

The Political Conference Season Opens

THREE PARTIES IN SEARCH OF VOTES

THE "silly season", as Fleet Street of "brains trust standing on the Conservatives' ineffectualness in over: the new political "term" has and Socialists alike". Mr. Grimond Mr. Grimond plumped for a bit of started with three Party conferences in quick succession. As we write, the Labour Party at Brighton is "lashing out" (according to the Evening Standard) against the Government and the Prime Minister (who has been described by Mr. Harold Wilson as "a great bookmaker turned pawnbroker"), just as the Conservatives will, a week or two later at their conference, praise the Premier and "lash out" at the dangers of Labour in office. Preceding the conferences of the Big Two, was the desperate voice of Liberalism from the beaches of Southport attacking both Tory and Labour and proclaiming the need to "split the vote if this means you will unite the country". Obviously only liberalism can unite the country!

was, in fact, not prepared to lead a "party of eunuchs or a party which had foresworn direct political action". And his final peroration was directed to those people "who wanted to keep their hands clean of politics", from angry young men and women, up to the professional classes and business management.

calls the holiday months, is side-lines shouting advice to Tories keeping in check the cost of living; Socialist controls and bit of Conservative free-for-all (and the devil . . . ?) as the Liberal approach.

the Governments since the war added up to a policy.

"the temper of a Government" he means the determination with which it governs. Not less government for the bogus heirs of radicalism; but more government; not spasmodic intervention but presumably a firm hand; a laissez faire economy with workers and bosses happy partners, but firm political control. We can sympathise with the Labour party man who cannot make sense out of this approach, but then neither do we believe that an electioneering speech ever makes much sense when transferred to the cold columns of print. In the atmosphere of the Conference Hall, aided by loudspeakers and delegates yearning for a cocktail of hope and inspiration, Mr. Grimond's criticisms of the Big Two were substitutes for a policy,

and his quips the (amplified) roar of defiance by the "people" against If we understand him aright by "the arrogance of the two major parties". How heartening that "The vote belongs to the people not to any political party" must have sounded in that little world of liberals!

While warning his audience of the dangers of electioneering

The two major parties would get more and more absorbed with their chance of office, and pay less and less attention to the country's problems.

the Leader of the Liberals, Mr. Grimond, got so carried away that he was quite unaware of the fact that his own speech was no more than a forceful piece of party peptalk, unequalled even by Mr. Harold Wilson on the opening day of the Labour Party conference. But it is not surprising. The Liberals under Mr. Grimond are desperate men and women.

Too many of them, he said, were simply the Pontius Pilates of modern life, quite ready to criticise but not willing to take the ugly decisions and take the blame for them. But the situation was too serious for anyone to stand on the sidelines. He believed that if political confidence could be restored for the future, there was nothing which could not be cured in the country's economy.

×

WHAT, we wonder, are the "ugly decisions" Mr. Grimond and his angry young men would have to take if in office? Opposing "socialist solutions"-it was "partnership the workers required in industry, not nationalisation"-as well as the

If the situation got desperate controls might be unavoidable for a very short while, but Liberals would oppose their reimposition except in the direst need, because production would be retarded and inflation not cured but merely turned into new channels.

Clearly this is not a policy but political tactics, of the way the Liberals would muddle through. (After all, the Tories do not believe in controls until the situation created by the financiers forced them to curb their activities "for a very short while"!) If anything Mr. Grimond said in his speech is significant it was surely the following:

the temper of a Government was even more important than its practical proposals, and it was this which had been lacking over the last six years. Only those who thought the random strokes of a chimpanzee created great art could possibly believe the spasmodic interventions of

Catching Them Early

According to the following news item from the Manchester Guardian the Liberals of Derby have stolen a march on the Catholic Church which believes in getting its flock when they are young and tender:

The claim that he is the youngest

What have the Liberals got that the other two between them haven't? What have they to offer the people that the others haven't already tried out? Even Mr. Grimond doesn't really know why the Liberals should be preferred to the other two parties. At least it is what this extract from he report of his speech sounds like to us:

The Liberal party could not carry the day but it was a nucleus. It policies might require to be further developed but that would come very rapidly if it could reach the position of being the alternative. He was not interested in how many seats they were going to fight -they had 150 candidates at the moment -but they would fight as many as the country demanded.

Isn't Mr. Grimond putting the cart before the horse; of wanting to be the "alternative" first and then developing the policies after? Or is it not a confirmation of the validity of the questions we have just asked, and that the Liberals are banking on being returned to power

"We have passed the point of no return. The old lifebuoys which have kept this party afloat so long are dropping astern, and in the next 10 years it is a question of 'Get on or get out,' and let us make it 'get on'."

It was no use for Liberals to try to liberalise the Conservatives or denationalise the Labourites; a kind

WORLD POPULATION GROWTH

Scientists of differing schools of thought vary considerably in their prophesies regarding the effects of the present rapid increase in world population. Will demand for food exceed the possible supply? Is widespread use of birth control becoming a necessity? Or

WORLD population is now multiplying so fast that at the present rate, it is bound eventually to outgrow its food supply, however much that can be increased, and then famine and disease will intervene to prevent further popula-

*

will other factors provide a (more or less) natural balance?

We publish below points raised by Dr. C. B. Goodhart at a British Association meeting and printed in "The Advancement of Science", March, 1957.

tion growth . . . The only solution seems to be the immediate and universal application of a policy of deliberate family limitation, and few are so optimistic as to believe that this is either practicable or likely to be effective in time to save us from the crash.

It is important to remember, however, that population increase is primarily a biological phenomenon, and that the arguments of Malthus, though mathematically sound, are based upon the assumption that Man has some specific and constant rate of reproduction. . . .

The selective advantages of fecundity are obvious and they are particularly strong in dense populations living under unhygienic conditions and subject to acute epidemic disease and a high rate of infant mortality. Cholera and plague strike indiscriminately at rich and poor, strong and weak, alike, and where only a fraction of the children born can hope to live to rear families of their own, only the larger families will be represented in the next generation, irrespective of the quality of the individuals concerned, for small families are liable to be wiped out completely. In primitive races of pastoral nomads or hunters, however, who live widely separated under hygienic conditions, disease may be less important and the principal limiting factors will be periodical shortages of food. Here fecundity loses much of its selective advantage, compared with such other qualities as strength and intelligence, and may even become a liability (e.g. Eskimoes). . . . in many of the most advanced nations and classes . . . declining numbers certainly cannot be attributed to genetical selection by famine . . . and we must not overlook the possibility that those qualities leading to success in Man may have become genetically correlated wih relatively low fecundity . . . an exceptionally good-looking and intelligent young woman has little difficulty in finding a husband . . . Attractive girls will usually marry and the fecund will have large families while the less fecund Continued on p. 4

paid-up member of the Liberal party in England has been advanced for five-week-old Tom Wigley, whose mother, Mrs. Cynthia Wigley, of Hope Street, Derby, has just paid his subscriptions to the Derby Liberal party.

Continued on p. 3

Where is Vladimir Dudintsev?

