

Freedom

AN ANARCHIST FORTNIGHTLY

"Laws and class privileges are transmitted like an hereditary disease."

GOETHE.

T. U. C.

WEAPON OF THE CORPORATE STATE

THE Trade Union Congress at Bridlington produced little enough in the way of surprises. Indeed, these annual affairs have settled down in recent years into a more or less fixed pattern. The leaders issue appeals for a "responsible" attitude from the rank and file, urging that any kind of union militancy upsets the delicate course of the unions and the Labour Government, and may result in disaster for "the whole structure of Trade Unionism as we know it" or "everything for which organised labour has striven for many decades"—the phraseology has become monotonously familiar. The atmosphere is like that of wartime, everything must be subordinated to some over-riding consideration, and it is really best to leave things to the wise judgment of "the leaders of our movement".

It is, of course, just this blanketing atmosphere which has taken all life out of trade union activity, creating that apathy amongst rank-and-file workers which has seemed the characteristic aspect of organised working class activity during recent years.

NATIONALISATION

After all the trumpeting about the great advantage to the workers which nationalisation of an industry would bring, the realities are beginning to be seen in just the light in which anarchists (including this paper) described in advance. Thus Arthur Horner, the Communist secretary of the Mineworkers' Union, explained to the delegates that nationalisation does not alter the relationship between

employers and employed. "Management is still the buyer of labour, the trade unions are still the sellers of their labour." This was not the line of the Communist Party or the Labour Party when they were advocating nationalisation as a boon to workers, but the truth can no longer be hidden in the face of experience.

RATIONALISATION IN INDUSTRY

Much of the discussion was taken up with the part that organised labour has to play in the present world of dollar crises and imminent slump. The only way for "Britain" to maintain her position in the world

is for production costs to be cut so that British goods can compete favourably on the export market. This means that greater rationalisation must be introduced into industry, more labour-saving machinery, more elimination of waste. Workers are not unnaturally afraid that all this means unemployment, and they see only too clearly that unemployment can be used to lower wages and so add another factor favourable to the owners of industry in their struggle on the foreign markets. It falls to the Trade Union leaders to dissipate such fears, and they set to work with the usual vague appeals about helping our country to recover, about not pressing sectional interests against the needs of the workers as a whole, and so on. The Trade Unions see these matters solely through the framework of capitalist production, which they seem to regard as sacrosanct. Since their idea of socialism does not extend beyond the transfer of ownership—not to the workers but to the State—such as nationalisation brings, it is perhaps not surprising. But even if one did not have years of past experience to guide one, surely this vision of struggling to cut production costs to get markets, this whole business of workers looking at industry through the eyes of the owners is too completely dreary and deadening.

THE QUESTION OF DISMANTLING

Some light is shed on this question by the discussion on the dismantling of German factories. German Trade Union leaders had appealed to the T.U.C. on the matter of dismantling, claiming that many factories scheduled for dismantling were not engaged in war production at all. Walter Padley pointed out that such attempts to destroy German industry would result in lowered wages for Germans, and hence would permit a later revived German industry to compete favourably with Britain and so force down wages here. One is here very near to a most absurd paradox; "responsible" trade unionists will look with approval on wage levels abroad higher than here because such wages hamper competition with British goods, while at the same time a "realistic" tightening of the belt and abandoning of wage claims by British workers is extolled as needful for the sake of successful competition in the world markets! Such a position is not stated in so many terms, but it is the logical implication of much that was said at Bridlington.

An interesting comment on this

THE CRIME OF BEING COLOURED

DR. MALAN, Nationalist Premier of South Africa, announced on September 6th that to protect the European race everyone in the Union would have to carry an identity card classifying him as European, native coloured, or Indian.

He told the Transvaal congress of the Nationalist party that the Government was determined to enforce apartheid (racial segregation); and that in the next session of Parliament it planned at least to create machinery to make it possible to enforce apartheid.

Dr. Malan said that the Government was also determined to stop non-European students mixing with European students at Witwatersrand and Capetown Universities.

