumably had direct sight, touch or hearing of God, all that we could say was that sensations existed, that we had no right to claim more. If we did, it was simply a matter of blind faith

whether we were atheists or materialists, or upholders of the " absolute ".

Why do not Marxists then accept this conclusion, which has been parroted around the world so long that it has come to be accepted as a truth by dint of mere repetition and has become almost every where in the bourgeois world to this day to appear to be an axiom on which must rest all profound philosophy.

The answer is simple, it arises from the consideration of anaesthesia. I have in front of me this moment a table which a Berklean of the modern type like Russell would no doubt define as a " set of possible sensations ", a " patch of white " when I look at the tablecloth, " a feeling of hardness " if I press even ever so lightly on the table, and so on. However, if a clever surgeon should inject a drug into my system I could be made not to feel the table ; or suppose my arm was deadened by paralysis in such a way that I could not feel it, it is quite clear that the table would continue to resist my arm and not the " feeling " of the table, since this would no longer exist.

Poor Berkeley could not have known this, as his famous *Treatise on the Principles of Human Knowledge* was written in 1710. He would never have put forward his theory if he had been aware of the possibility of deadening all sensation. Honest, as his lucid style reveals, he would not wilfully blind his eyes to an honest objection.

Berkeley then pre-dated the discovery of something by 136 years that would have thrown a searching light on his theory, and which only his successors have refused to face. For it was not till October 16th, 1846 that anaesthesia was first used and demonstrated in the Massachussets General Hospital, by one Dr. Morton.

It is obviously absurd to say that the object is nothing but a " class of its appearances " or " set of perspectives " as is logically constructed out of " sense data ".

If the total " perspectives " were the object I would have to observe the object from every side and angle, continually turning it over, before I could even say that " this is a pen " or " that is a bottle of ink ".

Suppose a friend with monochromatic colour-blindness walked into my room. Perhaps I might have a green pencil, mark you one green pencil, lying on my table. There are not two pencils. The monochromatic man could only see blacks and greys. According to the definition, however, there *would* then be two pencils, one a

" set of green visual sensations ", which I could pick up and put in my pocket, and yet another " class of grey appearances " which the colour-blind man can at the same time pick up.

This alone should be enough to show the absurdity of the doctrine that thus defines material objects as " sets of sensations " and identifies them with such.

Nevertheless for over 250 years logicians and philosophers (and the best of them) were fooled by it and *still are in* 1957 !

John Stuart Mill felt doubts about it, for early in his famous *System of Logic* he remarked : " When I am digging in my garden it is not an " Idea " that I am pushing into the ground ". He could find no logical objection to it however, as on page 395 (Chap. XXIV) he states : " *Feelings of sensitive beings or possibilities* of having such feeling are the *only* . . . *things* the existence of which can be a subject of logical induction ", and the next page remarks : " The existence therefore of a phenomenon is but another word for it being perceived."

No wonder that a recent writer complains that the Soviet Union is turning out thousands more scientists than the West, when our greatest logicians and mathematicians wallow in such outdated word phantasms as objects which are nothing more than collections of sense data.

How can our leading men set an example to the youth of our country ? Like the hen in *Thus Spake Zarathustra* which is quoted as being paralysed by the sight of a streak of chalk, they prostrate themselves before the dead metaphysical shibboleths of a pre-scientific age, which for all its phrase coining has never got a step beyond Berkeley.

The *degree* of *resistance* which a solid object offers to our body has nothing, essentially nothing, to do with sensation. Naturally if our skins were completely *insensitive* to pain as children we would take longer to learn not to bruise ourselves more often, and take longer to understand the danger of fire. We should nevertheless, given time, come to look for these things as harmful to our system and therefore adjust ourselves.

This consideration alone shows the mistakenness of Mr. Gregor's claim, for if your sensations *are* photographic copies in the exact sense, then even if we could see the other " unknown world ' mentioned by Mr. Gregor, we should not be able to distinguish it. Cause and effect can of course be supposed to be exactly alike, but if that were so how should we know which was cause and which

effect ?

Time and time again *Materialism and the Empiric Criticism* and Maurice Cornforth today in his *Science Versus Idealism* dissociate from a view that an image must be an exact copy, but reflects only the object's mere existence and is therefore nothing more than a system of correlates. He makes it very plain that to say that a thing is an " image " or a reflection is to say nothing about the exactness of the image, that Lenin's book refers to signals of the object's existence . . . and nothing more.

In Dr. John Lewis's* recent book in fact the matter is plainly put in a quotation from Lenin. The book in question is *Marxism and the Irrationalists.* The quotation from *Materialism and Empiric Criticism,* which is the most important work on philosophy produced at that time from the Marxist standpoint, runs as follows :

. . . " Absolute truths result from the sum-total of relative truths . . . and in turn relative truths represent *approximate* reflections of an object which exists independently of humanity. These reflections continually approach the truth ".

Obviously there would have been no sense in the expressions *approximate* and *continually approach* if our minds had an exact copy of everything on sight ; it would not only be not approximate but require no further continual approach.

Obviously if a plain mirror, a distorting concave mirror and a convex give a reflection of the same person when no one else is in the room, they all equally signalise his existence. Indeed it will no doubt be the only thing that the reflections have in common that they are of that one man.

The view that only sensations are real is the last great superstition of this age. Next, declares Mr. Gregor : " Man's experience speaks only for man. It tells us nothing except that under certain actualities we can produce a series of results which we can learn to expect provisionally ". Now of course when we have already observed certain things we know that whatever the nature of the external it is such as to *permit us to observe* them again if we could condition all the circumstances completely to our desire.

But what about the makers of the first apparatus, the first man to look through a telescope, or to observe green flashes on a zinc sulphide screen. As it was the first apparatus I am now considering it could not be true that the first man to make such a screen knew in advance what he was going to see. Therefore the only thing that

* *Marxism and The Irrationalists,* by Dr. John Lewis, p. 23.

caused him to build the first of such things was a " belief " in that he believed there to be something existing outside, so that when an alpha particle hit the screen it would emit a flash (see p. 341 *Science Versus Idealism* by M. Cornforth).

It was clearly a belief about something outside himself ; he could not even perhaps know that the flashes would turn out to be green and not some other colour.

Certainly Lenin would be guilty if he had been a naive materialist of an unscientific philosophy. Naive materialism is the doctrine that colours etc. " inhere " in an object and are somehow there even when nobody is looking. From a modern scientific point of view this is complete nonsense ; all colours are produced by wave lengths of different kinds of light reflected from different objects, in the complete absence of light in " total darkness " a thing literally has *no* colour ; different kinds of material absorb and reflect different kinds of light.

If a blob of paint gives our waves of light of one frequency it produces a sensation of yellow, a blob of a different kind gives out waves that together with a certain type of optical nervous system produce a sensation of red. Mix the two blobs of paint, the waves slow one another down giving a different wave length and thus a different colour sensation, i.e. orange, when the light impinges on our eye. This is clearly a process of interaction—simultaneous interaction like combining two sets of different liquids or two different colours, to give a new colour.

Incidentally this interaction can be cast into an exact formula as can any other logical formula, but as this is not an essay on logic, I do not propose to give it here.

At this point Mr. Gregor says Marx cannot be a " free " agent and at the same time have his future " determined " as a historical course which is inevitable.

There at last we have it ! Mr. Gregor has failed to see that the confines of philosophy can permit both.

That is the very point of Marxism. That *individuals may* have a real objective and relative freedom but that *classes* may yet be determined.

What may be predicated of a *class* may not always be predicated of individuals.

If a historian says " the British working class has existed for three hundred years and came into being when the big landlords drove the small peasants off the land ", quoting the Enclosure Acts

and so on, in saying that " the working class has existed three hundred years ", he is not of course saying that any actual working man or individual man is three hundred years old, any more than if I said : " All men are numerous " or " Man (the human race) is numerous ", I would be understood to mean each man is numerous.

Again, a group or colony of pacifists may as *individuals* hate *war* and preach (as *individuals*), against all war. If they lived in a warlike country, however, their bank savings and a portion of their tax might go into a pool of money to finance war. As *individuals* they would *actually* be *free* and believe themselves *free* to oppose war, but as a *group* or *class* they would, through payment of taxes and their pooled investments in the bank, *not* be free to oppose war, but perhaps be actually supporting it. " Ah," you will say, " but supposing one—knowing perhaps more about economics than most religious people, became a Poujadist and refused to pay his tax on these grounds. Would that not be an individual struggling for freedom ? " Perhaps, but it would hardly occur to all pacifists at once. He would have to organise some kind of combined opposition which would again necessitate combined or *class* activity. Many people in this country say that the inhabitants of the Soviet Union have less individual freedom than here, but this even if true does not prove that they have less freedom to run their own group concerns, that is less class freedom, than exists here.