AFTER Stalin's baneful influence supposedly began to wane in Russia and the more liberal atmosphere supposedly preferred by Khrushchev began to appear, Russian writers began to sip the heady wine of self-expression rather than the stale beer of social-realism-inthe-service-of-the-Party.

To tell them semi-officially that things were now different, Ilya Ehrenburg wrote a book called "The Thaw"-explaining the passing of the long frozen Winter of Stalinism and the coming of the Spring of 'liberalisation'. This was all right because it was Ehrenburg doing the explaining, and in the whole of the Soviet Union there is no cleverer explainer than Comrade Ilya, who in his day has explained the need for peace and for war, for tyranny and for the relaxing of tyranny. But other writers were not content to leave the field to Ehrenburg alone, with his semi-official explaining. They began to explore the possibilities of greater freedom as writers, in literature, not as Soviet citizens in the service of the State. Out of the intellectual turmoil that arose began to emerge new attitudes on the part of the writers, who dared to express criticism of the Soviet's action in Hungary, for example, and who then began to be told not to go too far. But one writer managed to get a book published which took the whole country by storm. Vladimir Dudintsev's Not By Bread Alone (which will undoubtedly be reviewed in FREEDOM before long) is a simple story of a young inventor struggling against bureaucracy, and whereas at first it was tolerated by the bureaucrats, it had such a wide success, aroused so much interest

and got people talking so openly about bureaucracy that they quickly changed their minds.

They quickly changed their minds about liberalisation altogether when the lid blew off in Hungary, when Poland stirred, when Soviet writers began exercising their new-found freedom instead of just thanking the Party for it.

With the result that Dudintsev has disappeared. In all the Party papers, articles began to appear attacking authors, musicians, poets, historians who forgot that their first duty was to the Party, not to their art. The State, terrified at what can happen if a little freedom is allowed, is now clamping down the lid again on all free expression.

If Nuclear War Comes Learning What to do in Easy Stages

The Government is planning, should another war break out, to evacuate 40 to 45 per cent. of the population of the highly industrialised areas, leaving only the able-bodied men and childless women.

to issue the handbook yet, but to have it ready in draft form so that it could be produced in millions directly international relations became strained and war seemed closer.

Major-General G. P. D. Blacker, Chief of Staff of the Commander-in-Chief of the United Kingdom Land Forces, said the army would co-operate with the civil authorities in the event of nuclear attack. This afternoon a large scale civil defence exercise is to be staged at the Swynnerton factory.

Air Marshal Sir Lawrence Pendred, Midland Regional Director of Civil Defence, disclosed this to a conference of industrial civil defence officers of England, Scotland, and Wales, at Swynerton royal ordnance factory, near Stoke on Trent, yesterday. He said that, in the event of an atomic attack the Government's official view was that we should get five minutes' warning.

Sir Lawrence said that with regard to shelters, the Government would, when it considered the time proper, tell the public what it could do for itself. He claimed that a slit trench would be a secure shelter from blast and heat, even at so close a distance as three miles from a 10-megaton hydrogen bomb. This, he said, was one of the lessons learned from tests.

Sooner or later, the public would be taught about the hazard of fall-out. A popular edition of a book entitled "Nuclear Weapons", was to be published next month and would be on sale at bookstalls. Other facts would be given to the public in a householders' handbook when the Government thought the time was ripe.

The Government's intention was not

(Manchester Guardian).

This report sounds as if it must be an official hand-out. It is good to know that when the government "considered the time proper" it would tell us what we could do for ourselves apart from being roasted in a slit trench; and again that "sooner or later" we should be "taught about the hazard of fall-out" and that "other facts" would be given to the public "when the government thought the time was ripe" by means of a "householders' handbook". It sounds as exciting as a book of exotic recipes, or a "What Every Young Woman should know about Sex" type of manual.

But how thoughtful of the government to spare us the details until it is absolutely necessary. We hope the instructions as to what to do are short and easily understood. After all we shall only have five minutes warning!

But, as Frank Barber writes in the News Chronicle:

. . . the really astonishing fact brought to light by Dudintsev's book is that three decades of purges and political terrorism have failed to destroy the idea of freedom and the sense of justice in the Russian people.

'For three dark decades the lid was kept screwed down, but when it was lifted for a few short months. there you saw a bubbling ferment of ideas and hopes and confusions and contradictions as encouraging as anywhere in the free world."

Perhaps the intellectuals of the 'free world' will now show their concern for their fellows in the Soviet Union-now that we can clearly see that Soviet writers are not all Party liners by conviction but by constriction.

Where are the writers of the 'free world' who will lead a free-worldwide cry of Where is Vladimir Dudintsev?'

AUTHORITY AND SOVEREIGNTY

SOVEREIGNTY: An Inquiry into the Political Good by Bertrand de Jouvenel, Cambridge University Press, 1957. 27/6d.

2

IT is a commonplace lament, made frequently in recent years, that the subject of political theory is in a parlous state. The great tradition in political thought, stemming from Plato and Aristotle and embracing such diverse figures as Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and Mill, seems to be exhausted. The academic practitioners of the subject have either become political prophets and pamphleteers, like the late Harold Laski, or confine themselves to the wearisome business of expounding and commenting on "the great books". Political science, the analysis and description of political institutions and systems, flourishes but political theory, which should be the heart of the study of politics, languishes. For this situation, two general factors may be held responsible. The first is the increasingly widespread acceptance of the notion not confined to Marxists, that political ideas are mere ideology. Ideas, as such, have no independent status but are to be treated and explained as a function of the social groups which espouse them. One no longer asks whether they are true but whose interests they serve. Political theories, on this view, are in the nature of social rationalizations, not scientific statements. Or, as Burnham puts it, "An ideology is not a scientific theory . . . It is the expression of hopes, wishes, fears, ideals, not a hypothesis about events . . . Legitimate theory is to be found not in the speculative works of the great thinkers (except incidentally) but in the construction of testable hypotheses-empirical theory-about political data.

for example, "Why should men obey the State?"-not this or that particular State but any State at any time. They wanted to establish, or in the case of the anarchists to demolish, the general grounds of political obligation. But no criteria applicable to all circumstances can be found or, if one insists on them, they turn out to be so general as to be completely vacuous. The real task of the political theorist, so it is argued, is more mundane: to analyse the usages of political language. He is not to ask: "What is Liberty or Justice?", as though liberty and justice were substances each with a peculiar essence which the right-minded could decry. Instead, he is to ask: "What are the usages of 'liberty' and 'justice' (the words)?" He will then discover that the problems and the para-

its overthrow by a superior power. It follows, also, as de Jouvenel points out, that what we loosely call 'authoritarian régimes' are generally régimes which lack authority but which make up for this deficiency by the frequent use of threat of physical power in the form of coercion. The Kadar régime at the outset was based almost wholly on power-the power of the Russian troops-but is now gradually acquiring authority as it is becoming accepted for one reason or another by both its subjects and other governments. The situation in Hungary and other 'police states' remains, however, essentially unstable in so far as apathy rather than positive consent is the basis of their authority. In the modern world in which the doctrine of popular sovereignty is the only widely acceptable myth, the most stable régimes are those democracies which provide some genuine means for eliciting the positive consent of the masses. It is these régimes which are least susceptible to revolutionary overthrow.