In "socialist" Australia a Bill was recently passed to close loopholes in the immigration laws which allowed Asiatics to remain in the country, and to enforce the "White Australia" policy.

A writ seeking an injunction to restrain the Immigration Minister, Mr. A. A. Caldwell, from exercising powers under the new legislation is to be filed on behalf of some of a number of Chinese arrested in Sydney and elsewhere for deportation.

The writ will seek a declaration that the Act is invalid.

A writ of habeas corpus will be sought for the release of the Chinese, who are being held in prison without bail.

Police are conducting further raids to pick up Chinese who have gone underground.

[See page 2 for a review of a new book on Negroes in the United States, and page 3 for further news of apartheid in South Africa.]

matter of competition from low wages abroad was provided by the discussion on the Polish coal mines. Large numbers of women are employed as surface workers in these mines while much of the underground labour is provided by German prisoners-of-war. It is interesting to know that this new socialist Poland employs such methods, and keeps German slave labour at work four and a half years after the end of the war. But the seceder of the resolution which brought forward these facts was no other than Abe Moffat, the Communist Scottish Miners' leader!

ROLE OF THE T.U.C.

Apart from all this, the Congress confirmed another trend which Freedom has frequently pointed out—that of the increasing incorporation of the Trade Unions as part of the State structure. Before the Congress, Ministers apparently conferred with T.U.C. leaders to brief them for putting over some of the less palatable of the government's pills. The Manchester Guardian remarks that, "The T.U.C. is apparently intended as a shock-absorber between the government and the impact of unpopular policies upon the people who will have to bear the brunt of them. The same political technique was followed over the decision to re-introduce direction of labour and over the attempt to enunciate a wages policy, when it was left to the T.U.C. to put its own interpretation on last year's White Paper."

This is another way of saying that the government increasingly regard the T.U.C. as the interpreters of its policies. But, as the Manchester Guardian goes on to say: "It is not a technique that has worked happily, because it has increased suspicions of national trade union leaders among the very people they are supposed to represent." The vilification campaigns in the press against unofficial strikers perhaps indicate the way in which a government might act in giving powers to trade union leaders which would make them independent of their rank and file. In several countries we have seen the trade unions degenerate into mere disciplining bodies for bringing the workers to heel. The attitude of T.U. leaders here makes such an outcome by no means impossible here.

British Association SCIENTISTS CURRENT PROBLEMS

IT is sometimes said that we live in a scientific age, that science has made great strides, that man is capable of mastering his environment. In fact, however, the advantages which science has made available remain potential advantages only—at least as far as the mass of people are concerned. And this is true not merely of the vast Asiatic populations but of the bulk of workers in the most advanced countries of the world. All this has not prevented the scientist from being regarded in such an awe-struck light that several thinkers—of whom Bakunin was one—have warned against enthroning scientists in the place of the priests.

Nevertheless, a rationally organised society would in fact turn to science for guidance in those matters requiring the organisation of fact and experience which is its proper province. Scientists, being human, already concern themselves with the practical problems which confront humanity, even though our type of society does not encourage the solution of practical problems in straightforward ways. The Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science recently held at Newcastle indicates how ready scientists are to play their parts in the improvement of human life. This enormous gathering at which many sections met to receive considerable numbers of papers, and which was attended by a record audience, testifies to the interest in contemporary problems and perhaps to a belief that they can be solved by the methods of science.

In particular, the meeting concerned itself with the problems of agriculture and world food supplies, and Lord Horder struck the right note when he stated that our approach to such problems must be global, regarding it from a world standpoint. The sections on agriculture, chemistry and economics all had contributions to make to this most pressing problem, approaching it both in the broadest lines and also in matters of considerable detail, so that it becomes apparent that scientists in many fields have concerned themselves to make a very practical approach to this question.

It is not possible to discuss here the papers read to the meeting but it will not be out of place to say something about the kind of way in which scientists tackle practical problems. In doing so we must bear in mind that it cannot be a matter of ignorance for scientific men that their abilities are not fully exploited by our society, and that the benefits that they and their forbears have been able to confer have not in fact filtered through to the great mass of people. One would therefore have expected that they would also have considered why this is so—why the structure of our society inhibits them from being the benefactors of humanity which they could be.