When Marx says the class struggle inevitably leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, Mr. Gregor protests. But supposing he had referred only to the past and said the rule of tribal law was at one time inevitable would Mr. Gregor have been so quick to deny it ? Obviously Marx did not mean people must sit down and wait for the future, with folded hands, as Mr. Gregor assumes ; otherwise there would have been no revolution.

Surely Marx's theory is coming true in front of our very eyes. As Alec Brown shows in *The Fate of the Middle Class*, the " nationalisers ", clever *middle class* technicians, are inventing clever calculating office machines which will inevitably reduce the white collar people to the ranks. Thus the bourgeoisie of today are digging their graves, and the bank clerks, for the first time in history, seek the protection of a Union.

Knowing, I confess, little more than Mr. Gregor of Sorel and Gentile, I hope that he can convince me that they have their heads less far in the clouds than some of our home-grown blowers of metaphysical bubbles and constructors of philosophical " houses

of playing cards " out of collections of so-called " perspectives " or " sense data ", and other contortionists.

Pierce, the founder of pragmatism, is a man who is highly esteemed as an exact logical thinker, and may be one of the few who deserve credit as a source of modern philosophy for the man of today. To mention James on the same line does no justice to Pierce.

In an excellent study of Pierce by W. B. Gallie, it is described how Pierce, in his declining age a pensioner on James' generosity, beseeches James to learn to think with more exactitude ! In fact, James' garbled version so embarrassed Pierce that Pierce had to rename his own philosophy and change it from " Pragmatism " to " Pragmaticism ". Pierce clearly owed nothing of value in the philosophical field to James.

Pragmatism is the theory of " what works ", but in reference to social classes what " works " for one may work to the detriment of the other.

It may well be true that to fill the gaps in his knowledge man has had in the past temporarily to rely on "myths", thus James' suicidal " Will to Believe ".

The basic assumption of pragmatism is doubtful, for a true proposition does not always imply its converse.

The inference (on which pragmatism seems based) that : " All truthful beliefs are useful beliefs " " Therefore all useful beliefs are true ", is false. As Dr. Lewis remarks : This is easy to see if we put : " All dogs are animals. Therefore all animals are dogs ".

Though this is a false inference, James based his philosophy on it.

Perhaps we ought not to expect better from James, as it is illogical in itself to expect illogical people to think logically, and it is pointed out by Gallie in the aforementioned book on Pierce* that James confessed himself " mathematically imbecile " and " a-logical if not illogical ", and in one of his later books publicly and solemnly " renounced logic ". Yet *Logic* is the grammar of science, and the rational, and it *is* a *rational ideology* the world needs today.

* Page 22. *Pierce and Pragmatism.*

SOCIAL EFFECTS OF MODERN WAR

WHEN Dr. S. Andrejewsky, a young Polish sociologist, now at work in London, had his book *Military Organisation and Society* (Routledge, 21s.) published, its good reception was assured because it examined the social consequences of the extraordinary changes in the technique of war—a neglected sphere of study in the view of the author. Recently, his further development of the subject was presented in the form of a talk at a gathering of a society known as Mensa, membership of which is limited to people with I.Q.'s of 155 and above. That which follows is an abstract of the talk.

Half the world's energies, Dr. Andrejewsky said, are devoted to the problem of how to force others to give up what they do not wish to surrender. Hitherto there has always been a victor, no matter how savage the conflict, but now a revolution has suddenly occurred that is quite as remarkable as the making of the first weapon, namley, that mutual suicide has arrived as a possibility which renders it unprofitable for the first time to take from others. Four possibilities therefore exist : The destruction of the entire world, continuance of hostile coexistence and the accompanying alternation between war and peace, conquest of the world by a single power, and the peaceful federation of states.

Ignoring the first as unthinkable, the second seems improbable unless there arises some way of producing a stalemate by inventing defensive weapons fast enough to meet development on the side of attack ; but all recent improvements have been in weapons of attack and there seems no likelihood of an immediate swing the other way. Hostile coexistence is, moreover, unlikely because if it includes the means of knocking out an opponent in a single swift blow, sooner or later this blow will be struck. What sort of a society will it be, then, with everyone's finger on the trigger ? It needs to be said at once that it will be very different from the modern liberal state like Britain or the U.S.A. Secrecy and

espionage will be of supreme importance when a single invention can swing the balance, and in a world where a state can be defeated before war starts simply because the enemy knows its rocket sites. Power in the future will undoubtedly depend upon the inventors ; greater police supervision and increased control of travel will also exist. A further, unusual development, now commencing, is that small states will find it comparatively easy to provoke the giants to fight. Hostile coexistence therefore provides no answer at all.

Considering the third possibility, if one state were to conquer the world, much would depend on the original constitution and civilisation of the supreme "victor". It is doubtful if world conquest could be maintained by an American type of constitution in the case of rule by force, and a peaceful victory could be maintained only by an extensive police network to ensure a monopoly of power ; but it should be remembered that the possession of bombs in quantity has its saturation point, and a big state might conceivably be overthrown with ease. One of the chief problems would be how to keep the pro-consuls in order. (The example of General MacArthur in Korea might be cited.) If America conquered the world its government would have to undergo changes comparable with those of Rome following the conquest of the Mediterranean ; after which it is more than likely that civil strifes would take humanity right back to the beginning again.

Alternatively, if Russia conquered the world, her system of rule would also have to alter, once the stimulus of war had gone. Russia's rulers today live and have lived in a constant conspiratorial atmosphere ; future leaders might well become like the French aristocracy after that country's revolution, if world peace were attained. The Russian system as it stands benefits nobody and is not acceptable if it leads to events like those in Hungary. In either event the possibility of a backyard nuclear genius blowing the world to pieces will loom increasingly large as being our greatest fear.

In short, world conquest by one power would be an expensive way of achieving the same ends as federal government, and it is the conditions for successfully achieving world federation that are here outlined.

★ ★ ★

In those times when humans lived in the animal state, animal laws applied, but with the aid of weapons man became able to

subdue the beasts and other men became his major enemy. Humans are unique in the practice of killing their own species systematically. In a world federation, with the usual checks of war taken away, and the setbacks of pestilence and famine reduced in their effect, the major problem will be to adjust population to resources and *vice versa*. Modern technology now enables us to produce enough for our needs and for the future, the earth's mineral resources are by no means exhausted. Although the theories of Malthus have been constantly negated, some form of limiting of population may nevertheless be needed. We cannot say for sure.

Hunger is the primary force leading to war and the second is thirst for power, which is allied to the first in that prospects of food shortage give rise to seizure of power to secure the lifeline. Charters such as those of the United Nations Organisation are useless just so long as many countries live in oppression and poverty, since peoples are bound to be swayed by the promisers of plenty. For oppressed people even total war with the possibility of total destruction is preferable to the conditions that exist. Discontentment over basic necessities must be got rid of.

An interesting question arising from this aspect is whether very dissatisfied people should have access to nuclear physics. Any nuclear physicist with suicidal tendencies could indeed destroy us all, and any such inclinations would have to be readily discernible. One day it might even happen that the only capital offence will be the study of nuclear physics, whether by neurotics or ordinary people. But prohibition of one branch of study could spread to others, and intellectual effort would thus lose its incentive. Pure altruism is rare as a motive for science ; poverty and keeping up with the neighbours are the main motives. And with what effect on occasions ; probably the invention of the stirrup by the Mongols was the greatest single factor in the downfall of the Roman empire.

It is only by stability that violence can be avoided. This implies a common basis of beliefs. If there were any control of belief in order to avert the possibility of war, our existence would indeed be monotonous. Moreover, the arts flourish best in an atmosphere of tension. Other art forms, hitherto unknown, may of course arise.

The thirst for power would have to be eliminated ; many agree that Gt. Britain's own Parliamentary system avoids power, but there is some disagreement over the form of election. Ultimately, the most beneficial and wisest system would be close to that of Plato, but such a form could not be developed from any system

that exists. Although psychologists should not be allowed to determine who should rule, some selection may occur ; great power might then fall into the hands of a tyrant if a successful method of administering pre-natal or genetic treatment were found able to make people become benevolent ! Another occurrence might be the eventual " breeding out " of the power lust in the course of time.

Perhaps the most interesting of points for reflection is whether our masculine qualities have outlived their usefulness. By this is meant, that there is obviously an implication of a change being called for once fighting has been done away with. Should female hormones be administered in the future federation of states ? Would it make any difference ?

Developments in the social sciences today point to the possibility of countering sudden changes, which, as mentioned, make for conditions of violence. If every person fulfilled the function that the educators planned for him, they would automatically do away with subversive tendencies. The selection of people to do what they are best suited for would *ipso facto* circumvent the causes of change. Already most of the world's countries are in danger of losing their civilisations as a result of mass communication in many media. Many advances in human thought stem from contact between cultures, and if this stimulus goes intellectual life will be endangered.