purpose. It is this model which underlies the social contract theory of the state so popular in the 17th and 18th centuries, and the 'associationist' theory of the state held by contemporary liberal theorists, such as Sir Ernest Barker. On these theories the State is an association distinguished from other associations in that the associates cannot retract their original wish to join together. In that respect it is not voluntary but it nevertheless remains an association in that it has a common purpose which is, so to speak, the cement which binds the members together. (The model is analytical not historical: the important point is the postulated existence of a common purpose). The other model is that of a human aggregation formed by domination from without. One group imposes its will by superior force on other men who then become subject to its authority. This, in essentials, is the model underlying 'force' theories of the State, such as the Marxist. De Jouvenel rejects both models as inadequate. The second because it ignores the element of consent that exists in all authority and fails to explain how the conquering group was originally formed; the first-the model of the voluntary association-because there is no such thing as a spontaneous convergence of wills arising simultaneously in the breasts of all would-be associates.

FREEDOM

project, sets out to rally the support of others. The essence of politics, therefore, is the activity which builds, consolidates and keeps in being aggregates of men. Attention is thereby focused on the capacity to form aggregates and the conditions making for their stability. States are only one type of aggregate and because of their complexity not easily comprehended. The student of politics, therefore, could profitably begin in studying more simple aggregates, such as trade unions and clubs: all exhibit the elements of political activity.

The Role of Leadership

It is clear perhaps, even from this crude summary, that de Jouvenel's theory which emphasises the crucial role of the 'natural' leader, is antipathetic towards anarchist thought. It warrants consideration, however, from all those anarchists who feel the necessity to examine their own presuppositions. Much of anarchist writing about existing states, for example, suggests that we have at the back of our minds what de Jouvenel calls the model of domination from without. Similarly, much of anarchist speculation about the future society presupposes the model of voluntary association. If, as de Jouvenel suggests, these models are weak, then it is possible that some of our conclusions are vitiated. I am not suggesting that de Jouvenel's own model is correct. It is suggestive and quite clearly applicable to the formation of some human groups. But, like other speculative thinkers, he is too concerned to establish his own concepts in the place of others. What his argument suggests is not the need for the adoption of his model but the need for a typology of associations in which his model would appear as one type along with other models, including the two he rejects which, equally clearly to my mind, are appropriate in some instances. Such a typology, however, could be arrived at only by a systematic study of associations, using the inductive not speculative method.

The second and complementary factor is the 20th century revolution in philosophy associated with the logical positivists and their successors, the linguistic analysts. The effect of linguistic analysis, judging by Weldon's Vocabulary of Politics, is to debunk the classical political theorists in much the same way as the metaphysicians were debunked earlier. Traditional political theory is a big mistake, rooted in a misconception of the nature of language. The classical writers asked silly questions and naturally produced only silly answers. They asked, doxes that beset the classical writers resolve themselves.

De Jouvenel's thinking has been uninfluenced by either the linguistic analysts or the school which equates political theory. In this respect the publishers are correct in claiming that it is "an event" in modern political writing. Whether, however, it will succeed in re-establishing orthodox political theory is another matter.

If the People are Sovereign . . .

The book, a sequel to the author's Power, represents an attempt to supply a moral and philosophical basis for the 'liberal' institutions of the West. Its main focus, however, is not on the muchdebated question of the origin of legitimate power in society but on the question of the legitimate use of power. With the acceptance of the democratic myth of popular sovereignty, this latter question has been regarded as otiose. If the people themselves are sovereign, it becomes unnecessary to prescribe how the sovereign should act: there is, in theory, no division of interests between sovereign and subjects and the people will act in their own interests. De Jouvenel, joining other 'liberal' writers of to-day, rejects this view and, drawing on the medieval tradition, reasserts the moral limitations on the sovereign, whether popular or otherwise. His 'liberal' standpoint also manifests itself in his conclusion that the essential function of the sovereign is to ensure social stability in the face of change and not, as the socialists would have it, to undertake all social initiatives as a prelude to the establishment of a just society. De Jouvenel argues that a just social order is impossible. Justice, in his view, is a quality, not of social arrangements, but of the human will. Since social change is inevitable, to dream of the establishment and preservation of a perfect social order is to invite the reign of tyranny ("there is tyranny in the womb of every Utopia"): the most that can be hoped for is that the ceaseless process of change shall be permeated by the quality of justice in individual wills. As may be judged, this is a book for the specialist and for the reader who is prepared for the hard task of reflecting on his own concepts of justice, liberty and the like. Of more general interest perhaps to the anarchist reader is de Jouvenel's conception of what politics is about. Traditionally, politics has been thought of as concerned exclusively with the public authorities-the State. As deniers of the legitimacy of the State, anarchists have consequently often considered themselves, and been thought of by others, as anti- or non-political. De Jouvenel, rightly to my mind, rejects this conception of politics as too narrow. Activity which can correctly be labelled 'political' occurs in many situations which have nothing to do with the State and manifests itself among anarchists as well as among other groups! De Jouvenel's own view is that politics, properly conceived, is concerned with a more fundamental phenomenon than the Statethe phenomenon of authority. Anarchists (and others) frequently use the terms 'power' and 'authority' as synonymous but this usage masks an important distinction. Among political scientists, 'power' is generally used to signify the capacity to influence the decisions of others in certain ways. Power may be based on physical force-the most obvious case-but it may also rest on morality, religion, habit and apathy. 'Authority', on the other hand, is a narrower concept signifying power that is accepted, respected, recognised as legitimate. Thus, an armed gangster or a rebel army wields power but not authority, while most governments exercise authority over their subjects. The importance of the distinction lies in the well-supported generalisation that power is only stable when it is transformed into authority. Power per se always invites

'A Natural Ascendancy'?

De Jouvenel departs somewhat from orthodox usage by defining 'authority' as the ability of a man to get his proposals accepted. From him the auctor is "the man whose advice is followed, to whom the actions of others must in reality be traced back". By persuading others to follow or to co-operate with him, he also acts as the guarantor of the action undertaken. Using this concept, de Jouvenel analyses how groups or 'aggregations' are formed in society. Two models, he argues, have hitherto been employed. The most widely accepted is that of the voluntary association. According to this model men come together under the pressure of a purpose which each has in common with the others. The purpose takes concrete form and is crystallised in a binding pact. The associates jointly vest authority in a number of representatives or agents who are authorised to implement the common

In their place, de Jouvenel puts forward the model of the human aggregation brought about by the summons of a man-the auctor who can win assent to his proposals. All that is necessary to explain the formation of associations, he argues, is that one man should feel within him "a natural ascendency" and then inspire others with trust in himself. Society, as he sees it, consists of a complex of human aggregations, rising and falling, and each inspired originally by a single promoter, with 'authority' as the sources of all initiatives and change. Political activity begins at the point at which an auctor, having conceived a

In any such study anarchist associations would clearly deserve close attention in view of their doctrinal rejection of authority. Much too little is known about the practice, as distinct from the theory, of anarchist organisations. What

Continued on p. 3

FREEDOM BOOKSHOP OPEN DAILY (Open 10 a.m.-6.30 p.m., 5 p.m. Sats:) New Books . . .