(Continued on page 4)

HONG-KONG

"Watching Britain's interests. Mounting guard over a vital bit of British territory far from home, you can't help feeling a tingling pride in what you stand for."

—Newspaper advertisement for the Army, August, 1949.

IF the United States is finding China an incandescent potato, says a *Worldover Press* despatch, so have the British a burning issue in Hong Kong. For 108 years they have had possession of this great trade outpost, which consists of 391 square miles of islands, rugged mainland, and water. Urged many times by liberal world opinion to give Hong Kong back to the Chinese, British governments, including the present Labour government, have turned deaf ears. With Communist forces likely to reach the border soon, voices have not been lacking, in the United Kingdom and even in Hong Kong itself, counselling a return of the territory if the Communist regime makes the expected request.

But there are many critical considerations which recommend a contrary decision. If Britain should accede to Chinese demands at such a juncture, it would perhaps cost highly in prestige, and stimulate new Communist uprisings in Burma, Malaya, and elsewhere. There are thousands of refugees who would be harshly treated by the Communists. Yet if Britain hung on in the face of a Chinese Communist *démarche*, this would add fresh fuel to the criticisms of white western imperialism. And if somehow a trade deal were made between Mao Tse-tung and the British, Britain would become the target of attacks by the western democracies opposed to any compromise with the Communist forces.

Confronted with this series of dilemmas, the British are saying little and making extensive military preparations. It is doubtful that they can muster more than 25,000 troops against a possible Chinese force of eight times that number, and they must rely primarily on air power. But even should a successful defence be put up in a showdown, again the effect on other sections of South-East Asia would be portentous. The advances of Chinese Communism have produced many embarrassing and ticklish problems,

but none is hotter than that of Hong Kong.

Meanwhile, the Hong Kong Attorney-General, J. B. Griffin has moved in the Legislative Council a bill for the expulsion of "undesirables".

Any person suspected of being likely to promote sedition or cause a disturbance of the peace is defined as "undesirable", as well as the diseased and unemployed. The bill will not apply to British subjects.

WHY?

The Hong Kong Government has issued a message of 4,000 words to British reinforcements arriving in the island to answer their question: "Why are we here?" One paragraph reads:

"There are two main reasons why you have been called upon to defend Hong Kong in the present disturbed times. The first is that we have obligations which cannot honourably be overlooked or renounced. The second, and this is perhaps of immediate concern to the people of Britain, is because it is very much to our economic interest to do so. . . . The change which is beginning now in Asia is so immense that it is difficult to appreciate what it will mean to us commercially."

On this the *Manchester Guardian* comments: "Soldiers do not respond to the kind of appeal in the second part of this 'message'. The soldier will ask himself why he should sweat for the taipan on the Peak."

We hope he does ask!

WHAT THE LABOUR PARTY MEANS BY WORKERS' CONTROL!

	1945	1949
Lord Citrine	Gen. Sec. T.U.C.	Chairman British Electricity Authority, £8,500.
Mr. Ebby Edwards	Gen. Sec. National Union of Mineworkers.	Labour Relations Officer, Coal Board, £5,000.
Mr. J. Benstead	Gen. Sec. National Union of Railwaymen.	Member of British Transport Commission, £5,000.
Mr. W. P. Allen	Gen. Sec. Amal. Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen.	Member of Railway Executive, £5,000.
Sir Joseph Hallsworth	Gen. Sec. National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers.	Chairman North-West Electricity Board, £4,000 (succeeded Mr. George Gibson).

FREEDOM FROM NATURE

ONE of the speakers at the recent anarchist Summer School pointed out that when talking about freedom it is much safer to ask "freedom from what?" rather than "freedom for what?" for the latter implies a doctrine. But later on in the discussion it was agreed that one cannot leave out either of the prepositions. For one wants freedom from restrictions in order to have freedom for carrying out one's desires.