★ ★ ★

Among the points raised during a discussion that followed Dr. Andrejewsky's talk, were : The unpredictable effect of weapons over the past 10-15 years, the possiblity of civilisation starting all over again as in Aldous Huxley's " Ape and Essence ", conquest of other planets, individual invention a thing of the past, and the existence of other and higher motives for wars. Finally a whole new world was envisaged as a result of the extended use of telepathy and the training of people in this technique. We may well see, in such an event, an automatic defence against the police state ; the secret nuclear physicist, criminally juggling with illegal atoms, would be one step ahead of the police every time, because when they turned the corner of the street he would be packed and already half way to the next town.

EDUCATION *versus* THE EDUCATIONALIST STATE

by HARVEY BLACK

I

IN the first chapter of his book *Democracy and Education* John Dewey writes :

> " What nutrition and reproduction are to physiological life, education is to social life. . . . Education, in its broadest sense, is the means of this social continuity of life. . . . Each individual, each unit, who is the carrier of the life experience of his group, in time passes away. Yet the life of the group goes on."

We have now " more and better education " everywhere, but at the same time human societies and cultural traditions are fast being broken. And again, if what the famous liberal educationalist said is true, why has " education " been such a popular battle cry among revolutionaries ? Men bent on the destruction of a society would be unlikely to nourish the means of its preservation. Perhaps their interest is one of sabotage ; to centralise into one state education system all the links which make possible the continuity of the innumerable elements in our complex society. Thus the communists took over all the second-hand bookshops in Czechoslovakia so that no one could get to work " educating himself " in a quiet corner on books not of the party line.

In point of fact, education is now primarily conceived as a system

for regulating the environment of the " educated " so that you can turn them into whatever you want to turn them into. You re-educate criminals. Americans brought up on 100 per cent unadulterated Dewey were sent to Europe to " re-educate " the Germans for democracy. Liberal educationalists have an outlook basically similar to that of the button moulder. Even as long ago as Dr. Arnold we had an educator primarily interested in producing types, rather than bringing out the latent intelligence in his pupils. On its negative side the Public School system was a device for bulldozing the world with a mass-produced bogus aristocracy of " types " who had learnt that it was bad form to be too intelligent. You did as you were told.

Political battles over education have mainly been concerned with who shall control this mechanism for conditioning environment. Mr. Jacks in his *Total Education* speaks with approval of what he describes as Hitler's method of breaking down

> " the traditional groupings (whether those be the family, the church, the political party, or the nation) in which he (the individual) finds himself and which largely determine what he is—a breakdown which is often significantly enough followed by a breakdown in the moral conscience of the individual, and then to build up immediately new groups which would determine the type of individual and promote the kind of behaviour which he (Hitler) desired. The method worked and it is a method which we can purge of its evil elements and adapt to our own needs. . . . Hitler has only misused and distorted a so-far neglected potentiality. . . . "

The keystone in the central political control of education was the 1944 Education Act, and not even Mr. Jacks can accuse Hitler of having drafted that piece of legislation.

Against this we have Thorstein Veblen in *The Theory of The Leisure Class* :

> " In point of derivation and early development learning is somewhat closely related to the devotional function of the community. . . . . To a great extent, the knowledge acquired under the priestly teachers of the primitive community was a knowledge of ritual and ceremonial ; that is to say a knowledge of the most proper, most effective, or most acceptable manner of approaching and of serving the preternatural agents."

This is expressed from the materialist standpoint. To put it another way education begins when one attempts to get to grips with meta-

physical reality, to gain a knowledge about matters of permanent validity, as opposed to the incidental fragments one acquires in the course of practical pursuits. It was when the importance of these " universal " matters was most widely recognised that our own civilisation reached its high water mark, and, as we should expect, when the old " Universities " were founded. (We tend now to think of the " universal " element in their name too much in relation to place and too little in relation to time.) Without a sufficient number of men acquainted with this " classical " knowledge and possessing a universality of outlook the direction of human society is at the mercy of opinions that vary from year to year as styles in clothing or the bonnets of motor cars. Which, of course, is what happens in a democracy where the curricula in schools and the political philosophies of successful politicians have to be changed with the season in order to " sell ".

Sir Percy Nunn in his *Education : Its Data and First Principles* accepts this state of affairs with equanimity. He takes G. K. Chesterton to task for gibing

> " at the man who would decide human immortality from the standpoint of an electrical engineer. But can an electrical engineer do otherwise ? We can none of us escape the habits that belong to our training. That is why men must differ in opinion to the end of time, and why large ranges of truth will always be inaccessible to each of us."

" Our training " for some technical or professional pursuit is, in Nunn's conception, our education. It has, as Mr. Pound would say, no pivot. The moralist educators of the Nunn and Jacks variety are not really worried what the electrical engineer *thinks* about immortality, or about anything else. Most of their books, which read like expanded " short talks after prayers ", are concerned with putting across a behaviourist " code " amidst the eclectic programme of modern mass education. So long as they all behave like good decent Englishmen. There are many would-be twentieth century Arnolds.

Education is an expression of authority. It is the way in which one learns what is true and what is untrue about the world and the universe in which we live. From this " pivot " one branches out to a knowledge of the individual truths of the science in which one specialises. The protestants, the liberals, the anti-clericals, the communists and many others reject the claims of authority and their education systems are without " pivot ". To cover up this

lack they either set themselve up in the place of authority and substitute an ersatz " pivot ", such as worship of the state or themselves, or they advance the thesis that " all is opinion " and that the crowning virtue is an " open mind ". The centre of their system is a sentimental picture of " the good man ", whose outlook is rather similar to that of *The Times*.

The Medieval Church by clarifying the conception of authority as distinct from power (whether that of kings or any other form of civil government) provided the basis for an education system. Power corrupts. Authority must be free from corruption. The civil government is preoccupied with immediate material problems so that if it controls education it will re-orientate it to produce the results it wants—atomic scientists, people to do more " work " or provide administrative window dressing in the form of cultural propaganda. It has no patience with people acquiring the means to criticise its actions by other standards than its own. Education therefore, is, or should be, *ultra vires* as far as the civil government is concerned.

So long as the civil powers could see no immediate advantage by promoting learning in schools and colleges they left these institutions alone. It was only when they realised the importance of the network of grammar schools, universities and the junior schools, that they began to take an interest in education.

The interest of the civil power usually had two aims. One to make use of the educational institutions for their own purposes (training of administrators etc.). Two to emasculate the expression of authority. If you nationalised the Church you could allow the educational establishments that depended on it to have a considerable measure of apparent independence.

In England the industrial revolution made standardised training in classes for the mechanical arts a feasible proposition for the civil government. Reading and writing were more and more needed as the medium for such training and a growing belief that the three " R's " had by then become of practical use to everyone led, in the nineteenth century, to the government's supplementing the work done by Church schools by authorising the expenditure of rates and taxes on further schools. This measure was also considered to be the most suitable way of dealing with the problem of child labour, which was an unpleasant feature of the industrial towns. In their vague sort of way spokesmen of the " Nonconformist Conscience " perceived a connection between the old learning and godliness, and

so presumed that if you taught a person something you would make him good.

This attitude explains the general acceptance of this new power delegated to the civil government. Lord Sandon's act of 1876 did not go so far as making attendance at school compulsory, but prohibited the employment of children under ten and of those between ten and fourteen who had not reached a specified standard in the three " R's ". Mundella's Act of 1880 made attendance at school compulsory between the ages of five and ten, so that the specific " educational " objective of a standard of proficiency in the three " R's " was replaced by the physical objective of getting children to be in a given place at a given time.

These developments were taking place at the high tide of the spread of the Darwinian theory. Human beings are what they are as a result of their adaptation to their surroundings, so that if you provided the " right " environment in the formative years you could manufacture perfect human beings. So would run the evolutionary argument.

Older institutions were presumed to be taking part in the same campaign to " cook " the environment of youth. If they did not, they were attacked by the egalitarians as giving unfair advantages to their pupils. Since education is now just environment it is considered as a " thing " which ought to be shared. The absurd contradictions in Mr. John Dewey's *The School and Society* (1900) show the determination of this great liberal educationalist to blast any other concepts of education from the face of the modern world. He says that a few centuries ago

> " a high priesthood of learning . . . guarded the treasury of truth . . . and doled it out to the masses under severe restrictions. . . . There were not in existence any means by which the multitude could possibly have access to intellectual resources. These were stored up and hidden away in manuscripts."

If the scribes of the " dark ages " were to read Mr. Dewey and learn that their lives devoted to copying manuscripts were merely spent in hiding knowledge away, they could be forgiven for wondering who it was who was really living in the dark ages. He adds :

> " Of these (manuscripts) there were at best only a few, and it required a long troublesome preparation to be able to do anything with them."