The Five Gifts: the Biography of

Vinoba Bhave R. P. Masani 15/-A New Birth of Freedom? K. Zilliacus 21/-The Man Beneath Len Doherty 10/6 Propaganda Lindley Fraser 7/6 Anthology of Chartist Literature Y. V. Kovalev 10/6 The Entertainer John Osborne 10/6 A Fretful Midge Terence de Vere White 18/-The Montesi Scandal Wayland Young 18/-Reprints (Penguins) . . . If It Die André Gide 3/6 The Castle Franz Kafka 3/6 The Pattern of English G. H. Vallins 3/6 Against the Law Peter Wildeblood 2/6 Second-Hand . . . Lectures & Essays R. G. Ingersoll 6/6

The Anarchist King

Film Review -

A FTER the press showing of Chaplin's

new film, The Observer sent a reporter to Switzerland to discuss it with Chaplin himself. She wrote of his wild excitement, has own satisfaction with his work ("the best film I ever made"), his eagerness to hear what the critics thought of this bit, or whether they liked that bit. And she reported also a statement by Chaplin about the purpose behind A King in New York, the impact he intended it to have, the message he hoped it would convey.

All the professional critics seem to have ignored this statement (I suppose most of them had written their pieces before it was published), and none of them seem to have worked out the purpose behind the film from the film itself. They thought it was propaganda of sorts, but they missed the message more or less completely. One of them decided it was "a rather strident criticism of every aspect of American life that comes within camera range," another that it was "a pointless attack on a phenomenon (Mc-Carthyism) which has already been dead two years," another that it was to make it "quite clear that Chaplin is no supporter of world Communism," and still another that it was a "very commonplace point, which has often been better put by others." Now the comrade with whom I saw the film and I, had read Chaplin's statement and knew what message to expect; but I think it would have been perfectly clear to us anyhow. The confusion of the critics was due to the fact that, not being readers of FREEDOM or any publication like it, they had not come across the message before. A similar confusion may often be observed in those good people who argue with anarchist speakers in Hyde Park. What Chaplin actually said to The Observer was: "As for politics I am an anarchist. I think there should be no government of any kind." But he went on to say that the film was not political but satirical, and that a comedian's job is to satirize. The film is a vehicle for anarchist propaganda, but only in the way that City Lights and Modern Times are vehicles for Chaplin's opinions. His intention is to entertain rather than to make propaganda; he would like his audiences to be amused and take in a serious point at the same time, but if

they cannot he would sooner have them mistaken than bored.

The plot of A King in New York, like all Chaplin's plots, is simple and obvious, not so much a drama as a means of connecting a number of comic and tragic episodes. King Shadov, a deposed monarch, flees to New York; his Prime Minister decamps with the funds, so he goes into commercial television; his friendship for the ten-year-old son of ex-Communists, who are on trial for refusing to give names to the Committee on Un-American Activities, results in his being called before the Committee himself; finally, when he has cleared himself and is about to leave for Europe, he learns that the child has "co-operated", and saved his parents by betraying his and their ideals.

Various people said of Monsieur Verdoux that he was "not the old Charlie", meaning that he was not a tramp with baggy trousers and a bowler; but Verdoux was an individualist with society against him and so was the decrepit Calvero of Limelight. King Shadov is not the old Charlie even in that sense. On the contrary he is always successful, the constant idol of the public, liked by everyone he meets, a "little fellow" only in physical height; and he never loses his imperious dignity, even when he is rushing up the steps of some public building with his finger struck in the nozzle of a fire hose, forty feet of hosepipe trailing behind him, and a fat man tied to the other end. The Chaplin theme of society against the individual is still there, but it centres on another character, the child Rupert Maccabee (played by Chaplin's son Michael). It is Rupert, too, who speaks the serious "message" of the film. Shadov meets him when he is inspecting a progressive school. "What are you reading?" he asks.

And Rupert makes a long speech about political "leadership", the invason of privacy, passports, restrictions on speech and various other frequent topics of FREEDOM, all of which are treated in a strictly anarchist way.

But the comedy is not suspended, as it is in for instance *The Great Dictator*, to give the speech a chance. Rupert, genius though he may be, is an offensive little pest who delivers his speech at the top of his voice six inches from His Majesty's ear, shouting down or ignoring all attempts at argument.

"Is there freedom of speech in this country?" he shouts at one point, "No!"

"No," says the king, "you've got it all!" (I had wondered, hearing the familiar arguments, whether Chaplin read FREEDOM; now I wondered whether he listened to Bonar Thompson).

The interview ends with Shadov sitting on his hat, which some other horrid brat has filled with paste . . . But I am emphasising the speech out of all proportion to its place in the film. A King in New York is not a speech with comic relief like Limelight, or even a comedy with speeches like Monsieur Verdoux. It makes its points by means of its comedy, and makes a joke of its points; Shadov is not the old Charlie but this is the old Chaplin. Indeed, the Chaplin personality comes over much more strongly in the details of the film than in the character he plays. Were it not for the titles and the inclusion of Sidney James in the cast, one would never suspect the film was made in England. Every comic detail, from the windscreen wiper on the television set in his hotel bathroom, to the way he turns his back on a whitewash act because his plastic surgeon has told him not to laugh, is presented with the side-splitting finesse that Chaplin uses so well.

The Irish and Catholic Power Paul Blanshard 6/-Case Studies in National E. A. Gutkind 6/-Planning R. M. Fox 5/-Smoky Crusade Focus Two Orwell, Woodcock, etc. 3/6 Goodbye to All That Robert Graves 4/-Hanged and Innocent? Silverman, Paget & Hollis 3/6 Golden Ages of History Joseph McCabe 5/-Birth Control Methods Norman Haire 5/-

Healing of Nations

Degeneration

Eaward Carpenter 3/-

Max Nordau 7/-

No Directions James Hanley 2/6 Race and Racism Ruth Benedict 3/-The Fraud of Feminism

E. Belfort Bax 3/6

We can supply ANY book required, including text-books. Please supply publisher's name if possible, but if not, we can find it. Scarce and out-of-print books searched for — and frequently found!

Postage free on all items

27, RED LION STREET, LONDON, W.C.I "Karl Marx, Das Kapital."

"You're not a Communist, I hope?" "Do I have to be a Communist," snaps the child "to read Karl Marx?"

"A valid answer. Well, what are your politics?"

"I'm against politics. I don't like any kind of government."

"But somebody's got to rule . . . " "And I hate the word 'rule'."

"Well," says the king, "If you won't have the word 'rule', what about 'leadership'?" And he is still young enough to experiment brilliantly with technique. In the last scene of the film, where he is comforting a heartbroken Rupert weeping for the loss of his self respect, Shadov settles himself for his own speech, a long, quiet message of hope for the future.

"This won't go on," he begins, and suddenly the film ends. D.R. Vol. 18, No. 40. October 5, 1957

Freedom

Three Parties in Search of Votes

Continued from p. 1

on a wave of public disgust for the other two political parties?