There is no good definition of freedom—one could quote dozens, and for those who have time it would be extremely interesting to make a historical study of what this word "freedom" has meant during the centuries. For freedom is linked to time. It has no absolute value, no changeless meaning. Anarchists and others subscribing to this paper in another thousand years will interpret its title differently from their twentieth-century comrades. To the Greeks and Romans there were two kinds of humans—free men and slaves, and the slaves were scarcely men. Paul of Tarsus, much influenced by Greek thought, brought into Christian theology the idea of the willing slave, calling himself the bond slave of Christ, thus making it easier to link up with the concept of the Messiah as the suffering servant which had been foreshadowed by the Hebrew prophets.

Even when the idea of liberty came to be interpreted in economic and political terms—when the German Humboldt for instance concerned himself with "freedom of the individual from the infringement of the State", when English reformists

like Mary Wollstonecraft, Godwin, Mill, and Tom Paine tried to define the rights of man, the word freedom still eluded definition.

SUBSERVIENT

Is it sufficient to say that freedom is not only a function of Time, but also of the individual—that it varies from one man to another, and can best be represented as the removing of those restraints which the individual wants to be removed in order to carry out his desires? Would anarchists be satisfied with such an interpretation? I think if we interpret the history of our species honestly we are bound to admit that just as the aggressive and the co-operative urges exist side by side in all of us (in some, one set developing more strongly at the expense of the other), so the desire for freedom exists side by side with the desire for shelving responsibility, the desire to be obedient to a boss, whether it be a parent, husband or wife, teacher or Fuhrer.

One must also recognise that when individuals coalesce into a mass, sometimes the desire for freedom is uppermost, as at the beginning of revolutions, sometimes the desire for obedience, as in movements like Catholicism or Fascism. It is no use blaming popes, priests, police-

men and leaders—no use blaming anyone. There is innate in each human being the desire to be a bond slave—and the weaker the personality, the more a man wishes to be a "willing servant". Even the Leader himself talks about serving the State, or the people or God or posterity.

I think I have stated before in *Freedom* my disbelief in the slogan "Man is born free but is everywhere enslaved". At any rate it cannot be included in present-day interpretations of freedom. For just as we have to be concerned now with freeing ourselves from the cruder manifestations of our aggressive urges before we annihilate the entire planet, so we have to be concerned with freeing ourselves from the desire to obey.

OBEEDIENCE

The problem of freedom is immensely complicated—it is not merely a question of dealing with the environment but also with our own inherited tendencies. Much can be done, I believe, in the progressive schools to solve it, but I sometimes wonder if we realise what method we are using? We talk of self-realisation, fulfilment, of leaving the child alone to grow up naturally. But have we really thought what we mean by naturally? As grown-ups we deal with the aggressive urges by letting the children "play them out" amongst themselves. We, as teachers, provide no "food" for them—we do not organise cadet corps, corporal punishment and so forth. Similarly, we deal with the urge to be regimented, to obey a leader, by providing no food for it ourselves. We do not boss. Is the same

treatment always useful in both cases?

Personally, I feel that we have not yet discovered the best method of dealing with the natural docility of the human being—for the ordinary child is every bit as docile as he is aggressive. And to return to that favourite dictum "let the child develop naturally", are we not acting upon the assumption that something called "Nature" is right and good? Have we dispensed with a benevolent Deity only to substitute a benevolent Nature? We may also be assuming that the child born to-day is the same basically as the child of Neanderthal Man—forgetting the extreme capacity for variability which *homo sapiens* has to a degree unknown in other animal species.

ACCEPTANCE

Get back to Nature, live like a man in a primitive society, and you will be much freer. Will you? I do not accept the point of view that man in any form of primitive society was free, nor do I think it possible to obtain the maximum amount of freedom, i.e., freedom to fulfil all one's potentialities and to carry out one's desires except in a society which has made full use (instead of abuse, of course) of applied science. In other words, I believe that while revolutionary anarchists may knock down all the barriers (and a very necessary process this is), it is only by co-operating with the scientist that it will be possible to remould the world "nearer to the heart's desire". The lady who "accepted the Universe", and was told by Carlyle, "By God, Madam, you'd better!" died a long time ago, and I

cannot see that we need to be like her. Man, the only animal, so far, who can contemplate Nature at all, surely cannot accept it if he wishes to be free. To accept the "natural urges" *in toto*, because no other human being imposed them on one, is no different from accepting man-made laws—unless we believe that some mystical power called Nature, is wiser and greater than Man.