Dewey objects to learning being " monopolised " by a minority,

while at the same time saying that that sort of learning is useless to the majority. Anything which requires any intellectual effort (such as " sorting out " manuscripts) must be rigorously excluded from the curriculum. He says (*The School and Society*) that our education system

> " is something which appeals for the most part simply to the intellectual aspect of our natures . . . it is an education dominated almost entirely by the medieval conception of learning."

One could only wish it were.

Having built up a nucleus of state operated schools, the next step of the civil government in Great Britain was to acquire control of policy in all other schools. The 1944 Act gives the politicians of the day a virtual monopolistic control over what part of the cultural heritage shall be transmitted from one generation to another. In France the Minister of Education prescribes the syllabus and the time-tables to be used in all state schools. Such happenings are but milestones in the programme of the Educators. M. L. Jacks, in *Total Education*, envisages the transfer of such national powers to some body such as U.N.O. which would revise all text books (especially in history) according to " the principles of post-war civilisation ". The resulting " history of Europe " *should* be the basis of all school text books. Mr. Jacks would seem to approve wholeheartedly of such an immense and uncontrollable concentration of world power usurping the function of authority. It would always be right because it would decide what was " right " and the " principle of post war civilisation " would always depend on who won the war and would always be changing. The text books would be constantly rewritten and the old ones meticulously destroyed. Mr. Jacks is the Director of the Oxford University Department of Education.

II

The importance of the Medieval Church in providing a highly effective recruiting system for scholarship is clearly indicated by the non-Churchman Veblen :

> " Even today there are such things in the usage of the learned community as the cap and gown, matriculation, initiation, and

graduation ceremonies, and the conferring of scholastic degrees, dignities and prerogatives in a way that suggests some sort of scholarly apostolic succession. The usage of the priestly orders is no doubt the proximate source of all these features of learned ritual. . . . "

This medieval tradition of learning (which Mr. Dewey so abhors) was severely weakened by the advent of Rennaissance " humanism " and by the Reformation. Professor C. S. Lewis has, in his *Prolegomena to Renaissance Poetry*, dismissed Renaissance " humanism " in two words—" Ciceronian Latin ". One should not study medieval authors because they used words that Cicero never used. It would be bad for one's style.

The Universities remained, most of the Grammar Schools remained and in many places the nationalised Church continued to carry out the educational work previously performed by the Catholic Church. The notion of a universal education was more and more restricted to what we now call a " classical education ", a study of ancient Latin and Greek.

As survivals and relics these traditional education establishments have lived on through the centuries. They have inspired many imitations, but having frequently lost all touch with the ideas which gave them their being they have not been in a position to do battle in the explosive war of ideologies which has been a feature of our own time.

Among the ideas which have been successfully propagated since the French revolution, and with the greatest intensity during the twentieth century, there are four beliefs which have, more than any others, undermined the medieval conception of learning and furnished axioms for the propagandists of " state-controlled comprehensive education ". They are : *Belief in the absolute importance of environment* as the determinant factor in human development ; *Belief in equality ; The Hegelian belief in the " state " as a superhuman entity ;* and the *Encyclopaedist belief in learning for its own sake.*

The educational effects of the doctrine of environment have already been noted.

* * *

In his book *The School and Society* John Dewey expresses the hope that " culture shall be the democratic password ". Against

this Werner Jaeger (Paideia, Vol. 1) writes :

> " It is a fundamental fact in the history of culture that all higher civilisation springs from the differentiation of social classes—a differentiation which is created by natural variations in physical and mental capacity between man and man . . . our earliest literary evidence shows us an aristocratic civilisation rising above the mass of the common people. . . . All later culture, however high an intellectual level it may reach, and however greatly its content may change, still bears the imprint of its aristocratic origin. Culture is simply the aristocratic ideal of the nation increasingly intellectualised."

At the present time it is the Dewey or egalitarian interpretation of " culture " which is preferred, though whether " culture " is the word. . . . In his suppressed work *Doom of Youth* Wyndham Lewis tells us that " Everyman's a genius . . . may be the outstanding achievement of the twentieth century . . . " We have seen the term " gentleman " extended to all men, and the word " char-lady " is a fitting monument to mass indiscriminate " levelling up ". As for those aristocratic tendencies on the part of Nature—they must be dealt with.

> " . . . and if mankind decided that *all* men should be gentlemen (as they did) nature puts her spoke in as usual, and remaking, or never endorsing, or deliberately withholding the requisite from all the billions of gentlemen that mankind has decreed should exist . . . Nature may put it into the head of some ' genius ' to invent a new political theory, or smite with sudden imbecility all the phalanxes of upstart talent or afflict with the plague of Black Boredom all those concerned."

However, the educationists have shown that they, more than all others, want equality, whatever the consequences in the sphere of real education. Their slogans are " Equality of Opportunity " and " Parity of Status ". Mr. Jacks in *Total Education* states that every school must be " co-ordinated " and that " co-ordination " is the opposite of

> " such a hierarchy of conditions as we see in the school world today . . . (it implies) . . . parity of conditions in all schools. This, though difficult to attain, is not beyond our power. By legislative enactment we can ensure equal conditions in premises and equipment, in service and pay, in staffing ratios and the qualifications of teachers "

The legislative enactments which Mr. Jacks has in mind could

not, however, have been possible without the powerful operation of the third idea-clot which I have mentioned—the belief in the state as a superhuman entity.

It is unfortunate that the " state " should be made to operate so extensively on the material level of " Public Utility " supplier at a time when the majority of men have become obsessed with the notion of the " state " as a superhuman being with an independent existence. They have been unable to consider the state, when acting in this capacity, merely as one form of human association which could often be advantageously replaced by another form of human association. The genesis of this form of " statism " is described by Wyndham Lewis in *Rude Assignment :*

> " For many eminent thinkers the State is of course everything—in Hegel's system it is a metaphysical absolute, conditioning the individual. Plato was by far the most illustrious exponent of this barbarous doctrine. Such a type of thinking is that of men in love with power—Hegel, the slave of the idea of the Prussian State, Plato an unusually embittered member of the Athenian aristocracy."

Two statements by educationists possessed of the belief that the " state " exists as a metaphysical absolute are illustrative. Mr. Meiklejohn (New York 1940) in *Education between two Worlds* writes that :

> " Education is the expression of the will of some social organism . . . with one life, moved by one mind . . . both teacher and pupil are agents of the state."

Albert P. Pinkevitch (translated Perlmutter) in *The New Education in The Soviet Union* :

> " Let us not lose sight of the fact that our Soviet organism still contains many foreign cells which form a neutral, passive or inert tissue ; also there are cells of injurious tissue which like cancer and sarcoma, must sometimes be combated by surgical means. Hence the great significance of the organisation of the Union of Communist Youth (Komsomol) and the closely associated Society of Pioneers."

Even if one considers that this form of " statism " is no more than over-indulgence in metaphor, the effects of such over-indulgence can be highly toxic. One does not have to look even as far as Mr. Pinkevitch's homeland.

Only during a war does the normal individual accept the national

state as something of overwhelming importance. Because then it is exercising one of its prime functions—protecting the rights and ensuring the survival of the people and institutions of which it is composed. This acceptance of the " super-state " during periods of war can be and has been exploited. Wars are used as occasions to introduce revolutionary civil legislation with a strong collectivist bias.

In *Total Education* Mr. Jacks quotes with approval Karl Mannheim's statement about the value of war for getting agreement about social reform—

> " Otherwise the only alternative is dictatorial planning. . . . In this context there is much truth in the statement of the psychologist William James that the problem of modern society is to find a moral substitute for war. That means to find a unifying purpose which acts as strongly as war in stimulating a spirit of altruism and self-sacrifice on a large scale, but without an actual enemy."

Self-sacrifice, unlimited taxation and government spending, out of which it is easy to buy up a monopolistic control of all educational establishments ; promises of wonderful new buildings, better pay for staff etc. ; the 1944 Education Act. For Mr. Jacks the battle has not yet been won and to fight

> " the social reform campaign to victory, total mobilization will be necessary and the integrating conditions of total war must be reproduced."

H. C. Barnard in his *History of British Education* notes that

> " It is not without significance that the Education Acts of 1870, 1902, 1918 and 1944 were passed in time of war . . . there are not wanting those who are interested in education primarily as a means of promoting military efficiency. . . . The noteworthy advance which Prussia, for example, had made since the beginning of the century, and her recent successes in war against France, were attributed as much to her educational system as to her military organisation."

* * *

The fourth idea-clot—learning for its own sake—is the alternative which the learned bodies of a materialist and egalitarian society hold out to the aim of " learning in order to please the Prince ". Far from being an inspiring and effective *idée opposée* to " statism " it can be used as a means of neutralising the potentially independent

intellect.