*

NO political party or organisation however left-of-centre it may be can present itself to the public with a "policy" which clearly differentiates it from that of any other party or organisation, so long as it proposes to implement its policies through the existing State and governmental machinery. Truer still, we believe, is this assertion when the existing economic and financial set-up is the basis of these policies! In such circumstances policies may perhaps differ in details which the party propagandists magnify into "an issue" at election time, but viewed objectively these differences only serve to underline the common ground which makes the change of government a no more serious interruption in the daily life of a country than the death of a king or president. In saying this we do not underestimate the influence such "details" in policy have on the elector when it comes to voting. This does not disprove our argument, it only strengthens it! For, it means that a swing in the votes is brought about by details and not on basic differences between the parties.

THE SECOND OF THIS YEAR'S ANARCHIST SUMMER SCHOOL LECTURES HEALTH IN A SANE SOCIETY

(Continued from previous issue) THE relationship between poverty and ill-health may appear obvious to most of us, as it did to the early Socialists, but this depended on crude observation and was not so easily proved. It was argued by those that would not see that heredity and good breeding accounted for the difference between the physical standards of the poor and the nobility. The high death rates of the former were explained away by 'natural selection'. Poor living conditions and disease were said to be the results of ignorance stupidity and low morals. It was only between the wars that the first really indisputable statistical evidence was produced and John Hewetson has summarised much of it in this booklet "Ill-health, Poverty and the State". Ironically and significantly the true prevalence of ill-health was first dramatically revealed by examination of recruits for the army. In 1918, a survey of over 2 million examinations revealed that of every nine men of military age in Britain, presumably the healthiest section of the community "only three were fit and healthy, two were on an infirm plane of health and strength, three were incapable of undergoing more than a very moderate degree of exertion and the remaining one was a chronic invalid". School surveys also revealed a sad state of affairs. In 1927, 87% of children in a large survey showed some sign of rickets, 83% showed abnormalities of the ears, nose and throat, 94% had decayed teeth, and so on. At the Peckham Health Centre, of 1,530 men, women and children of a relatively well-off group only 9% were normal. Of the remainder 83% had something wrong but were doing nothing about it, since they were actually unaware that they were less than perfectly healthy. This indicates the low standard which most people accepted in matters of health. We have got so used to seeing ill-health around us that we no longer recognise it. In the poorer districts, however, it is obvious that people are pale, weak, tired and spiritless. Cosmetics hide many sins of society.

by the Registrar-General into five economic groups-Professionals, Clerks and Shopkeepers, Skilled Manual Workers, and Unskilled Workers-showed that the mortality was 23% higher in the unskilled workers than in the professional classes. But for children the differences were fantastic. In 1930 to 1932 the infant mortality of the lowest group was five times that of the well-to-do. This figure is really grotesque. Richard Titmuss calculated that "54,000 deaths would not have occurred in the single year 1936 if the standard of health reached by the Home Counties applied to all England and Wales". And the Home Counties standard of health was very far short of our Utopian concept. Poverty must have been responsible for many hundreds of thousands of deaths per annum in this country alone. And when one includes other poorer countries in the Far East and Africa, this crime against humanity is incredible. And these are death figures which give us no indication of the immense misery, pain and suffering endured by surviving men, women and children living in conditions of poverty. How does poverty produce ill-healh? There are many factors in poverty which have been blamed, e.g. over-crowding, overwork, lack of exercise, excessive worry, ignorance and poor diet. They probably all play some part but poor nutrition has been shown to dwarf all the others in importance. Obviously tuberculosis will spread more easily if a number of people occupy the same bed, but the poverty which reduces a family to living in one room invariably also reduces it to a state of malnutrition.

families to obtain a physiologically adequate diet even if the most economical foods were bought and most efficiently prepared by a dietician, which is seldom the case. Sir John Boyd Orr. whose figures were accepted somewhat reluctantly by the Ministry of Health in 1936, showed that a diet completely adequate for health was reached at an income level about that of 50% of the population. Thus more than 50% of the population were undernourished. The most unfortunate aspect was that the families who were worst off were those with children. Now Sir John Boyd Orr was rightly concerned with the diet necessary for full and vigorous health, that is, a minimum diet for maximum health. This is much higher than the level of diet necessary simply to keep people alive and sufficient to prevent gross disease, which was the previous standard, that is, a maximum diet for minimal health. The majority of people probably exist somewhere in between, in a state of subnutrition though not actually ill. Many do not recognise this state of subnutrition rather than malnutrition but the proof of the pudding has literally lain in the eating. Controlled feeding experiments have proved the existence of this state of subnutrition in people whose diets have long been regarded as ample. Dr. Corry Mann demonstrated that the addition of a pint of milk per day for a year to the diet of a group of schoolboys increased the average height by one inch, the weight by over three pounds, improved mental and physical performances, and reduced the incidence of illnesses such as colds, coughs and chilblains. More dramatic were the results of giving food supplements to expectant mothers in South Wales, after improved obstetric services and educational propaganda had had almost no effect. The maternal death rate was cut to one quarter and the infant mortality to one half of what it was in the group that was not supplemented. When the experiment was concluded the feeding scheme was discontinued! In another experiment the

army proved that in three months 24 out of 33 recruits who had been rejected as unfit for service could be accepted, after being exposed to good food, rest, fresh air and exercise. The cost of the extra food was 7/6 per head per week. A small sum to pay for health, yet just beyond the reach of so many.

3

Thus, by a blunderbuss technique of biological deprivation, mainly nutritional, capitalist societies have, in the past, maintained large, dependent, apathetic working populations. But the method is obviously rather slap-happy. The balance is rather precarious so that periods of relative plenty alternate with periods of depression, extensive unemployment and extreme poverty. Wars take their natural place in this economic chaos and cause further devastation, accentuating poverty and malnutrition.

It is widely conceded that if there were a general election to-morrow Labour would win. This foregone conclusion is based (apart from the general assumption that a change of government might be for the good -though objectively there is no reason why it should not be for the worse!) on the Rent Bill introduced by the present government which hits more people than it favours among those who voted Conservative, and which the Labour Party proposes to amend if it is returned at the next Elections. Important as this issue is in the day to day problems of our lives it is surely a proof of the superficiality of the public's approach to life itself and to the individual's understanding of self-interest when an election can be decided over an issue such as the Rent Bill.

In fact when poverty descends, food is usually the first to suffer since rent, taxes and insurances must be paid by law, and fuel, light and clothing make obvious and immediate demands on the budget. It is only when these items have been disposed of that the residue of the budget can be used for food, the most important single need of man. This residue may often be too small for many

THE correspondence between Philip

the recent bus trike seems to hinge on

the alleged excesses committed by irres-

ponsible striking workmen. Like Philip

Sansom, G.G. and N.H., I also accepted

the stories printed in the national news-

papers as containing a modicum of truth

and in numerous discussions attempted

to justify the action of the men on strike

by the usual analogy of men in war

fighting not only a common enemy but

also traitors within their own ranks. As

for the reported cases of violence . . .