It isn't any longer safe to let Time and accidents alter our basic character as they altered the basic characters of animals in the past. We cannot get freedom unless we take on the responsibility of saving ourselves. As Alex Comfort pointed out in his recent broadcasts, no-one else will save us. Certainly not Nature. It was a novelist, Thomas Hardy, not a scientist, who said that Man's misery and his bondage comes from the fact that he has so many more potentialities than the limits of his environment will allow him to fulfil, and he desires to have even more.

Man wants a hell of a lot. He may start off thinking the simple life will satisfy him, but either he or his descendants will soon want to complicate it, and the thirst for knowledge is as acute as that for beer, and to frustrate it is as dangerous as any other sort of frustration. There is an obverse side to George Orwell's "1948". Instead of becoming one of the most dangerous tools of the State, science can be used by freedom-loving individuals to extend their freedom still further, so that finally man is released from slavery to the natural, as well as the man-made, law.

MARJORIE MITCHELL.

CHRISTIAN REBELS

THE CHRISTIAN ORIGINS OF SOCIAL REVOLT, by W. Dale Morris. Allen & Unwin. 12/6

TO those who have had any extensive contact with what passes for Christianity in the world to-day, the idea that it can ever have been connected with revolt seems at first sight plainly ridiculous. The organised religious bodies are, for the most part, enthusiastic supporters of reaction, and those individual Christians who stand outside the various churches usually find, or at least seek, some purely personal fulfilment which rarely brings them into the revolutionary or even the radical stream of activity.

But this was not always so, and, as Mr. Morris shows in his new book on *The Christian Origins of Social Revolt*, there was an intimate connection which lasted, in England at least, up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, between the more extreme of the heretical and dissenting sects of Christians and the movements of social unrest which were in progress at the time.

I do not think this need necessarily be taken to mean that there is any intrinsically revolutionary element in Christianity. The New Testament contains some phrases which can become highly explosive if they are used in the right way, but reactionaries can usually pull out a tag of the opposite kind to cap that used by the radicals, and the old contention that Christ was a revolutionary only holds water if his reputed sayings are read in a very special way.

The reason why the great movements of social revolt in the middle ages and the 17th century assumed a Christian symbolism is to be found, I think, merely in the fact that the thought of the age was still predominantly Christian and men thought in religious terms. The Bible remained the basic philosophical authority right down to the enlightenment for all except a tiny minority of intellectual sceptics, who were usually very discreet

about their doubts, and it was the natural place, for those who sought justification for their rebellion, to find intellectual support.

The result, as Mr. Morris shows, was a series of revolts, lasting over ten centuries, whose record cannot be read without admiration. The author takes us from the early heretics of the Middle Ages, the Albigensians, the Cathari, the Waldenses and their fellows, down to the last big fling of Christian radicalism in Western Europe, in the shape of the Christian Socialist movement, with its attempt to revive co-operative production on a wide scale in England. There are important chapters on the peasant revolts, the Hussites, the Anabaptists, the Levellers and the Diggers, and the information contained therein is of absorbing interest. Particularly so is the extent to which the author shows that almost all the heretical movements of the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century had left-wings who advocated communism and social equality, and some of the fulminations of the early religious agitators have a strongly libertarian ring in their denunciation of rulers and their practices. John Ball, the itinerant preacher who seems to have been the chief theoretician of the fourteenth century peasant revolts, declared: "Things cannot go well in England, nor ever will, until all goods are held in common, and until there will be neither serfs nor gentlemen, and we shall all be equal." The Taborites, the extreme wing of the Bohemian Hussites, also preached communism of goods, declared the possession of property a sin, and said that "there should be no kings, no masters, no subjects on earth."