The German University system was the first to acquire a reputation for elevating knowledge (however unimportant) into a sacred end in itself. Many years ago Ezra Pound, writing in *The New Age*, denounced what he called the German-American conception of learning. He complained bitterly that American Universities had grown up on the German model :

> " Every man of intelligence had that intelligence nicely switched on to some particular problem, some minute particular problem unconnected with life, *unconnected with main principles. . . .* "

The system says in effect that

> " Metaphorically you are to build up a damned and useless pyramid that will be no use to you or anyone else, but will serve as a ' monument ' ; to this end you are to sacrifice your mind and vitality. . . . The student has become accustomed first to receiving his main idea without question ; then to being indifferent to them . . . in most cases his experiments have been blind experiments . . . in accord with a main idea dictated by somebody else . . . in this state he has accepted the idea that he is an ant, not a human being. He has become impotent and quite pliable . . . his mind is prepared for all sorts of acts to be undertaken for exterior reasons ' of state ' etc., without regard to their merit."

That this is not the " natural " occupation of men who are not hard pressed to earn a living is admitted by Veblen in his *Theory of the Leisure Class* :

> " Knowledge for its own sake, the exercise of the faculty of comprehension without ulterior purpose, should, it might be expected, be sought by men whom no urgent material interest diverts from the quest."

But, he states, the intellectual interests of the leisure class tend to seek expression

> " on the side of classical and formal erudition. . . . The most frequent excursion into other than classical fields of knowledge on the part of members of the leisure class are made into the discipline of law and the political, and more especially the administrative sciences."

The natural tendency of men released from immediate material preoccupations is to try and learn something of general principles

and see how they apply to their own surroundings.

Rémy de Gourmont should perhaps be permitted the last word on the doctrine of knowledge pursued for the sake of knowledge. In *Le Chemin de Velours* (1900) he wrote :

> " Education is a means, not an end . . . Considered as the precise instrument of future work, education may have a very great, even absolute importance. It may be the necessary condition of certain intellectual achievements. It will be the staff of the intelligence ; but offered to the second-rate brain, directed simply and solely to the enlargement of the memory, it has no power to regenerate sick cells. It will rather serve to crush them. It will make them dull. It will divert from the natural needs of life the activities merely meant for daily exercise . . . it has an influence only upon an intelligence in action or capable of action. It does not determine, it inclines. Above all, it does not create intelligence."

(*To be concluded*)

THE FRONTIERS OF LITERATURE AND ART

by ROY MACGREGOR-HASTIE

IT will not have escaped the notice of students of Internationalism that the commonsense argument that " We are all human beings and therefore have a great deal in common " has become of recent years the special property of the Communist Party ; whether those who owe allegiance to other creeds and policies have chosen to ignore the force of the argument, or whether, having seen the Kremlin's multifarious publications on this theme they have simply shrugged their shoulders and dubbed reality " red ", we shall never know. It is, however, heartening to be back in Europe and find there in existence organisations whose sole object is the emphasis of the essential similarity of outlook of the nations of Western Europe.

It has been obvious, too, of recent years, that the only organ of the United Nations (apart from the technological information exchange agencies) that has functioned at all satisfactorily is UNESCO ; it is not surprising therefore to find in a still divided Europe a body of men who are working together to establish patterns of human behaviour seen against the background of European Culture.

Established as a statutory body in Switzerland in December 1954, The European Cultural Unity Foundation is essentially a practical attempt at restoring the confidence of Europeans in the creativeness of their own culture and at reviving the idea of Europe as a single Cultural Community without which no true or lasting union can be achieved at the economic and political level ; the currency of this latter idea is given force and point by the inclusion among the Trustees of the Foundation of M. Robert Schumann. In one of the Foundations pamphlets, M. Schumann and the other Trustees—H.R.H. Prince Bernhardt, Lord Jowitt, M. Gamu and Dr. Alberto Pirelli—have listed the immediate and long term plans of the ECU now incorporated in its official programme : with an initial grant of 600.000 swiss francs placed at their disposal they propose to award exhibitions for historical, scientific and social studies in European Unity, finance conferences at which common experiences may be shared, and award scholarships and prizes to writers and artists so that they may pursue their own investigations in their own ways into the Europeanism that is regarded as being a condition precedent

to the creation of a World State.

The prestige of the European Literature Prize, so recently established, acquired largely through the Foundations discovery and rewarding of Werner Warsinski and Milosz, is a good omen for the eventual success in all its ventures of this youngest of the organisations with similar objects. The names of the associations set up by the European Cultural Centre at Geneva are in themselves evidence of the practical approach to the problems of Internationalism and Art, which is the most satisfying characteristic of ECU : the Association des Instituts d'Etudes Européenes, Communauté Européene des Guildes du Livre, Association Européene des Festivals de Musique, Bureau Européen de l'Education Populaire, Agence des Presses Européenes Associées, Association Européene du Disque, Liens avec l'Europe.

All of these Associations are functioning, if at times reluctantly, and playing an important part in the overcoming of the mistrust felt traditionally by the intellectuals of adjoining states for each other.

It is however the theories behind the practice which make the ECU not only an admirably efficient but also an academically and artistically important institution ; in a recent broadcast given for the Australian Broadcasting Commission, I tried to summarise the interim conclusions arrived at by those who are working toward a solution of the problems posed by the present language pattern, the principal barrier to any sort of literary unity in Europe. I pointed out that an artist has no longer any right to describe himself as being British, American, Australian, Italian, French or German, for if there is one thing which by its very nature is international it is Art as an entity ; it is obviously easy for those who rely on an international sound code convention, that of music, and for those who work in the plastic media of painting, sculpture and the like, to make their meaning clear. A man or woman of reasonable intelligence can listen to a symphony in Madrid, composed by a contemporary Russian composer, and appreciate not only the beauty of the composition but the didactic content of the work of the artist qua artist. The poet, however, is at a disadvantage from the start. Lulled into a sense of false security by the normality of the written and spoken word as a means of ideas, it is often not until he has mastered the techniques of intelligibility in Beauty and Truth that he realises that he has condemned himself to a limited audience through his neglect of the other languages, spoken in the countries with which his own has so much in common. If his ideas and conclusions are to have

any value at all they must be conveyed in the relevant form to all for whom they should be intended, i.e. all those whose intellectual and emotional climate has nourished them. Without going into unnecessary detail in condemning the translation way of exporting conclusions in verse and rhyme, it seems only reasonable to require those writers who would object to being charged with parochialism to master at least the languages of the European continent to which their work belongs.

The creation of a pool of " linguistically European " writers in prose and poetic forms is probably the most interesting and potentially the most valuable of the recent preoccupations " manifestoed " by members and associates of ECU. It is, I would suggest, mere commonsense, as anyone who has read Rilke, Kafka and Pavese in the original will agree.

The fact, however that it is " mere commonsense " does not make their self-imposed task any the easier, nor does it make their aim and object " acceptable " as being necessary. If I may give a personalised example of the doubts felt by some English academic and literary " authorities "—the Editor of the Institute of Linguists Journal this year described me as a " young poet with advanced ideas on the internationalisation of poetry " but could not resist the temptation to describe me in the same sentence as "Scottish"; to him and many others, the whole idea is just a dream, as it is to the hundreds of young male, female and indeterminate writers in London's imitation Italian coffee bars, who are more concerned with learning to play the Spanish guitar than with castellano as a literary language. The fact that the dream is fast becoming a reality only changes the " dream " into something resembling a nightmare ; when I asked the members of a " Brains Trust " at a meeting of South Kensington Labour Party how they would work for a closer integration of the lives of Europeans they rejected literary and political solutions and pinned their hopes on " more International Work Camps ! "

The specialist character of the vocabularies of the languages of the nations which make up our Europe, given that character by the quirks of fate which have from time to time caused their development to proceed along different lines, is something for which we should be grateful, not regretful. If we can learn to draw on them all, and haul down our flags we shall be making it plain that we realise that : " Europe, although geographically little more than a headland of Asia, has led the world for centuries . . . a fact due solely to the vigour and inventiveness of Europe as a cultural community ".

A DIARY

MORE than a month after the Queen's visit to Paris there were relics here and there, such as bookshops displaying old engravings of fireworks on the Seine to celebrate a royal marriage of two hundred years ago, or immensely long red and blue gloves in the window of a little boutique in a back street. Among the groups of people in fancy dress, or in uniform, on the various bridges and quays when the Queen boated along the river it appears there was a large crowd of chefs wearing their check trousers and tall white hats, and I was told that many of the English could with difficulty be prevented from rushing in among them and trying to kidnap one to carry back home.

The Queen, in the brilliantly lit barge, is said to have looked like an orchid in a cellophane box from the florist.

When the Greek King and Queen visited Paris last summer the *Figaro*, in the midst of its lyrical description of the festivities, announced: *Rarement trois Scandinaves s'étaient trouvés ainsi réunis, trois hommes de taille haute et puissante.* The three Scandinavians in question were the King of Greece, of Danish origin, the President of the Republic and the president of the Conseil Municipale, both Normans. This, however true, was an original observation on the part of the *Figaro*, since these days any mention of racial origins is more or less taboo.