I said that they were unavoidable but

in all probability exaggerated by a biased

press. My hearers usually replied that

they were sympathetic to the men on

strike but the attack on children, etc.,

etc., etc. filled them with horror. This

week I received a copy of the official

journal of the Transport & General

Workers' Union, Vol. XXXVIII and an

article on page 7 makes salutary read-

ing for all of us who smugly imagine

Sansom, G.G. and N.H. concerning

Even when the general dampening effect appeared to be operating satisfactorily, there were for too many individual variations. The results lacked scientific uniformity. For a variety of reasons individuals persisted in dropping below the level of subnutrition into a state of real malnutrition which crippled their activity and usefulness. Many fell prey to severe physical diseases, ranging from the true deficiency states such as rickets and pellagra to bacterial infections such as tuberculosis, rheumatic fever, pneumonia and gastro-enteritis. Chronic bronchitis and early degenerative diseases took their toll. Even cancer had a higher incidence amongst the poor. Occupational hazards, particularly exposure to silica dust, and industrial accidents were another great source of ill-health, much of it preventable, but disregarded because of the obsession to keep production costs down.

H. M. Vernon has calculated that the contributions of heredity, occupation and social environment to physical ill-health were 10%, 25% and 65% respectively. In a same society we could thus aim to eliminate 90% of organic disease.

(To be continued)

To Labour's vote-catching Ace, Lord Hailsham could well reply for the Tories with the Joker of Taxfree overtime and sixpence off the price of cigarettes, and thereby create a real dilemma for millions of electors which could only be resolved by calculations to determine which Party best represented the "people's interests". And on this basis the public preference for one party might be decided by a saving of a few shillings per family per annum! Once interest was aroused by the poor quality cannon-fodder the relationship between poverty and ill-health was quickly established. Statistical breakdown of the mortality rates published

Authority and Sovereignty

Continued from p. 2 precisely, are the conditions which allow the combination of co-operative activity and individual sovereignty? How far is it true that the formation of anarchist groups depends upon the activity of a single person, however 'unauthoritarian' in the popular sense? Opposition to the principle of leadership does not mean that anarchist movements lack leaders in the sense of persons who are recognised by other anarchists as playing a special role: we know, for example, who to turn to for a more or less 'authoritative' exposition of anarchist theory. How do such leaders interpret their role? And what effect do they have on the stability of the group? In many associations the stability of the group over a period of more than one generation is achieved by the institutionalisation of power. The personal power of the mortal leader and initiator of the group is replaced by the vesting of authority not in a person but in a role which certain individuals are designated to perform. The leader is then obeyed not because of his personal power or ability (which may be negligible) but because of the authority the group has vested in his role. The general impression that an outsider has of anarchist groups is one in which there exist leaders exercising personal influence. How do these groups survive the death or withdrawal of such leaders? In other associations the period during which personal power is transformed into the authority of officeholders is frequently marked by crises. Are similar crises met with in anarchist groups and is the instability of some of these groups due to the refusal of their members to institutionalise power when the 'natural' leaders have left?

THE BUSMENS' HOOLIGANISM How Bad Was It?

cles through the strike. In regions Nos. 2-and 3-that is that great tract of territory that stretches from West Surrey to Land's End-there were no incidents at all; the conduct of the strikers was quiet and orderly. The local press and police commented favourably on the orderly conduct of the strikers; so they did in the Derby district, and in Region No. 10 (from the Wash to the Humber). And here is what happened in some of the places where incidents did occur. In North Wales (Region No. 13) a lorry was carrying children to school: it was stopped by a striker. However the nearest pickets were seven miles away and the striker, who stopped the lorry, merely wanted to warn the driver that the lorry was carrying too many children for safety. The local Press who first reported this as an act of aggression later gave the right angle to the story. In Liverpool, a passenger coach was waiting outside Lime Street Station and when the driver was asked for his clearance pass he struck one of the two men comprising the picket. The other man went to the assistance of his mate and soon afterwards the picket left the scene. The local Press reported 'Liverpool Coach Driver Kicked'. Pickets stopped a bus carrying hospital workers and it was reported locally that a crowbar was used as a weapon. Inquiries revealed that the bus was certainly stopped but allowed to pass when it was established that only hospital workers were being carried. One of our members was carrying a bicycle pump after using it on his bicycle-no crowbar was present. In Edinburgh a number of our members, acting as pickets, went to interrogate the driver of a coach. The driver of the coach drove into them, all jumped clear except one, who held onto the radiator and was carried a mile. Again, in Edinburgh, pickets approached a driver of a bus; the police arrived and one of them boarded the bus. The pickets started to walk away and as they did so the driver ran into them; one man was slightly injured. In Edinburgh also, pickets deflated tyres of two buses which were conveying workers to a factory in Bathgate. The driver of another bus failed to stop when approached by a picket, and ran into two men and a girl who was injured.

"Alloa-a group of strikers approached a garage in Clackmannan as extra runs had been made by several of the buses being operated from there. The owner and several others armed themselves with pitch-forks and other weapons, and then threatened the strikers, police arrived and everyone dispersed. On one occasion a brick was thrown through the window of our Liverpool office. That was certainly not done by strikers. There were altogether about 30 instances in which strikers actually took aggressive action. In about eight of these a brick, or stone, was thrown. In each instance it was a single act, nothing like a volley was heard of during the strike; in the remainder of the instances, tyres were deflated or petrol tanks interfered with. There were no instances more serious than this."

A purist might ask, how do I know that these versions are correct, and I could only answer that I do not know.

But this I do know, and that is that

We are not trying to be facetious though we admit to not being able to take these Party conferences seriously. They remind us of the market place in which three eloquent salesmen are trying to talk us into believing that the very ordinary tin of baked beans each is offering is really the most exquisite Haricots blancs a la Maitre-d'Hotel, Cassoulet de Toulouse and Haricots rouges a l'Etuvée respectively.

We might be forgiven for being seduced by the salesman's eloquence and the colourful labels, into sampling not one but all three tins. But to go on conference after conference, election after election trying their tins and expecting them to contain anything but baked beans (red, white, or green) does not invite forgiveness but makes the testing of one's brains imperative!

These are some of the questions which suggest themselves to someone who is prepared to accept a broader definition of politics than the traditional one. If a serious attempt were made to answer them, I should be surprised if anarchists in the process did not discover facts which both illuminate and perhaps also modify their own theories. – G.O. that we are imune from the wiles of the propagandist. I can do no better than to quote chunks of this article by Frank Coyle.

"Our investigation was thorough, and our facts were obtained from—among others—the police, employers and those who drove and operated passenger vehi-

PROGRESS OF A DEFICIT!Deficit on Freedom\$780Contributions received\$534DEFICIT\$246

September 20 to September 26

London: Various Anon. 2/3, Capetown: M.L. £1; Hitchin: H.E.H. 5/-: Bletchley: R.S.* 2/6; London: J.S.* 3/-: London: Hyde Park Sympathisers 1/6; Los Angeles Group: per A.S. £8/15/0.