Mr. Morris's book suffers from the fact that the information he gives is ill-digested, the author being content to make long quotations from other authorities instead of using his own powers of description and analysis, and there are some important omissions. For instance, he pays no attention at all to the widespread dissenting movement in Russia, where, before the rise of the revolutionary movement in the mid-nineteenth century,



the heretical sects led peasant resistance to the Tsar. The Doukhobors, in particular, carried on a fine anti-militarist struggle, while their free communist practices aroused the admiration of Tolstoy and also helped to make Kropotkin an anarchist communist, as he tells us in his *Memoirs*. There is also no reference to a number of Christian rebels in our own time, such as Gill and Schweitzer, whose contribution to rebellious thought cannot be ignored.

These criticisms should not, however, be taken as intended to minimise the interest or value of this book to all who are concerned with the history of social revolt.

GEORGE WOODCOCK.



PRIVATE ANGELO. Director: Peter Ustinov. General release.

THIS is a very funny British film made in Italy, with Peter Ustinov as an Italian who is allergic to fighting, and Godfrey Tearle as the Count Piccolgrande who begins the film as a cavalry general and ends as a salesman of American sewing machines. The Italian, the German, the American and the British army "types" are mildly guyed, and the dialogue of Angelo and the Count is full of a quite unequivocal anti-militarism, but Angelo, of course, has to end as an unexpected hero to satisfy the conventions of the cinema. The dedication to all conscripts at the beginning should not be missed, while future Schweiks* should pick up a few hints and tips.

W.

THE FOUNTAINHEAD. Director: King Vidor. Now showing in London.

IN connection with the discussion of Communist and individualist anarchism in *Freedom* (23/7/49), a recent American film, "The Fountainhead", has a very special bearing on the concept of the latter type of anarchism that "a man has the sole and exclusive right to the product of his own labour". In addition to its melodramatics, the film proposes the interesting and provocative question: Does a radical architect who agrees to supply a design for a slum-clearance project on functional principles on the strict understanding that if accepted it must not be altered in any way in construction have the right to destroy the nearly completed project because the conditions are not fulfilled? In his court defence the architect has some interesting things to say about the broader relation of individualism of progress and reaction. The story is based on the life and ideas of Frank Lloyd Wright.

JACK DIETHER.

* See *The Good Soldier Schweik*, by Jaroslav Hasek.

BLACK MAN'S BURDEN

BLACK ODYSSEY by Roi Otley John Murray, London. 18/-

BEFORE I opened *Black Odyssey*, I thought that it was going to be one of those autobiographical books by coloured people which are of great value to those of us who happen to have been born with white skins because they make us understand more clearly the special disadvantages of having been born with a dark one. *Black Odyssey*, however, is not the story of an individual, but of a race, the story of the Negro in America; and it is such a tragic and terrible story that it is remarkable how dispassionately it is written. Roi Otley says in his introduction that his book is not so much history as reporting, and I think that this is a just, though modest, estimate of it. It is a collection of revealing facts and stories, rather than a considered historical work, but within its limits it is extremely informing.

I found the account of the Negroes in Colonial America particularly interesting. Those were the days when you could find in a newspaper an advertisement offering for sale:

"Englishmen, Cheshire cheese, Negro men, a Negro girl and a few Welshmen."

They were in fact the days of the indentured servant and the bond slave, and the Negro was only one among many unfortunates in the new worlds. But in the future pattern of Negro slavery soon emerged. And with it appeared that strange duality of American thoughts that has puzzled so many foreigners; a duality that is present even in some of the best Americans. Patrick Henry who cried: "Give me Liberty or give me death!" also said when apologising for the anomaly of his being a slave owner: "I am drawn along by the general inconvenience of living without them; I will not, I cannot justify it." Jefferson is the most extreme and tragic case of this duality; as someone has said: "He dreamed of Liberty in the arms of a slave."