★ ★ ★

Paris is growing bigger and bigger and sprawling in all directions almost as badly as London, except for the western side which is protected by the Bois de Boulogne, a hundred years old exactly, and

the Park of St. Cloud.

It is hard to imagine that only just over a century ago the boulevard du Montparnasse was unpaved, a deserted swamp in wet weather. When the hero of Balzac's *L'Initié* wanted to hire a quiet room in a house on the corner of the boulevard and the rue Notre Dame des Champs the lodging-house keeper told him he would find the district as deserted as the Pontine marshes. " Do you know the Pontine marshes ?" he asks the landlady. No, she replies, but she has heard an old gentleman, one of her lodgers, use the expression. (Not a very apt one, because, as its name implies, this street is a rather steep hill). Not only was the boulevard du Montparnasse, today so full of traffic and restaurants and thronged with people, as deserted as the Pontine marshes, but there was a plantation of mulberry trees on the plain of Montrouge. Their owner did not spin silk, he sold the silk-worms' eggs.

★ ★ ★

The inevitable new blocks of flats in districts a few miles outside Paris are being built among trees which are carefully preserved while the building is going on, and this makes them much less frightful. Dwellings there must be ; nuclear research stations like the strange assembly of buildings at Le Christ de Saclay may be thought necessary ; but what about the new monstrosity at the edge of the Bois de Meudon ? As you approach this lovely forest, leaving Villacoublay aerodrome on your left, on your right is the Ecole de Chasse where people can take shooting lessons, and just beyond an inn which I imagine may be the one in Maurice Sachs' *Abracadabra* where Grain de Sel played a terrible practical joke. Just here, on the field adjoining the wood, an acre or so is being laid out with coloured bricks and tiles in strange designs, in a series of horrid little hazards—is it to be a playground for what John Betjeman calls the kiddiz, or is it a miniature golf course ?—impossible to say ; but it is, in its small way, a notable contribution to the general uglification. A couple of miles along the road in either direction, it would not have mattered in the least.

★ ★ ★

The only non-communist European countries which have so far remained relatively unspoiled by progress are Spain and Greece (except for Athens, which is the victim of improvers). Mr. Gerald

Brennan's book *South from Granadu* about his seven years in a mountain village in Andalusia has been greatly praised by critics ; it is a delightful book in every way. The beauties of southern Spain, which include the landscape, the inhabitants, their dress, and the biblical agricultural implements they use, have remained almost unchanged since Mr. Brennan went to live there nearly 40 years ago —the fatal 40 years, elsewhere, of unprecedented " progress ". The improvements he mentions—better roads, heavier crops—seem to be desirable ones.

★ ★ ★

Three notable artists have died recently—Constantine Brancusi, Wyndham Lewis and Roy Campbell. Brancusi gave an impression of Olympian calm when he received visitors in his studio surrounded by the precious polished objects he had sculptured. The other two were storm centres who never ceased to be intransigently combative, and who never temporised with Anglo Saxon hypocrisy.

Roy Campbell was killed in a motor accident, a tragic death for he was only in his fifties. As a satirist he was all the more effective for not being bitter. He was a supporter of *The European*, and once wrote us a long and wonderfully funny letter, half of which had to be cut to fit in with the English law of libel.

Wyndham Lewis was blind for some years at the end of his life, which hardly bears thinking of. His blindness did not diminish the astonishing talent he had for vivid visual descriptions of places and people in his books, possibly a rather unusual gift for someone so interested in ideas. Never will those who read it forget the Canadian scene in *Self Condemned*—a novel which, together with Michel Mohrt's *Mon Royaume pour un Cheval* might, if hawked among the queues of people intending to emigrate to the great Dominion, make them melt away.

★ ★ ★

A very old and battered motor car painted all colours of the rainbow rushes round Paris filled with teddy boys. One of its slogans : *Ne riez pas Madame votre fille est peutêtre à l'intérieur.*

CINEMA

Yangtse Incident, High Tide at Noon, A Man is Ten Feet Tall, 12 Angry Men

by VINCENT MURRAY

FILM-DIRECTORS rarely find their way into the popular press. Some connection with a much-lauded star or spectacular production might bring it about, but as it's the stars who sell the films, why bother with the back-room boys ? Hence directors rise and fall without the general public being any the wiser. A typical case in point is Max Ophüls whose death in March went unheeded except by the more serious critics. He had been ill for some time, but that had not prevented him fighting hard against his producer's decision to re-edit completely his latest film, nor, when he had to give way, from refusing to allow the re-edited version to be shown to British critics. Whether this film will be a commercial success or not Ophüls' recent work in the commercial field should have put him in a position of trust with his various producers, for *La Ronde* and *Le Plasir* can hardly be counted as failures. They were probably his most popular films and their elegant opulence is certainly typical of his later style. His American films, too, *Caught* and *The Reckless Moment*, had a similar European grace in their settings and unhurried, flowing camerawork. Indeed the mobility of his camera became a passion with him as the years went by and often appeared overworked when the theme did not lend itself to such treatment. But how suited was his style to stories set in period, especially Austria at the turn of the century. Here, in *Liebelei* and *Letter From An Unknown Woman*, I feel he reached the height of his achievement, when style and content perfectly blended. His talent was minor, but refined and sophisticated, and within its limitations unsurpassed.

Back to the present. New British films now on release include a fiction-film from a semi-documentary director and a semi-documentary from a fiction-film director. The latter, **Yangtse Incident,** the less interesting of the two, describes the trials and tribulations of H.M.S. Amethyst, whose story is familiar, for memories have been carefully jogged of late by radio and T.V. publicity. Director Michael Anderson has come a long way since the days when he directed Robert Newton in *Waterfront*, but despite his excellent direction of *The Dam Busters*, which put new life into the semi-documentary and set off the recent Powell and Pressburger attempts in the genre, the stultifying tradition of British naval films has here proved too strong. Its dead hand reaches out to upper and lower decks, stifling all but the inevitable niceties of naval decorum.

The technique goes directly back to the war-time semi-documentaries, of incidents which did happen, or might have happened, played out by actors instead of the men who did the job in the first place. The result is a smoothly efficient, completely impersonal style of narration in which the characters, vague, idealised types of British manhood, are totally lacking in individuality. A (probably subconscious) realisation of this by the scriptwriter has led, as so often before, to the introduction of " comic " lower deck figures, stage-Welshmen, Cockneys or Scots, but you cannot infuse " humanity " into a work piecemeal like this. The whole conception is wrong, and if this remains nothing else will alter the character of the film.

High Tide At Noon contains some shrewd observation of character, which puts it one up on *Yangtse Incident* right away. The story, a not-so-quiet romance in Nova Scotia, is slight, a quality that often goes hand in hand with good film-making, and indeed the lyrical treatment it receives makes the film one of the most personal to come out of a British studio for some years. As in his early semi-documentary mining drama, *The Brave Don't Cry*, Philip Leacock makes a study of a small, isolated community with impressive skill. Much of his success is due to his choice of players, for it is no good using natural types for character-roles. Betta St. John makes a very good impression in her first part in a British film.

I have raised the question of character-portrayal in cinema more than once and will undoubtedly do so again, for it is a problem that must be solved if the film is to produce works of lasting value. Among recent films examples are hard to find, but Kazan's *Baby Doll* came near to a solution with its long, central duologue in which acting, script and direction achieved just the right balance. To a certain extent concentration on character is actually undergoing a minor vogue in commercial circles just now, for once *Marty* had been suitably Oscar'd the intimate television-type drama became touchable. The usual " cycle " began, and the latest to reach our shores are **A Man is Ten Feet Tall** and **12 Angry Men**, both of which, to their great advantage, dispense with spectacle and get down to character portrayal. The former is the more derivative with much dead-wood grafted on. It is set in the same area as Kazan's *On The Waterfront*, and, if it was not for the excellent acting of Sidney Poitier as the negro leader, the stock characters and conventional situations would seem dull indeed. 12 *Angry Men*, though, is a different matter. With action confined in one small room the editing principle comes into full play, and character becomes equally important as the jurors argue and rave about guilt and innocence at a murder trial. Henry Fonda plays magnificently (and how refreshing is his naturalistic style after the gibberings of the " Method " representative) as the one who is not convinced and sets himself against the others. More films of this quality would keep open more cinemas than any budget-relief.

NEW BOOKS

Dangerous Estate by Francis Williams (Longmans, 24s.).

MR. FRANCIS WILLIAMS, a former Editor of the *Daily Herald*, a frequent sound broadcaster and chairman of television press conferences, has given us a most readable history of newspapers, from the publication of the first issue of the *Daily Courant* on 11th March 1702 up to the modern day.