LOFT TOTAL TO DATE		01 10		
Previously acknowledged		Contraction of the second		
Iotai		10		

1957 TOTAL TO DATE ... 1534 TO

*Indicates regular contributor.

Fire Fund TOTAL TO DATE £382 3 3 GIFTS OF BOOKS: London: K: London: C.F.

in any strike the blackleg can command the support of the whole of the upper, middle, and certain sections, of the lower classes. The police are there for his protection and behind them the military. The press will plead his case and the employer and his wife will regard him as their social and intellectual equal. For once in his dim life he will be accorded the dignity that will be denied to him when he is no longer of service to them. As for the strikers standing in little groups in the gutter . . . they are beyond the pale . . . may my sympathies and support always be with them.

London .

ARTHUR MOYSE.

Some Are More Equal Than Others

VATICAN CITY, SUNDAY.

The Pope said to-day that men and women are equal.

God had created them "as persons equal in rights and dignity."

But, he went on, a woman must subordinate herself to her husband.

FRELDOM

ents and children, between children and teachers, and between work and leisure, can lead to an entirely different conception of the school, "calculated", as Godwin wrote (in 1797!) "entirely to change the face of education. The whole formidable apparatus which has hitherto attended it, is swept away. Strictly speaking, no such characters are left upon the scene as either preceptor or pupil . . ." Or as Bakunin envisaged,

"They will be schools no longer; they will be popular academies, in which neither pupils nor masters will be known. where the people will come freely to get, if they need it, free instruction, and in which, rich in their own experience, they will teach in their turn many things to the professors who shall bring them knowledge which they lack".

A number of experiments foreshadow this changed school in one or more aspects-the Pioneer Health Centre at Peckham, the Cambridgeshire Village Colleges, the Leicestershire County Colleges, Teddy O'Neil's school where "time-tables and programmes play an insignificant part, for the children come back when school hours are over, and with them, their parents, and older brothers and sisters", or A. S. Neill's "community of children and adults". The school as an extension of the family, as a family centre in which, according to the needs of the individual, the cohesion of the family could be heightened or its tensions loosened, as a source of autonomy and reciprocity, as a functional 'plant' for learning through childhood and adult life, as a centre for the exchange of skills and experiences-all might flow from the association of parents and teachers if it is pursued beyond the tender trap of Crestwood Heights.

PEOPLE AND IDEAS Parents, Teachers and the Tender Trap

"The most fruitful and far-reaching development of education in our generation will come as a result of conceiving of it not only as a matter of psychology but also as the core of social and political philosophy; and of regarding education as the fundamental principle, and educational institutions as the essential material of concrete social organisation. The organisation of communities around their educational institutions is capable of universal application in any society and at any stage of culture. It is also the ultimate form of social organisation."-HENRY MORRIS.

4

(Paper read at RIBA, 15/5/1956).

AT the risk of boring you with still more snippets from the misgivings of American sociologists, I would like to go back to the contrast between the educational panacea of Human Relations as offered with so much reasonable conviction by Ashley Montagu, and the shortcomings of this doctrine in practice in America noted by David Riesman. Dr. Montagu in The Direction of Human Development, writes of the coming together of parents and teachers in the complementary task of developing the potentialities of the child: "The parents would contribute what the teachers ought to know, and the teachers would contribute what the parents ought to know, for the benefit of the child as well as for the benefit of all concerned. The teaching the child receives at home and the teaching it receives at school must be joined and unified. The teaching of the elementary skills of reading, writing and arithmetic is important, but not nearly as important as the most important of all skillshuman relations".

'joined and united', all avenues of escape are closed. After all, how many children of your acquaintance enjoy discussing their school life with their parents or their home life with their teachers? Is not the plurality of environment one of the child's means of defending itself against the prying omnipotence of the adult world?

TT was almost with relief that I realised that the basis of my support for the idea of parent-teacher associations was not educational theory but social theory -the social theory of anarchism. For the anarchist, seeking functional, as opposed to political, answers to social needs, and contrasting the social principle with the political principle, sees in the state's control of education a usurpation of a social function. (Historically of course, the Education Act of 1870 didn't 'usurp' anybody's function, but if you accept the conception of an inverse relationship between the state and society -the strength of one resulting from the weakness of the other-you can see how the social organisation of popular education was, so to speak, atrophied in advance, by its political organisation. That this has not been the disaster-though some would say it has-that anarchist thinkers like Godwin predicted, has been due to the local diffusion of control, the divergent aims of teachers and the resilience of children). Functionally, the administration of the school is the concern of parents and teachers, and if we really seek a society of autonomous free associations, we must see parent-teacher associations as the kind of body whose eventual and 'natural' function is to take over the schools from the Ministry, the County Councils, the Directors, Inspectors, Managers and Governors who, in a society dominated by the political principle are inevitably their controllers. I do not know whether schools so administered would be any better or any worse than they are at present, but I do believe that a 'self-regulating' society would run its schools that way. Among privately controlled schools in this country which exemplify this kind of organisation, are, for instance, Burgess Hill School, owned by a Friendly Society of parents and teachers, and King Alfred School, governed by a society of people interested in modern educational methods and 'administered by an advisory council of pupils and staff. I have not heard of any parent-teacher associations in the ordinary school system which aspire to such a function, though if they develop with anything like the intensity of the Home and School Association at Crestwood Heights, one can imagine the members reflecting after a time on whether their own intense 'participation' had not rendered the usual complicated and expensive bureaucracy of school administration superfluous. One can also imagine that if the responsibilities of such associations extended to the functional questions of actually running the school, there would be a lessening of that dreadful overconcern about the 'normality' of the child which is such a depressing feature of Crestwood Heights, where children are regarded as cases "the moment they lag behind the highly formalized routines of their mates or show signs of distinctive individuality".

cation Fellowship. Another body, the National Federation of Parent-Teacher Associations was founded last year. Some of these associations have sprung up in a negative way to resist, and in some cases successfully avert 'closing down' orders for schools. In the case of one independent school in London (St. Paul's Junior School, Hammersmith) due to close down because the existing building could not economically be kept in repair while the trustees could not find the money for a new building, the parents successfully raised loans for it announcing last year that they "would accept financial and educational responsibility for a new school". On the other hand, at our local primary school, due to be closed by the LCC as part of their educational re-organisation, a parents' association was formed, thirty years too Does this mean that with all our good late, to resist the measure, but proved successful only in making a handsome present to the retiring headmistress! Another local school makes clear its opinion on the proper place of parents with a notice at the entrance: "Parents are requested not to accompany their children beyond this gate". Other associations have seen their function in improving the school's equipment-providing a film-projector, a record-player, stage-lighting. At secodary schools in Hertford and Hatfield, the Parent-Teacher Associations have built swimming pools. Having completed the swimming pool at Morgan's Walk School, Hertford, the Association is turning its attention to the provision of a library.

hunting-ground for the committee-minded man or woman, and a trap for the excellent teacher who may be less adept at committee work. Another criticism is that it does not necessarily bring in the type of parent with whom contact is most needed; for example those whose children present particularly difficult problems, perhaps because of their home background".