It seems clear that there was comparatively little 'colour feeling', as we know it now, in Colonial America. Marriages between white and coloured people were quite common and many white women married or lived with Negro men, without rousing any opposition. Negroes fought in the American Revolution and a feeling of hope ran through the Negro community. They thought that the declaration of freedom and equality of all men really meant what its words implied. It was Mark Twain who wrote, after he had seen some American State-House or Court-House, with the words "All Men are created free and equal" inscribed on it in large letters that they should write underneath that inscription in very small lettering "Except the Negro race."

Little good came to the Negroes out of the American Revolution, except the passage of a bill forbidding the bringing of more slaves into America under heavy penalties. This was a measure that the American Colonists had tried in vain to secure; too many Englishmen were financially interested in the continuance of the slave trade. The prosperity of Bristol and Liverpool—the great slave trading centres, was largely based upon it. This is an aspect of slavery which English people generally manage to forget.

Mr. Otley is extremely good on the period of the Abolitionists, and also on the Underground Railroad, the secret organisation which assisted slaves to escape to the North, passing them on from one sympathiser to another. Some of the workers in this dangerous task were themselves escaped slaves who took the desperate risk of going back to help others.

It is interesting to know that the early Abolitionists were denounced as Anarchists because they followed their great leader, William Lloyd Garrison, in adopting the 'non-voting principle'. And it is a pity that we are not told more about their views. This period did not last long, however. Frederick Douglass, the remarkable Negro Abolitionist, was a disciple of Garrison's and was against using the ballot as a weapon. But Negroes alarmed by the activity of the pro-slavery politicians in the North, opposed him. Douglass finally united the dissident Negro groups by breaking with Garrison on this point; and in the end the Negro became affiliated to the Republican Party.

The Civil War and Emancipation aroused even more ardent feelings of hope and expectation than the Revolution had done. But though freedom secured the Negroes against the horrors of slavery, the early promise was not maintained. Gradually the coloured people were disenfranchised again, Jim Crow laws were passed, lynchings grew common. The turn of the century, however, marked a definite turn for the better in the course of Negro affairs. There had been a great migration of coloured people to the North and they had had more opportunities there. The result was the emergence of a great many extremely talented Negroes in the fields of sport, music, the theatre, and finally literature and science. And the appearance of these gifted people had a real effect on the attitude of white people towards the whole race.

To-day, difficult as the position of the Negro still is in America, it has certainly improved. In the North, Negroes are employed in innumerable trades and professions where they were practically outlawed a few years ago. Again, there is hope in the air. Negro leaders are relying principally, however, on the pressure of public opinion outside the United States to improve things within. For even Imperialist nations are affected by the ill-treatment of Negroes in the South since it offends all races of a darker colour than those which have been ironically called "the yellowish-pinkish races". As Mr. Otley says, it seems apparent to the Negro that "the United States must attempt to square its high-minded slogans of Democracy with the fact of the Negro citizen's position in America"—or give up any pretence of moral leadership of the world.

Can such a tragic story have a happy ending? That remains to be seen. Recently, when two Negroes were excluded from a public golf course at Martha's Vineyard in Massachusetts, the editor of the small country newspaper published there wrote an editorial denouncing racial discrimination which has been widely quoted in papers all over the United States. It ended: "The real test to-day is the ability and desire of all of us to meet Americans as Americans and men as men."

GAMEL WOOLSEY.

... from our stock ...

CHRISTIAN ORIGINS OF SOCIAL REVOLT. W. D. Morris 12/6
BLACK ODYSSEY. Roi Otley 15/-
DOWN AND OUT IN PARIS AND LONDON. George Orwell 8/6

Penguin Island Anatole France 2/6
The Cage Billany & Dowrie 9/6
Colossus of Maroussi Henry Miller 8/6
William Cobbett W. B. Pemberton 1/6
Story of San Michele Axel Munthe 9/6
Promise and Fulfilment (Palestine 1917-1949) Arthur Koestler 12/6

The World's Masters (New Series) Ingres, Hogarth, William Blake Vermeer, Holbein, and Botticelli each 3/-
Ready September 23rd: The Meaning of Art (Penguin) Herbert Read 2/6

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP

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