This historical side of the book makes fascinating reading, whether we turn back to the earlier pages to capture again the atmosphere of the coffee houses, when " Mr. Spectator " came up to town, or the exciting struggle for the right to publish parliamentary reports ; or watch once more the battle of the Press lords in the 'thirties, when newspaper canvassers offered fabulous bribes to win new readers and newspapers were bought and sold like pots and pans.

All this is factual, substantiated by an array of names, dates and figures ; it is the author's comments and opinions which provoke controversy. For example, he suggests that the *Daily Mail* became " progressively more reactionary " when its control passed to Lord Rothermere " until he was in some danger of finishing it off altogether when he turned it pro-fascist and anti-Jewish in the 1930s " — a controversial description of that newspaper's fleeting support for Sir Oswald Mosley. He is no kinder to Lord Beaverbrook, accusing him of smear campaigns " that trail their unpleasing way through the diary columns of his various newspapers." Mr. Williams is lavish with his abuse and generous with his praise when this is deserved, as in the case of the great C. P. Scott and the *Manchester Guardian.*

As this review was being written Fleet Street was buzzing with rumours of a merger between the *News Chronicle* and the *Daily Herald*, which has had an uneasy existence since the day Julius Salter Elias was introduced to Ernest Bevin, and the official organ of the Labour Party entered upon a marriage of convenience with the capitalist Odhams Press. Is one more newspaper to disappear from the stage, in this age when it is considered impossible to launch

a new one ? Is the strangle-hold of monopoly to be tightened, until the cycle is complete and the Press which struggled to free itself from government control is confined in the strait-jacket of financial control ?

G.V.

The Meaning of the Disaster by Constantine K. Zurayk.

The Moslem Brethren by Ishak Musa Husaini.

(Khayat, Beirut)

NEITHER of these books is new, though both now appear in English for the first time. Dr. Zurayk's analysis of the Arab defeat in Palestine and his long term proposals for the regeneration of the Arab people make particularly interesting reading now that eight years have passed and the " second round " of the Palestine War has arrived.

His proposals are resolved under five headings : a real understanding of the dangers of Zionism, total mobilisation of military resources, unification of the Arab States, activation of all classes of society throughout the nation, and a readiness to bargain and sacrifice minor interests to repel the greater danger.

In 1948, these aims seemed a windy impossibility. In 1957, awareness of the Zionist menace is no longer confined to the Levant but is co-extensive with membership in the Bandoeng Group, and even includes the Eisenhower administration. Total mobilisation of the Arab armies has admittedly been retarded by restrictions in the West on the sale of armaments and also by separative effects of the Baghdad Pact, but nonetheless Israel now has reason to be nervous of her frontiers ; while the military, political and economic unification of the Arab states has already begun with the semi-federation of Egypt, Jordan and Syria. Popular participation in the irredentist movement depends on what is permitted by individual governments. Some encourage and some repress it. In Egypt the populace itself defended Port Said ; in Iraq the students who volunteered for Egypt were shot down by the police.

But most important of all, in the forum of the world, the Arabs have learned to bargain with the Great Powers. The intransigent cry that the Jews must be driven into the sea is no longer raised by independent Arab rulers. Significantly, the last time that the cry was heard, it came from Britain's staunchest ally in the Middle East, Nuri Said of Iraq ; it was timed to coincide with the Anglo-French attack on Egypt, in an effort to discredit the Egyptian cause in the

eyes of neutral countries. From Egypt came no answering cry, and Dr. Fadhel Jamali, Iraq's ambassador to the United Nations was later obliged to repudiate it.

The methods advocated by Dr. Zurayk to effect this regeneration of the Arab world could scarcely be called reactionary or obscurantist : mastery of the machine, separation of mosque and state, training in the empirical sciences, acquisition of all that is *of value* in Western civilisation. The emergency did not permit the Arabs to wait for a gradual evolution—a plunge forward, a revolution was necessary. That this revolution is now taking place, politically, economically and culturally, throughout the Arab world cannot be doubted.

The Moslem Brethren by Dr. Ishak Husaini, another Palestinian scholar-nationalist, is a history of one particular instrument in this movement of revolution. The book is rather a collection of Brotherhood texts than an evaluation of Brotherhood achievements. Between the manifestos and the practical appliance remains a gap that still needs its historian. Nevertheless, these documents are instructive, and surprise by their moderation. Indeed, the social policies outlined are not so very different from those advocated by Dr. Zurayk, but as a specifically religious movement, comparable in many ways to the Society of Jesus in the first century after its foundation, the Brotherhood identified the Foreign Occupation with an Aggressive Christendom, thus raising the political struggle to the power of religion. History may later show that this was an error of judgment, just as the Brotherhood's demand for a theocracy in the twentieth century would seem an anachronism to thinkers like Dr. Zurayk and to the world at large.

Both books are recommended to the serious student of Middle Eastern affairs.

A. N.

Mosley: The Facts (Euphorion, 12s. 6d.)

"THIS extraordinary man", says the band around the dust-jacket. It is a quotation about Sir Oswald Mosley from D. C. Somervell's book *British Politics Since* 1900, and it will be re-echoed by many readers of this remarkable book.

This is neither biography nor autobiography, but an "anthology" (if that is the correct word) culled by a group of Mosley's friends from a wide variety of sources. Have they selected the most flattering references and omitted all those not so friendly in tone ? The former are certainly well represented — and what fascinating reading

they make. How interesting to read today the praises of Mosley sung by such a diverse chorus as Winston Churchill, Lloyd George, Bernard Shaw, Beverley Nichols and Lord Nuffield. The abuse is quoted, too, but the publishers invite us to examine the suggestion that praise changed to censure when Mosley ceased to be a supporter of the " Establishment " and became its most violent critic. Is this the whole explanation? The reader must judge for himself.

The book falls naturally into two parts, devoted to the pre-war and post-war Mosley, with his attitude towards the war forming a gulf between the two which many early admirers have been unable to cross. Why was this airman and soldier of the first world war subjected to imprisonment without trial for four years of the second conflict ? Was the government justified ? Or may there not have been at least an element of truth in Mosley's warning that the war would result in the loss of the British Empire and the rise of Russian communism ?

But why read a book about a discredited figure who seeks to revive the fascist creed against which we waged war for six years, his opponents will ask ? A post-war boycott by the national Press has removed Mosley from the public eye, or reduced him in some minds to a *passé* figure buried in the limbo of political obscurity. It will be a shock to such readers to discover that Mosley has advanced far beyond pre-war fascism to advocate the union of Europe, independent of both capitalist America and communist Russia, and that he has in recent months addressed on this theme large and enthusiastic meetings in London and the provinces — apparently without a ripple disturbing the placid waters of Fleet Street. At sixty, Mosley is a man with a past — but with an even more remarkable future.

Well indexed and illustrated with 40 photographs, the book is extraordinary value for such a modest price, fixed, no doubt, to capture the mass sales it deserves. There is no dedication, but it might well have carried that which John Strachey wrote on the frontispiece of his *Revolution by Reason* (published in 1926) : " To O.M., who may one day do the things of which we dream ".

G. V.

Emma in Blue by Gerald Hamilton and Desmond Stewart (Wingate, 16s.)

THE tableau of Nelson as godfearing patriot and Lady Hamilton " the woman who inspired him ", together rising heavenwards over the heads of Lady Nelson " the thin-lipped woman who would not set him free " and Sir William, the cuckold who did not care,

has long since been installed in the Temple of National Glory. *Emma in Blue*, a documented investigation into this curious *partie carrée*, knocks the gilt off the stucco.

Emma in her early days, according to her letters and other contemporary records, emerges as a very beautiful but true sister to a Graham Greene barmaid :

> " The only question she posed herself, when she had to decide what to do, was whether her action would be an occasion for the pleasure of others, or for herself. This philosophy in practice formulated itself on simple lines. To yield was to be good. To withhold was to be unkind and, therefore, bad. Throughout her life, this was to be the sum of her morality."

In her decline, her nightly swoons at the theatre during Graham's rendition of the Death of Nelson remind us of the posturing of that other great national exhibitionist who used, transparently disguised, to attend each of Lowell Thomas's lectures on Arabia.

Nelson's moving last hours aboard the *Victory* and his pretty legacy of Emma to the nation have almost obscured for us his essentially neurotic, bigotted and vindictive character. If Trafalgar was a stoic's end, the Bay of Naples in 1799 with its breach of faith, its mockery of justice, its denial of a confessor and summary execution of Admiral Prince Caracciolo, was not so honourable, even though rewarded with a dukedom in Sicily.

Emma in Blue will probably be attacked on emotional grounds ; in matters of scholarship it is unassailable. Nevertheless the exposition of the strange friendship between Emma and the Queen of Naples may offend, the candid analysis of Nelson as man may upset, devotees of the romantic brand of history.

The authors are too expert to underline the moral, but it is plain enough: that honest dealing, marriage vows, clemency and the rights of the condemned are obligations for English heroes as for foreign villains.