THERE are plenty of indications-the formation last year of the National

Federation-the recent long correspondence in the Manchester Guardian on Parental Apathy-Dinah Brook's articles in The Observer on Parents in Action, that the movement for bringing parents closer into the life of the school is continually gaining strength in this country.

But David Riesman in one of the essays in his book Individualism Reconsidered makes this comment on the situation of the children of 'Crestwood Heights', (the Canadian suburb studied in the book of that name by J. R. Seeley, R. A. Sim and E. W. Loosley):

"Their parents want to know how they have fared at school: they are constantly comparing them, judging them in school aptitude, popularity, what part they have in the school play; are the boys sissies? the girls too fat? All the school anxieties are transferred to the home and vice versa, partly because the parents, college graduates mostly, are intelligent and concerned with education. After school there are music lessons, skating lessons, riding lessons, with mother as chauffeur and scheduler. In the evening, the children go to a dance at school for which the parents have groomed them, while the parents go to a Parent-Teacher Association meeting for which the children, directly or indirectly, have groomed them, where they are addressed by a psychiatrist who advises them to be warm and relaxed in handling their children! They go home and eagerly and warmly ask their returning children to tell them everything that happened at the dance, making it clear by their manner that they are sophisticated and cannot easily be shocked. As Professor Seeley describes matters, the school, in this community operates a 'gigantic factory for the production of relationships'." This really frightening description pulled me up with a jerk. Accustomed to think of parent-teacher co-operation as unequivocally a Good Thing, I had never considered its possibilities as a tender trap, a well-intentioned conspiracy against the child. For where home and school are two separate worlds a child unhappy at home might find a means of escape in the different life of school, and a child who is miserable at school might find consolation in the atmosphere of home. But if home and school are

Some of the results and the pitfalls of this kind of organisation are described in The Times (16/9/57). The staff at one school reported that

"the progress of several children in arithmetic was being impeded by wellintentioned efforts to help them at home. At a series of evening meetings, the staff worked through specimen arithmetic papers with the fathers and mothers, explaining the particular methods in use at the school. Similarly, the headmistress of a village school introduced italic handwriting, a move which appeared to perturb some parents. As a result of discussion several mothers became interested and asked her to arrange evening classes so that they might learn it for themselves.

intentions we are on our way to Crestwood Heights? David Riesman was shocked when, after his description of that suburban community, one of his colleagues declared that children were worse off there than they had been under the ancien régime. Historical amnesia had blinded him, as it blinds many nowfashionable critics of progressive education, to the brutalities and savageries in the treatment of children a hundred or so years ago. Then children were harnessed to the engine of society with often little concern for their own development. Many were too frightened or too cowed to be anxious. And he goes on (soft pedalling the economic background and the contradictory aims of the Crestwood Heights commutors described in last week's FREEDOM) to attribute the pervading anxieties of the parents and children of Crestwood Heights to the fact that, in their way, its inhabitants are frontiersmen, explorers:

"Whereas the explorers of the last century moved to the frontiers of production and opened fisheries, mines, and mills, the explorers of this century seem to me increasingly to be moving to the frontiers of consumption. They are opening up new forms of inter-personal understanding, new ways of using the home as a 'plant' for leisure, new ways of using the school as a kind of com-

C.W.

MEETINGS AND **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

LONDON ANARCHIST GROUP

Every Sunday at 7.30 at THE MALATESTA CLUB. 32 Percy Street, Tottenham Court Road, W.1. **LECTURE - DISCUSSIONS**

IN this country the pioneer of parentteacher co-operation was the Home and School Committee of the New Edu-

"Formal association between parents and teachers does face certain difficulties. On occasion it may provide a

munity centre, as the chapel of a secular religion perhaps".

This conclusion is a reminder that beyond the impasse of Crestwood Heights, the changing relationships between parents and teachers, between par-

World Population Growth from p. 1

will do their best and will certainly leave some descendants. Unattractive but highly fecund girls will be less likely to marry, but those that do will have plenty of children . . . However, the group that is both unattractive and infecund will be at a double disadvantage and so will tend to be under-represented in future generations. Consequently in each generation, owing to the elimination of this last group, we would expect to find that the mean fertility of nubile and attractive mothers should be below that of the less attractive . . . Using similar arguments we would expect that most other human characteristics leading to success in life will become genetically associated with lower fecundity, quite apart from the fact that in more advanced communities low fertility in itself usually results in a higher standard of living. .

on the assumption that the fact that the largest families are to be found among less intelligent people means that as a group the less intelligent will leave proportionately more descendants in each generation. . . .

If intelligent people, though fewer of them have really large families, more often marry and have small families than do the less intelligent, they may well leave as a group as many descendants as the less intelligent, of whom a few have the largest families but a higher proportion leave no children at all. . .

[Again] we know that more or less complete sterility is surprisingly common, affecting perhaps 10 per cent. of married couples, besides those people who, never intend to marry and who must be considered psychologically in-

OCT. 6-John Smith on LIVING IN SOCIETY

OCT. 13-Donald Rooum on FREEDOM & OWNDOM.

OCT. 20-Reg. Wright on GROUP WORK IN INDUSTRY

Questions, Discussion and Admission all free.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS Weather Permitting HYDE PARK Sundays at 3.30 p.m.

GLASGOW

OPEN AIR MEETINGS Maxwell Street Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m.

* Malatesta Club *

SWARAJ HOUSE, **32 PERCY STREET,** TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.I. (Tel.: MUSeum 7277).

ACTIVITIES Every Sunday at 7.30 p.m. London Anarchist Group Meetings (see Announcements Column)

	, since artificial feeding is now perfectly satisfactory, selection against low milk yield has ceased [and] a considerable number of civilised women are unable to feed their own babies In less advanced peoples, on the other hand, the only children to survive infancy are those whose mothers did have an adequate milk flow So also, if selection for the highest fecundity is replaced, we would expect to find a fall in the average fecundity of the population, as is in fact seen in advanced races with low mortality There is another important argument in favour of our suggestion that the selective disadvantage of lower fecundity is compensated by other characters of high survival value associated with it, and that is in the inheritance of intelligence it has been suggested that since the less intelligent seem to be the most prolific this means that the average level of intelligence of the population will be falling [but] observations failed to show any sign at all of the expected fall in mean intelligence. This has been considered a very puzzling and unexpected result, but it is puzzling only		Every Wednesday at 8 p.m. BONAR THOMSON speaks Every Friday and Saturday: SOCIAL EVENINGS FREEDOM The Anarchist Weekly Postal Subscription Rates : 12 months 19/- (U.S.A. \$3.00) 6 months 9/6 (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$1.50) 3 months 5/- (U.S.A. \$0.75) Special Subscription Rates for 2 copies 12 months 29/- (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$4.50) 6 months 14/6 (U.S.A. \$2.25) Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed a/c Payee, and addressed to the publishers FREEDOM PRESS, 27 Red Lion Street London, W.C.1. England Tel.: Chancery 8364
--	---	--	--

Printed by Express Printers, Louden, S.1.

Publishen ov Freedom Press. 27 Red Lion Street, London, W.C.L.