A. J. N.

PRISONER IN RUSSIA

by GEORGE A. FLORIS

"YOU must go right to the end of the road"—these words of his wife, killed in an aerial bombardment together with their child, gave Gyula Zathureczky, peace-time journalist and war-time first lieutenant, the title of his book.* His wife's words prevented him from firing his last bullet into his own skull when he knew that, wounded, he was to become the prisoner of the Soviet Army.

No adherent of Ferenc Szalasi's Arrow Cross Government—swept into office with the help of the Germans upon Regent Horthy's attempted armistice and enforced abdication—Zathureczky participated in the military operations around Budapest without enthusiasm, but with a calm determination. He was one of those Hungarian officers who, to the bewilderment of their German comrades, did not hesitate to hop home for a snack or for a nap between two military engagements. However, while the operations lasted, they were brave to the death. It was shortly before Christmas 1944 that Zathureczky was wounded and taken prisoner.

While the memory of his wife saved him from death by his own hand, his officer's rank saved him from death by the hand of his Russian captor. At first sight, the Russian soldier wanted to "finish him off" but, at second thoughts, he remembered that captured officers should be produced for interrogation.

Although at the interrogation by a high-ranking and—in spite of the red star on his cap—aristocratic-looking officer, First Lieutenant Zathureczky remained adamantly reticent, his life was spared. The Russians, though not strict adherents of the Geneva Convention, were anxious to keep up certain pretences—and they needed slave labourers for post-war reconstruction.

Suffering agonies of pain with his injured leg, Zathureczky was

**Az uton vegig kell menni*

dragged all over Hungary in various convoys of prisoners until his group arrived at a prisoner of war camp near Timisoara in Western Rumania, where they made a temporary halt. Just when life in the camp began to become tolerable, with medical treatment, delivery of food parcels and the holding of religious services, Zathureczky was branded a " war criminal " by the new " democratic " Hungarian government. Learning this, the Russian Camp Commander put him into solitary confinement up to the day the trek was to continue Eastward.

At another stop in Eastern Rumania, near to the dreaded Russian border, Zathureczky was visited by his valiant sister Anna, who had come all the way from Budapest, when she had learned of her brother's whereabouts. However, Anna's " act of Veronica " was not to end her brother's calvary. He had to go " right to the end of the road ", with waggonloads of humanity transported into Russia. After a long, exhausting journey and a brief glimpse at the grim suburbs of Moscow they landed in a large Distribution Camp in the North.

The comparatively well-equipped camp—complete with bath, library and " club " premises—was not to become a lasting home. The journey continued, often on foot. Zathureczky once had to march a long distance in the cold with his left foot bare, because *oedema*—a heart failing caused by the lack of vitamins—made his foot swell to such proportions that he could not put on his boot.

Their final destination was called—as if to give his late wife's words a prophetic warning—*Tupik*, the Russian for " the end ". There the prisoners were accommodated in miserable huts, and their work was to fell trees and collect peat standing with their feet deep in water. Just as before and after, the prisoners had to endure, at the end of their long and arduous working hours, the pep-talks by " activists ", fellow-prisoners willing to co-operate with the Russians in the ideological re-education of the others. These " discussions " cut painfully into their sleeping hours. The prisoners, whose food was short—particularly of those who, like Zathureczky, would not pander to the whims of the " activist " chief cook—could therefore not recuperate their strength from rest. In addition, the Commander of the Tupik Camp, a corrupt Russian sergeant major, was a lover of fine boots and, as a consequence, Zathureczky had soon to put up with miserable footwear in place of the strong pair of boots he had had before.

As a small consolation, the prisoners were once issued with

cards, enabling them to send a brief message home, a " sign of life " at least—even if their wretched existence could scarcely have been described as " life ".

However, Zathureczky was destined to go " right to the end of the road " and Tupik did not, after all, prove to be " the end " for him. After yet another long march, where he and his best friend were almost lost in the snowstorm, he arrived with his group back at the large Distribution Camp, for re-assignment. This time the destination was not another labour camp, but Kamiskovo, a camp for recuperating prisoners.

In Kamiskovo more generous portions of food and better conditions awaited them—although activists and MVD agents were still present. Zathureczky had not too bad a time there, at any rate compared with the toil and starvation in Tupik. After a while he was put in charge of the physical training class for the convalescent, a task which earned him extra rations of food. However, he had to go through the agony of being crossed off the list of a repatriation transport the night before departure, because of the intrigues by two junior officers among the prisoners, who had denounced him to the Russians as a " Fascist reactionary ". In those trying hours his new friend among the prisoners, a German referred to as " Dr. Peter ", was of great help with his kindness and wisdom.

Several months later, the time for Zathureczky's repatriation finally arrived. Even on his way to the reception centre for returning prisoners in Russia, Vladimir, he was trembling lest his destination should suddenly change into *Ljubjanka*, the dreaded MVD gaol in Moscow, transformed from a brothel to its present purpose. But he *did* arrive at Vladimir safely, whence he proceeded to Hungary at last.

At Debreczen, three young men searched for his name on a long list but, in the end, they waved him by. Apparently, the charges brought against him in the camp at Timisoara, before his departure to Russia, were not recorded and his name was missing from the list of wanted " war criminals " in Rakosi's Hungary. That was in July, 1947. When he saluted the People's Democratic officer in charge at the exit of the railway station, the other did not return the salute, remarking grimly : " You are soldier no longer ! "

In this account of his suffering during the thirty months he was in the hands of the Russians, Zathureczky remains admirably calm and balanced in his judgment. While he depicts Russian cruelty

as he experienced it, the excesses committed by soldiers and officers, he also gives credit where it is due. Thus he pays a generous tribute to the benevolent commander of the camp at Timisoara who, by putting him into confinement within the camp, saved him from a fate worse than death at the hands of the pro-communist Hungarian collaborators.

While he has an understandable contempt for the Hungarian " activists " in general, he presents their case fairly by quoting a conversation he conducted with one of them, a brother officer who sought to justify his co-operation with the Russians as the intention of serving the Magyar people in the new constellation.

Zathureczky registers the selfishness, greed, even hatred and theft among the prisoners themselves, but he does not omit to mention the comradeship in many instances, in spite of the strain. He particularly liked the soldiers of peasant origin whom he met in the camps and who had remained true to their healthy rural individualism and thus to eternal Hungary.

He is fair in his judgment of the problem of Hungarian Jews in Russian hands who—as the primary victims of Hitler—often enjoyed more favourable treatment by their communist captors. The Jewish storekeeper at Timisoara bought his gold ring for a pittance of food, but he introduces us also to the Jewish doctor in Russia who cured him with the last dose of the precious medicine which the doctor might have needed himself at any time.

The glimpses through the chinks of the prison walls on Russian life in general are fascinating. We see, in a nutshell, the reasons for the general deficiency of the communist economy. The impossible " norms " stipulated the Bolshevik planners compel the workers to cheat. Once people learn how to cheat at work, they will go on cheating, and thus producing even less than they would have produced without coercion. The trees felled by the prisoners were counted by the two Russian female technicians again and again. Railway lorries were deliberately derailed several times because, as the prisoners discovered, their replacement on the rails was considered a " specialist " job and rewarded by a high percentage on the " norm ".

In this way, the system that meant to fight poverty by terror produced more poverty which it tried, in turn, to fight with more terror. We also see in the book, how the communist leadership sought to benefit from the misery of the prisoners by seeking to bribe them into " activism ", and thus replenish from their ranks

the international Muscovite ruling class, so essential to uphold the system of terror all over Eurasia.

When during his imprisonment Gyula Zathureczky could no longer pursue his duty as a soldier, he took up his duty as a journalist by making interesting and valuable observations which he used in his book on his return to the free world. We must be grateful to him for having collected and recorded them, even if, owing to linguistic barriers, his book remains confined to a very limited readership—to the Hungarian refugees who escaped to the West from the red terror enveloping their country of origin.

★ ★ ★

MOSLEY: The Facts

* * *

A New Book About

"THIS EXTRAORDINARY MAN"
—as D. C. Somervell describes him in his book *British Politics*

". . . a dangerous book"
—*Coventry Standard*

". . . the book makes fascinating reading . . . he is a speaker of rare skill, able to attract a large audience and to arouse it to fervent enthusiasm"
—*Bradford Telegraph and Argus*

12s. 6d.

From all Booksellers or from:
UNION BOOKSHOP · 302 Vauxhall Bridge Road · S.W.1

Next month in

THE EUROPEAN

THE DEFENCE WHITE PAPER

by

MARTIN PRESTON

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

1 Year £1 10s. 6 months 15s. Single copies 2s. 9d.
(including post)

U.S.A.
1 Year $4.50 6 months $2.25

Cheques should be made payable to THE EUROPEAN and sent to THE EUROPEAN, 302 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, S.W.1.

Contributions, which must please be typed on thin paper, can be returned only if accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.